QUALITY REPORT

Expanding Access to LPG in Haiti Through Microfinance Services

GS-420 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-9F30A20D · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.9
Overall Score
out of 10

Integrity (35%)	6.1
Transparency (25%)	5.0
Claim Safety (25%)	3.7
Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a Gold Standard cookstove/LPG avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings in the verification report. However, the record has several reliability gaps and contradictions, and key risk items such as reversal treatment and leakage justification are only partially documented, which keeps confidence moderate rather than strong.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-420
Sector	cookstoves
Vintage	2020
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC 3.1
Crediting Period	2015 — 2024
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.
Verified ERs	98,266 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2021
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-11

Red Flags

- ■ The verification report and monitoring report disagree on several points, including leakage treatment, grievance mechanism documentation, safeguards, usage monitoring method, and the credited period; this weakens record reliability.
- ■ Reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record, and no buffer pool percentage is stated.
- ■ The claimed and verified emission reduction figures differ sharply in the extracted data, which raises a material over-crediting or extraction-consistency concern.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Reversal events are not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is stated; leakage treatment is only described as quantified without the deduction level being visible.

The verification report dated 2022-09-28 confirms additionality through VVB review and reports no material findings or corrective actions. The project uses a project baseline, but the extracted record does not state when the baseline was last reassessed, and reversal risk is not addressed. Leakage is described as quantified in the verification report, yet the actual deduction level is not visible in the extracted facts, so permanence and leakage robustness remain only moderate.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and a documented annual survey approach in the verification report.

- The extracted record shows low extraction confidence and multiple contradictions across documents, while the claimed-versus-verified emission reduction figures are inconsistent.

The project has a named verifier, LGAI Technological Center, S.A., and a defined monitoring period from 2019-04-01 to 2021-03-31. The verification report also indicates annual survey-based usage monitoring, which is a positive sign for MRV quality. However, the extraction confidence is low and the record contains contradictions, including differing descriptions of the usage monitoring method and a large mismatch between claimed and verified emission reductions, which reduces transparency.

Claim Safety — 3.7 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline and the verification report indicates quantified leakage treatment, which is better than an unaddressed baseline/leakage setup.

- Usage is verified at about 84.7%, but the record does not show the assumed usage rate for comparison, and the large discrepancy between claimed and verified emissions increases over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the large gap between the claimed emission reductions and the verified amount in the extracted record, which suggests either a major extraction issue or a substantial over-claim risk. The verified usage rate is about 84.7%, but the assumed usage rate is not stated, so it is hard to judge whether the crediting assumptions were conservative. The project is not shown to have CCP approval or CORSIA eligibility in the extracted record, so there is no strong external claim-quality signal.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Seventeen documents were used, including a verification report, monitoring report, PDD, appendix, and stakeholder consultation material.

- Extraction confidence is low, and several key fields are either not stated or contradicted across documents, including the credited period and safeguards-related items.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with 17 documents used and references to the monitoring report, PDD, appendix, stakeholder consultation, and verification report. Even so, min extraction confidence is low, meaning at least one key document was poorly readable, and several fields are missing or not stated. The contradictions around safeguards, grievance mechanism, leakage treatment, usage monitoring, and the credited period further reduce documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	Reversal risk not addressed
● **Leakage**	Leakage quantified but deduction not visible
● **Baseline**	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards present but inconsistently documented
● **Double-claim**	No CCP/CORSIA status stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full verified leakage deduction, reversal treatment, and any buffer pool allocation in a single reconciled disclosure.

→ Publish a clean reconciliation of claimed versus verified emission reductions and resolve the document contradictions on safeguards, grievance mechanism, usage monitoring, and credited period.

Documents Reviewed

- 220609_Monitoring_Report_5th_TC.docx
- DEV_627.pdf
- DEV_627 (1).pdf
- GS2564_Annual Report_2020.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01-01-2015 to 12-31-2015.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_02-01-2017 to 03-31-2018_v3.docx
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-01-2016 to 31-01-2017_v5.docx
- 220909_GS2564_MR5_v4_reviewed.xlsx
- 101.5-Transition-Annex_15Jul2020.docx
- GS2564 Local Stakeholder Consulation Report Feedback_round2.pdf
- PDD_12-03-2014_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-420
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-420
- (1)GS2564_Annual Report_2019.pdf
- 220804_deviation_request_Annual_report2020_VVB_SC_FINAL.pdf
- 101.1-T-MR_GS2564_21092020.docx
- FVR verification_GS 2564_TQC_28092022 v04 - Clean version.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-9F30A20D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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