

QUALITY REPORT

GS10818 - Dissemination of Improved Cookstoves in India by Greenway - Dissemination of Improved Cookstoves in Karnataka by Greenway - VPA023

GS-4089 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-74FE98BA · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.4
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
■ Documentation (15%)	3.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the record also shows many corrective actions and clarification requests, weak or inconsistent usage evidence, and several contradictions across documents that reduce confidence in the claimed emission reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4089
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AMS.II.G version 12
Crediting Period	2020 — 2025
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	24 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- The verification report lists 17 corrective actions and multiple remaining clarification items, which suggests material documentation and implementation issues.
- Usage and baseline-related inputs are inconsistent across documents, including conflicting usage rates, conflicting usage-monitoring methods, and a change in crediting-period dates.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which is stronger than an unverified project assertion.
- The verification report records 17 corrective actions plus remaining clarification items, and reversal events are noted as not addressed.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and identifies a quantified leakage deduction of 5%, which are positive signs. At the same time, reversal events are marked as not addressed, the buffer pool is not stated, and the verification report lists 17 corrective actions plus several clarification items, all of which weaken the integrity assessment.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is stated and the project has a named VVB, which supports traceability of the review process.
- Key quantitative fields are missing or incomplete in the extracted record, including verified and claimed ERR totals, and the extraction confidence is low.

The project has a named VVB and a clearly stated monitoring period in the verification and monitoring records, which helps with traceability. But the extracted record does not provide verified or claimed ERR totals, and the extraction confidence is low, indicating that at least one key document was difficult to read and limiting transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + Leakage is quantified at 5%, which is better than leaving leakage unaddressed.
- Usage evidence is weak because the monitoring approach is self-reported and the verified usage rate differs from the assumed 100% usage.

Claim safety is weakened by the reliance on self-reported usage monitoring and by the gap between the assumed 100% usage and the verified usage rate of 85.7% in the monitoring report. The project is also marked as CORSIA-eligible, which increases the need for careful scrutiny, although the quantified leakage deduction and VVB review provide some mitigation.

Documentation — 3.6 / 10

- + Multiple official document types were available, including verification, monitoring, validation, and stakeholder consultation records.
- The extraction confidence is low and the record contains many unresolved findings, which lowers trust in the completeness of the documentation.

The evidence set includes a verification report, monitoring report, validation report, and stakeholder consultation material, so the project is not poorly documented overall. However, the record shows low extraction confidence, many corrective actions, and several unresolved findings, which reduce confidence in the completeness and reliability of the documentation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	5% quantified deduction
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible status increases dual-claim scrutiny

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled set of monitoring and verification figures for usage, FNRB, and credited emissions, with a clear explanation of which document is authoritative for each value.

→ Close all outstanding corrective actions and clarify reversal handling, baseline reassessment timing, and the basis for CORSIA eligibility.

Documents Reviewed

- GS10818_Monitoring-Report_13022024-Clean.pdf
- GS10818_ER Calculator_VPA wise_matrix_2nd ver_11012024.xlsx
- GS10818_ER Calculator_VPA wise_matrix_3rd ver_11112024.xlsx
- GS10818_Annual-Report_2023.pdf
- GS10818_Monitoring-Report_13022024-TC.pdf
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_TR_11112024_Clean.pdf
- GS10818_ER Calculator_VPA wise_matrix_3rd ver_18072024.xlsx
- Stakeholder consultation report.pdf
- (1)GS4GG Design Certification Report _PoA10818.pdf
- GS10818_VPA_16-26_SDG-Impact-Tool.xlsx
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form_SC_FINAL.pdf
- T-PreReview_V2.2_POA-Design-Documents_clean.pdf
- CL_190_Approved_Clarification_request_inclusion.pdf
- T-PreReview_V2.0-Preliminary-review-request-form.docx
- GS10818_VPA_23_Ex-ante_ER_Sheet_V2.0.xlsx
- Greenway Grameen POA-DD version 05.1_clean.pdf
- GS10818_VPA23-DD_v.2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4089
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4089
- PoA GS10818_Verification report_clean(1).pdf
- PoA GS10818-14 VPAs_Validation report_02-02-2023_clean.pdf
- PoA GS10818_Verification report_track(1).pdf
- PoA GS10818_Verification report_clean(13).pdf
- GS10818_PoA RCP Validation Report_clean-R1.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-74FE98BA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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