

QUALITY REPORT

Cleaner Cooking for Rural Zimbabwe

GS-3634 · Gold Standard · Zimbabwe

Report ID: CM-06F6EE26 · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a certified Gold Standard cookstove project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage deduction, which supports a moderate integrity profile. However, the record shows several contradictions on usage rates, FNRB, leakage treatment, and credited volumes, and the low extraction confidence reduces trust in the documentation.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3634
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Zimbabwe
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC 3.1
Crediting Period	2021 — 2026
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Limited
Verified ERs	499,119 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-11

Red Flags

- Credited and verified emission reduction figures conflict across documents, including a large jump in verified and claimed totals.
- Usage rate, FNRB, leakage treatment, and reversal handling are inconsistent across documents, weakening confidence in the MRV record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which is stronger than an unverified project assertion.
- Reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record, and there is no buffer pool percentage stated.

The verification report indicates additionality was confirmed by Carbon Check (India) Private Limited using a combined test, which is a meaningful positive. The monitoring record also shows a quantified leakage deduction of 0.01%, but reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated, leaving permanence weaker than ideal. The project uses a project baseline, yet the absence of a reassessment date limits confidence in baseline robustness.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, and both claimed and verified emission reduction totals are available in the record.
- The extraction confidence is low and the record contains multiple contradictions on key MRV inputs, including usage rate and FNRB.

The record provides the monitoring period, VVB identity, and both claimed and verified emission reduction totals, which supports basic transparency. However, the extraction confidence is low, and the contradictions list shows inconsistent values for usage rate, FNRB, leakage treatment, and emission reduction totals across documents. That combination suggests the public MRV trail is only moderately reliable.

Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

- + The project uses a project-specific baseline and reports a quantified leakage deduction of 0.01%, which helps reduce over-crediting risk.
- The verified usage rate and assumed usage rate differ across documents, and the verified total is much higher than earlier figures.

Claim safety is helped by the project-specific baseline and a quantified leakage deduction, both of which reduce the risk of systematic over-crediting. Still, the usage rate differs materially between documents, and the verified emission reduction total is much higher than earlier reported figures, which raises concern about the stability of the underlying calculations. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which does not itself create a problem, but it does mean claims should be handled carefully.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

- + The record includes 19 documents used, the VVB name, monitoring period, and safeguard elements such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism.
- Key fields are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage and baseline reassessment timing, and the extraction confidence is low.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with 19 documents used, a named VVB, and safeguard elements including FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing. Even so, the record is incomplete on several important points, including buffer pool coverage and baseline reassessment timing, and the extraction confidence is low. Those gaps and readability issues reduce confidence in the completeness of the evidence base.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	quantified leakage deduction
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled MRV table that explains the differences in usage rate, FNRB, leakage treatment, and credited volumes across documents.

→ State reversal management clearly, including whether a buffer pool applies and how any non-permanence risk is handled.

Documents Reviewed

- VPA2_Zimbabwe_MRV3_ER calc sheet_v1.2.xlsx
- GS11551 Annual Report VPA 2 2025.docx.pdf
- VPA2_Zimbabwe_MRV2_ER calc sheet_v1.4.xlsx
- GS11551 Annual Report VPA 2 2023.pdf
- 501_V2.0_T_Article-6-Authorisation-Checklist_Cicada Carbon v2..pdf
- TASC_Zim_VPA_2_MP2_v1.9_Clean.pdf
- VPA2_Zimbabwe_ER calc sheet_v1.2.xlsx
- LOA00008 Cicada Carbon - Project Level Letter of Authorization..pdf
- TASC_Zim_VPA_2_MP1_v2.1_Clean.pdf
- TASC_Zim_VPA_2_MP3_v1.5_Clean.pdf
- TASC_Zim_Joint_VPA_7_MP2_VPA_2_MP5_v7_Clean..pdf
- VPA2_Zimbabwe_FValRep.pdf
- VPA2_Zimbabwe_VPA-DD_v.1.7_clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3634
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3634
- CCIPL 2097 FVR 16-09-2024_CC.pdf
- CCIPL 2260 FVR - Clean.pdf
- CCIPL 1433B GS 11551 - TASC- FVR.pdf
- CCIPL 1935 VPA2 TASC- FVR-Clean.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-06F6EE26 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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