

## QUALITY REPORT

# GS1340 Efficient cookstoves in Burkina Faso - VPA-05 - tiipaalga F3PA cookstoves in Bam and Loroum

GS-617 · GS · Burkina Faso

Report ID: CM-1612FF4E · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.7**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.2</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.6</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a cookstove project with some positive evidence on additionality, safeguards, and quantified leakage, but the record shows several material verification issues and low extraction confidence. The project appears moderately documented, yet contradictions in usage rates, leakage, FNRB, and crediting period reduce trust in the reported performance and claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-617
Sector	industrial
Country	Burkina Faso
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves v1.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2025
VVB	SustainCERT
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

## Red Flags

- The verification report raised a material finding about traceability of households, technology, and usage rate, and listed many corrective actions.
- There are multiple contradictions across documents, including very different usage rates, leakage deductions, FNRB values, and crediting period dates.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the verification report, which supports the project's core eligibility case.
- The verification report records a material finding and numerous corrective actions, while reversal risk is not addressed and no buffer pool is stated.

The verification report from 2024 confirms additionality through VVB review, which is a meaningful positive signal. However, the same report includes a material finding about traceability of households, technology, and usage rate, and it lists many corrective actions, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the monitoring and crediting basis. Reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record, and no buffer pool percentage is stated.

### Transparency — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring period is clearly stated for 2022 and the project has a named VVB, SustainCERT, which supports basic MRV traceability.
- Total ER figures are not stated in the extracted record, and low extraction confidence plus several document contradictions weaken transparency.

The project has a named verifier, SustainCERT, and a clearly defined 2022 monitoring period, which helps basic traceability. Still, total ER claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low, meaning at least one key document was poorly readable. The record also contains several cross-document inconsistencies, which further reduces transparency.

### Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + Leakage is at least quantified, with a leakage deduction of 0.95% in the monitoring report.
- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which increases dual-claim sensitivity, and the usage rate and FNRB values conflict sharply across documents.

Leakage is at least quantified, with a 0.95% deduction in the monitoring report, which is better than leaving leakage untreated. Even so, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible, so claim separation deserves caution, and the usage rate and FNRB values vary sharply across documents. Those contradictions raise over-crediting and claim-quality risk.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + The record includes a PDD, monitoring report, verification report, and 19 extracted facts, with FPIC and a grievance mechanism both mentioned.
- Extraction confidence is low, and the verification report required multiple corrective actions, indicating incomplete or difficult-to-verify documentation.

The extracted record draws from four document types, including the PDD, monitoring report, and verification report, and it notes FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing. But the extraction confidence is low, and the verification report required many corrective actions, suggesting the documentation is not clean or fully reliable. The crediting period is also inconsistent across documents, which adds to the documentation weakness.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified but inconsistent
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA-eligible status

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clean reconciliation of the contradictory usage rate, leakage deduction, FNRB, and crediting-period values across the PDD, monitoring reports, and verification report.

→ Provide a complete, readable monitoring package with total ER claimed and verified, clearer traceability evidence, and explicit treatment of reversal risk and buffer arrangements.

## Documents Reviewed

- GS 1340 - VPA 01-10 - ER\_MP8\_v2.0(14).xlsx
- (2)Monitoring Report\_4th monitoring period\_01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018\_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_5th monitoring period\_01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019\_v1.pdf
- GS 1340 - VPA 01-10 - ER\_MP6\_v3.0 (1).xlsx
- GS 1340 - VPA 01-10 - ER\_MP7\_v1.0(1)(7).xlsx
- (2)Monitoring Report\_3rd monitoring period\_01.01.2017 to 31.12.2017\_v3.pdf
- T-PerfCert\_V1.1- MR\_GS1340\_GS2456\_GS3516-GS3524\_MP7\_v2.0\_clean(8).pdf
- T-PerfCert\_V1.1- MR\_GS1340\_GS2456\_GS3516-GS3524\_MP6\_v3.0\_clean (1).pdf
- T-PerfCert\_V1.1- MR\_GS1340\_GS2456\_GS3516-GS3524\_MP8\_v4(14).pdf
- (2)Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_08.02.2015 to 31.12.2015\_v2.pdf
- GS1340\_POA-DD\_CP2\_v8.0\_clean.pdf
- PDD\_09.12.2014\_v3.pdf
- (1)PDD\_29-10-2015.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-617
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-617
- (2)Verification Report\_4th monitoring period\_01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018.pdf
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form\_PoA GS1340 Verification Vintage 2022\_v3.0\_SC\_FINAL.pdf
- CCIPL 1325 FVR V.5.0 Clean.pdf
- CCIPL1777\_FVR\_v1\_26072023(7).pdf
- 28052024\_Verification-Report\_GS2456 GS3516-24-MP8-PoA\_GS1340-Burkina-Faso.docx(14).pdf
- GS1340\_GS2456\_GS3516-24\_6th M.P\_Verification Report.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-1612FF4E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)