

QUALITY REPORT

GS1729 Myanmar Stoves Campaign - SLOW LIFE in Myanmar - VPA No. 002

GS-322 · GS · Myanmar

Report ID: CM-F7344DE5 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, no material findings, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, reliability is weakened by document contradictions on leakage treatment and crediting period, and key quantitative registry fields such as verified issuance totals are not stated in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-322
Sector	industrial
Country	Myanmar
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	The Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves Version 01, February 2013
Crediting Period	2015 — 2017
VVB	SustainCERT
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- The documents conflict on leakage treatment: the monitoring report says leakage was deemed negligible, while the PDD reportedly quantified it.
- The crediting period differs between documents, with the monitoring report showing an older period and the validation report showing a later period, which raises record consistency concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the monitoring report reports no material findings or corrective actions required.

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, and reversal risk is not clearly addressed because reversal events are noted as not addressed and no buffer pool is stated.

The project scores moderately because the monitoring report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB found no material findings or required corrective actions. Integrity is weakened by the absence of a stated buffer pool, reversal events being noted as not addressed, and the leakage treatment being inconsistent across documents. The baseline is project-specific and was last reassessed in 2017, which is acceptable but not especially strong for robustness.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report identifies SustainCERT as the VVB and provides a defined monitoring period with an annual survey for usage monitoring.

- Verified and claimed issuance totals are not stated in the extracted record, and the contradictory crediting-period evidence reduces confidence in reporting consistency.

Transparency is mixed: SustainCERT is named as the VVB, the monitoring period is clearly stated, and usage monitoring is described as an annual survey. However, the extracted record does not state total claimed or verified ERs, and the contradiction on the crediting period suggests the public record is not fully consistent. The medium extraction confidence also limits confidence in documentation completeness.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project uses a conservative national default approach for non-renewable biomass, and the verified usage rate of 84% is below the 100% assumption.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which increases dual-claim scrutiny, and the leakage evidence is mixed because one document says negligible while another says quantified.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a national default approach for non-renewable biomass and the verified usage rate of 84% is lower than the 100% assumption, which is directionally conservative. Still, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible, so dual-claim scrutiny remains relevant, and the leakage evidence is not fully aligned between the monitoring report and the PDD. The absence of a clear buffer pool or reversal treatment also leaves some residual over-crediting concern.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ Multiple document types were used, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation material, with medium extraction confidence.

- One key document was not identified, and the contradictory crediting-period and leakage statements show that the record is not fully harmonized.

Documentation quality is fair rather than strong. The record includes several relevant documents, including the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation material, and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low. That said, one document is unidentified, and the contradictions on leakage and crediting period indicate that the available documentation is not fully coherent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality test
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated; reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment timing available
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled registry note that resolves the leakage and crediting-period contradictions and identifies which document governs each value.

→ Disclose verified and claimed issuance totals, plus any buffer pool or reversal-management provisions, to strengthen transparency and permanence confidence.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.03.2015 to 28.02.2017_v3.pdf
- GS1729 PoA-DD_21.09.2016_v4.docx
- GS1729 PoA Design Consultation Report_16.05.2013_round2.pdf
- DEV_809_new.pdf
- DEV_809.pdf
- DEV_657.pdf
- PDD 20.02.2013_v5.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-322
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-322
- Validation_Report_GS1729_POA_RCP_DesignChange-R1_(1).pdf
- T-PreReview_V2.0-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report - Myanmar(1).docx
- Myanmar PoA-Design-Change-Memo-1729 31.08.2022(3).docx
- Validation_Report_GS1729_POA_RCP_DesignChange-R1_.pdf
- VR-Myanmar Stove-Microscale-Validation-Appraisal-Report - RCP and PRC.docx
- Myanmar Stoves Campaign PoA-DD-08.11.2022.pdf

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-F7344DE5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy