

## QUALITY REPORT

# VPA 26 - GHG Emission Reduction through use of Bondhu Chula (Improved Cook Stoves) in Bangladesh

GS-765 · GS · Bangladesh

Report ID: CM-ODDC6B11 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.6**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.1</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.4</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.0</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a named verifier, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the evidence also shows several documentation inconsistencies, missing quantified leakage treatment, no buffer pool information, and uncertainty around double-claim risk because CCP status is not clearly stated.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-765
Sector	industrial
Country	Bangladesh
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	The Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves version 1.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2034
VVB	TÜV NORD JI/CDM Certification Program
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

## Red Flags

- Leakage is described as negligible in the verification report, but the earlier monitoring report did not address it, and no quantified deduction is shown.
- The record contains multiple data inconsistencies in respondent names, mobile numbers, and reported figures, which weakens confidence in the monitoring evidence.
- CCP status is not mentioned, while CORSIA eligibility is marked true, leaving some dual-claim risk unresolved.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project's core eligibility case.

- No buffer pool percentage is stated, reversal events are marked as not addressed, and leakage is only described as negligible rather than quantified.

The verification report confirms additionality through the VVB, which is a meaningful positive signal. At the same time, the project has no stated buffer pool percentage, reversal events are not addressed, and leakage is only described as negligible rather than supported by a quantified deduction. The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional approach, which keeps the integrity score moderate rather than strong.

### Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring period, verifier name, and usage monitoring approach are stated in the verification report.

- Total claimed versus verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the monitoring evidence includes several internal inconsistencies.

The verification report provides a named verifier, a defined monitoring period, and an annual survey-based usage monitoring method. However, total claimed and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the report contains multiple internal inconsistencies involving respondent names, mobile numbers, and reported values. That combination limits the clarity and auditability of the public record.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The project uses a national default approach for FNRB, and the verified usage rate of 95% is close to the assumed 99%.

- CORSIA eligibility is true while CCP status is not mentioned, and the leakage treatment is not quantified, which leaves over-crediting and dual-claim risk only partly resolved.

The project uses a national default FNRB method and reports a verified usage rate of 95% against an assumed 99%, which is reasonably close. Still, leakage is not quantified, and the record does not clearly resolve dual-claim exposure because CORSIA eligibility is true while CCP status is not mentioned. I privileged the verification report's later statement that leakage is deemed negligible over the earlier monitoring report's lack of leakage treatment, but the contradiction still lowers confidence.

### Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including the verification report, monitoring report, PDD, and appendix material.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report lists several data inconsistencies and missing respondent identifiers.

The evidence set is fairly broad, with official documents including the verification report, monitoring report, PDD, and appendix material, and the project has a named VVB. Even so, extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report itself notes several missing or inconsistent data points. The crediting period also conflicts with the PDD, and I privileged the later verification report because it is more recent and likely reflects the updated project status.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal treatment stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Negligible but unquantified
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA eligible, CCP unclear

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of claimed versus verified emission reductions, including any corrections to inconsistent survey and installation records.

→ Provide quantified leakage treatment, buffer pool information, and an explicit statement on CCP status and any double-claim safeguards.

## Documents Reviewed

- GS 3112 MP5 ER calculator v4.0 18102023.xlsx
- GS 3112 MP3 ER calculator v 4.0 26092022.xlsx
- GS3112 MP4 MR v 4.0 15052023\_Clean.pdf
- GS 3112 - VPA01-36 MP3 Monitoring Report v5.0 26092022\_Clean.pdf
- GS3112 MP5 Monitoring Report v4.0 18102023\_Clean.pdf
- T-V3.0-Deviation-Request-form\_GS Micro scale PoA GS 3112\_GSdecision(2).pdf
- GS 3112 SDG-Impact-Tool.xlsx
- GS Micro scale PoA GS 3112\_PoA Renewal Deviation\_SC\_FINAL.pdf
- GS 3112 Transition-Annex- v 3.0 13012022.docx
- GS 3112 PoA-DD ver 6.0 08122025\_clean.pdf
- PDD\_01.20.2015\_v4.docx
- PDD\_03-09\_2015.docx
- PDD\_13-01\_2016.docx
- GS 3112 PoA renewal PoA-DD v3.0 09092022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-765
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-765
- GS 3112 Final Verification Report v2.0\_Clean.pdf
- 22-094\_FVerR-GSPoA3112\_ 15-06-2023\_Clean.pdf
- FVerR-GSPoA3112\_31-10-2023.pdf
- CCIPL 2863 PoA FVR\_Clean.pdf
- GS3112 Emission Reductions\_Not Applicable.xlsx
- CCIPL 1323\_Renewal PoA\_FVR\_clean.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-0DDC6B11 · 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)