

QUALITY REPORT

Myanmar Stoves Campaign - Soneva in Myanmar - VPA No. 019

GS-3646 · GS · Myanmar

Report ID: CM-B169F99A · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.7
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some solid quality signals: the VVB confirmed additionality, no material findings were reported, and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism are documented. However, there are reliability concerns around document quality, a project-specific baseline, and a contradiction on the crediting period that reduces confidence in the record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3646
Sector	industrial
Country	Myanmar
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	The Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves Version 01.1
Crediting Period	2021 — 2036
VVB	SustainCERT
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- The crediting period differs between documents, with the verification record aligning to one range and the validation record showing a different range.
- Leakage treatment was described as quantified in the verification report, but the earlier validation report said leakage was not addressed.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.7 / 10

+ Additionality was tested using a combined approach and was confirmed by SustainCERT in the verification report.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and reversal risk is not clearly addressed because reversal events are marked as not addressed.

The verification report from SustainCERT confirms additionality using a combined test, which is a meaningful positive signal. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, and the report also states a quantified leakage treatment with a 0% deduction. On the weaker side, the baseline is project-specific, baseline reassessment timing is only partially clear, and reversal events are marked as not addressed, so permanence and baseline robustness are not fully strong.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, usage monitoring method, and verified usage rate are stated in the verification report.

- Total emissions reductions claimed versus verified are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low, which weakens documentation clarity.

The verification report provides the VVB name, monitoring period, usage monitoring method, and a verified usage rate of 95.45%, which supports traceability. The record does not include total emissions reductions claimed versus verified, so it is not possible to check consistency on the core issuance figures from the extracted data. Because the extraction confidence is low, the transparency score is reduced further.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The verification report reports a quantified leakage treatment with a 0% deduction, and the verified usage rate of 95.45% is close to the assumed 100%.

- The project uses a project-specific baseline and the record contains a crediting-period contradiction between the verification and validation documents, which raises over-crediting and record-consistency concerns.

Claim safety is helped by the verified usage rate being close to the assumed 100% and by the verification report's quantified leakage treatment. However, the baseline remains project-specific rather than standardized, which is weaker for over-crediting control. The contradiction on the crediting period between the verification and validation documents also creates a reliability concern, so I privileged the later verification report because it is more recent and appears to reflect the final audited position.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Twenty documents were used, and the record includes a verification report, validation report, monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation material.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the crediting period contradiction suggests the documentation set is not fully consistent across sources.

The record includes multiple document types, including validation, verification, monitoring, and stakeholder consultation materials, which is a positive sign for completeness. FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are all mentioned, supporting a reasonably documented safeguards package. Still, the extraction confidence is low, and the conflicting crediting-period entries show that the documentation set is not fully clean or internally consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not clearly addressed
● Leakage	quantified 0% deduction
● Baseline	project-specific baseline
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a fully reconciled issuance and crediting timeline across validation, monitoring, and verification documents.

→ Publish a clearer baseline and permanence rationale, including explicit treatment of reversal risk and any buffer or equivalent safeguard.

Documents Reviewed

- VPA 019 (GS11645) - Ex-Post Emission Reduction Calculation(2).xlsx
- VPA 019 (GS11645) - GS4GG Monitoring Reprt_v1.pdf
- VPA 019_v3.0-VPA-Design-Document 10102023.pdf
- GS1729 PoA-DD_21.09.2016_v4.docx
- VPA 019 (GS11645) - SDG-Impact-Tool.xlsx
- GS1729 PoA Design Consultation Report_16.05.2013_round2.pdf
- DEV_809_new.pdf
- DEV_809.pdf
- VPA 019 (GS11645) - Baseline _ Emission Reduction Calculation.xlsx
- DEV_657.pdf
- Stakeholder-Consultation-Report Myanmar.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3646
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3646
- 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
- DEV_573.pdf
- VR-Myanmar Stove-Microscale-Validation-Appraisal-Report - RCP and PRC.docx
- CCIPL1610_FVR_V3.0_Clean.pdf
- Myanmar Stoves Campaign PoA-DD-08.11.2022.pdf
- GS11644_GS11645_GS11646_MP01.MD.GEN.009.Verification_ReportCLEAN_(1).docx.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-B169F99A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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