

QUALITY REPORT

Congo (DRC) Improved Cook Stoves VPA 003– Ngaliema

GS-3348 · GS · Congo, the Democratic Republic of the

Report ID: CM-3985CE21 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	3.4
■ Transparency (25%)	3.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including a named VVB, a quantified leakage treatment, and an annual usage survey, but the record is weak on core quality checks. The monitoring report shows many corrective actions and material findings, while additionality confirmation, buffer protection, and verified usage data are not found in the extracted record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3348
Sector	industrial
Country	Congo, the Democratic Republic of the
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption Version 4.0
Crediting Period	2020 — 2040
VVB	CTI Certification Co., Ltd (CTI)
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Seventeen corrective actions and multiple material findings were reported in the monitoring report, indicating substantial documentation or implementation issues.
- Additionality was not confirmed in the extracted record, and reversal risk is not addressed with a buffer pool or similar protection.
- The monitoring report says safeguards were not described, while earlier stakeholder consultation documents indicate benefit sharing, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism, creating reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.4 / 10

- Additionality is not confirmed in the available monitoring record, and no VVB-verified test is stated.
- The project has no stated buffer pool, reversal events are marked as not addressed, and the monitoring report lists many corrective actions.

The monitoring report identifies the VVB as CTI Certification Co., Ltd and states a quantified leakage treatment, but it does not provide a verified additionality test or a buffer pool. Reversal risk is explicitly not addressed, which is a weakness for a cookstove project with long crediting duration. The large number of material findings and corrective actions in the monitoring report further weakens confidence in project integrity.

Transparency — 3.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period, methodology version, and VVB name are identified in the monitoring report from 2024-02-28.
- Claimed versus verified emission reductions are not available, and the extracted record shows no verified usage rate.

The record gives a clear monitoring period, methodology version, and VVB name, which helps traceability. However, total emission reductions claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, and the usage rate is only assumed at 90% with no verified value. That leaves the MRV picture incomplete despite the presence of a recent monitoring report.

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

- + Leakage is at least described as quantified, which is better than leaving it entirely unaddressed.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a reassessed standardized baseline, and the usage rate is assumed at 90% with no verified value.

Claim safety is limited by the project-specific baseline method and the absence of a verified usage rate. The FNRB value of 83.1 is based on a national default, but there is no comparison to a more conservative alternative in the extracted record. Leakage is described as quantified, which helps, but the lack of verified reductions and the unresolved monitoring issues keep over-crediting risk elevated.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + The record includes multiple source documents and a recent monitoring report dated 2024-02-28.
- The extraction confidence is high, but the document set still contains many unresolved findings and contradictions, reducing confidence in completeness.

The evidence set includes a monitoring report, stakeholder consultation material, and other extracted documents, and the monitoring report is recent. Still, the record contains many corrective actions and material findings, and several key fields are missing rather than merely unspecified. The contradiction set also shows that stakeholder consultation documents reported benefit sharing, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism, while the monitoring report says these were not described, so the documentation is not fully consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No VVB-confirmed additionality found
● Permanence	No buffer pool or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline only; reassessment missing
● Safeguards	Safeguards appear in older consultation but not in monitorin
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the VVB-verified additionality assessment, verified emission reduction totals, and the leakage deduction calculation in the monitoring package.

→ Document safeguards consistently across reports, including FPIC, grievance handling, and benefit sharing, and resolve the many corrective actions raised by the verifier.

Documents Reviewed

- MR of GS11325-GS11327-28022024_clean.pdf
- DD of VPA003_Round I_Clean.pdf
- GS11327_STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION REPORT--VPA3.pdf
- 11327 VPA3 DD clean.pdf
- 20230510_GS4GG Final VAL Report_Congo Cookstove VPA3_clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3348
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3348

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-3985CE21 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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