

QUALITY REPORT

SMG - Access to Clean Cooking in Himalayas

VPA 01

GS-4411 · GS · Nepal

Report ID: CM-30A88AD3 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some solid integrity signals: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, leakage is quantified at 5%, and the monitoring report shows no reported reversal events in the extracted record. However, the evidence base is incomplete in places, with no buffer pool information, no verified total emissions reductions figure, and several corrective-action items around stakeholder engagement and double-counting checks.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4411
Sector	industrial
Country	Nepal
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	REDUCED EMISSIONS FROM COOKING AND HEATING: Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC) Version 4.0
Crediting Period	2023 — 2027
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- No buffer pool percentage is stated, and reversal handling is only described as not addressed in the extracted monitoring record.
- The record contains contradictions on reversal events, FNRB value formatting, leakage justification, and benefit-sharing disclosure, which reduces reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ The VVB confirmed additionality, and the project uses the TPDDTEC methodology under Gold Standard, which supports a structured baseline and accounting approach.

- Leakage is only partly supported by the record: a 5% deduction is stated, but buffer pool coverage is not found and reversal handling is not clearly resolved.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through a combined test and the VVB is named as LGAI Technological Center, S.A., which is a positive sign. Leakage is quantified at 5%, but buffer pool coverage is not stated and reversal handling is described as not addressed in the extracted monitoring record, so permanence is only moderately supported. The project uses the TPDDTEC methodology, but no baseline reassessment date is found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, usage monitoring method, and claimed emissions reductions are stated in the monitoring report.

- Verified total emissions reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the documentation set includes an unknown source plus a low-to-medium completeness signal.

The record includes a defined monitoring period, the VVB name, the usage monitoring method, and the claimed emissions reductions figure, which helps traceability. At the same time, the verified emissions reductions total is not found, and the evidence set includes an unknown source, so the public accounting trail is incomplete. The extraction confidence is medium rather than high, which limits transparency confidence.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project reports a quantified leakage deduction of 5% and a high FNRB value of 91.44, which is close to the national default and reduces some over-crediting concern.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, and the record does not clearly show a recent baseline reassessment or fully resolved double-counting safeguards.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage deduction and by the usage rate being both assumed and verified at 90, suggesting limited mismatch on that parameter. However, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which keeps dual-channel claim risk relevant, and the record does not show a clearly recent baseline reassessment. The contradictions around FNRB formatting and benefit-sharing disclosure also weaken confidence in the claim boundary.

Documentation — 5.8 / 10

+ Fourteen documents were used, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and the extraction confidence is not low.

- Several corrective-action and clarification items remain in the record, including stakeholder consultation, grievance mechanism, and double-registration checks.

The documentation base is reasonably broad, with 14 documents used and both monitoring and stakeholder consultation materials present. Still, the record contains multiple corrective-action and clarification requests, including stakeholder engagement, grievance mechanism setup, and double-counting checks. Because the extraction confidence is medium and some key fields are missing, the documentation package is only moderately complete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed test
● Permanence	buffer/reversal handling unclear
● Leakage	5% deduction quantified
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance present, details partial
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified emissions reductions total, buffer pool treatment, and a clear reversal-risk statement for the monitoring period.

→ Provide a complete, VVB-verified double-counting and eligibility statement, including baseline reassessment timing and any CCP or registry status.

Documents Reviewed

- MR_GS12488_v7.0_CL.pdf
- Project Annual-Report GS12488-Vintage 2.pdf
- FValR_GS12488_&_GS12628_v2.0_CL.pdf
- SMG Nepal - T-PreReview_V2.0-Design-Consultation-Report vF.1.pdf
- FValR_GS 12487_POA__v3.0_CL.pdf
- SMG Nepal - 430_V1.2_IQ_SDG-Impact-tool.xlsx
- SMG Nepal - T-PreReview_v2.3-VPA-Design-Document vF.1.pdf
- SMG Nepal - Stakeholder Consultation Report vF.1.pdf
- GS12488_T-PreReview_V2.0-Preliminary-review-request-form (VPA).pdf
- GS12488-Ex ante v4.0.xlsx
- GS12487_T-PreReview_V2.0-Preliminary-review-request-form (PoA).pdf
- SMG Nepal PoA Design-Consultation-Report v2.0.pdf
- GS 12488 Stakeholder Consultation Report VPA 1.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4411
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4411
- FVeR_GS12488_&_GS 12628_v5.0_CL.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-30A88AD3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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