

QUALITY REPORT

GS1205 Sustainable Energy for Development PoA, VPA 3: Improved Cook Stove Project in Brazzaville

GS-400 · GS · Congo

Report ID: CM-61CE6F0C · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.7
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This improved cook stove project has some positive safeguards and a high verified usage rate, but key quality evidence is missing or not stated in the extracted record. The baseline is project-specific, leakage is not addressed, and additionality is not confirmed by a VVB, which keeps confidence in the crediting claim moderate at best.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-400
Sector	industrial
Country	Congo
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption v2.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2025
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed and no leakage deduction is stated in the monitoring record.
- Additionality is not confirmed by a VVB and the extracted record does not show the test used.
- No buffer pool or reversal treatment is stated, even though the project is an energy-efficiency cooking project with potential usage and durability risks.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report shows a very high verified usage rate of 96.5%, which supports real-world adoption of the stoves.
- Leakage is marked as not addressed, and no leakage deduction is reported in the monitoring report.

The monitoring report indicates a verified usage rate of 96.5%, which is a positive sign that the cook stoves were actually being used. However, leakage is explicitly not addressed, no leakage deduction is stated, and additionality is not confirmed by a VVB in the extracted record, so the integrity case is only moderate. The absence of any stated buffer pool or reversal treatment also leaves permanence-related risk insufficiently documented.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The record includes a monitoring period from 2016-08-01 to 2018-07-31, a methodology version, and multiple evidence documents including the PDD and monitoring report.
- The VVB name, verified versus claimed emission reductions, and CORSIA status are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is helped by the presence of a monitoring period, a named methodology version, and multiple source documents including the PDD, stakeholder consultation, monitoring report, and appendix. Still, the VVB name is not found, and the extracted record does not provide claimed versus verified emission reduction totals, which limits auditability. CORSIA eligibility is also not stated, leaving registry and market-use clarity incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.7 / 10

- + The project uses a defined methodology for technologies that displace decentralized thermal energy consumption, which is more structured than an ad hoc baseline.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and the leakage treatment is missing.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-specific baseline and the lack of a stated leakage treatment. The verified usage rate is strong, but the absence of a quantified leakage deduction and the lack of additionality confirmation increase over-crediting risk. The project is on Gold Standard, but CCP status and CORSIA eligibility are not stated in the extracted record, so dual-claim risk cannot be fully ruled out.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + The extracted record shows six documents used, high extraction confidence, and no material findings or corrective actions in the monitoring report.
- Several important fields are not stated in available documents, including the VVB name, additionality test type, buffer pool, and reversal treatment.

Documentation quality is fair: six documents were used, extraction confidence is high, and the monitoring report reports no material findings or corrective actions. At the same time, several key items are not stated in available documents, including the VVB name, additionality test type, buffer pool percentage, and reversal-event treatment. The crediting period is also much longer than the monitoring period, which is normal, but the recency and completeness of the evidence remain only moderate.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	additionality not VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	no buffer or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	leakage not addressed
● Baseline	project-specific baseline
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the VVB verification statement and the specific additionality test used, with clear evidence that it was independently checked.

→ Document leakage treatment, permanence safeguards such as any buffer contribution or reversal monitoring, and the project's CORSIA/CCP eligibility status.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-08-2015 to 31-07-2016_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01-08-2016 to 31-07-2018_v1.pdf
- GS4GG Transition-Annex_GS1205_PoADD_21 10 2019.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-08-2014 to 31-07-2015_v2.pdf
- GS2514 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report Feedback_round2.pdf
- PDD_12-05-2016.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-400
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-400

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-61CE6F0C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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