

## QUALITY REPORT

# VPA 28 - GHG Emission Reduction through use of Bondhu Chula (Improved Cook Stoves) in Bangladesh

GS-767 · GS · Bangladesh

Report ID: CM-6F2A8091 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.5**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably documented Gold Standard cookstove project, but the evidence shows several reliability and claim-safety weaknesses. Additionality is confirmed by the VVB, yet leakage is not addressed in the latest verification report, baseline reassessment timing is not stated, and the monitoring file contains multiple data consistency issues and corrective actions.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-767
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

- The latest verification report says leakage is not addressed, while an older monitoring report described it as negligible.
- The verification report lists multiple CARs/CLs and several data inconsistencies between survey forms, monitoring summaries, and the installation database.
- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not mentioned, leaving dual-claim risk only partially resolved.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the verification report, which supports the project's core environmental case.
- Leakage is not addressed in the verification report, and the project uses a project-specific baseline with no baseline reassessment date stated.

The verification report confirms additionality through VVB review, which is a meaningful positive for integrity. However, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, the last reassessment date is not stated, and the latest verification report says leakage is not addressed. The report also lists five corrective action requests and one clarification request, indicating unresolved or recently corrected issues in the monitoring evidence.

### Transparency — 5.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, usage monitoring method, and key usage rates are stated in the extracted records.
- The verification report records five corrective action requests and one clarification request, plus several internal consistency issues in monitoring data.

Transparency is moderate because the record includes the VVB name, monitoring period, usage monitoring approach, and both assumed and verified usage rates. At the same time, the verification report documents multiple inconsistencies between survey forms, monitoring summaries, and the installation database, including missing mobile numbers and mismatched respondent names. Those issues reduce confidence in the completeness and auditability of the MRV trail.

### Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The verified usage rate of 99.1% is close to the assumed 99%, which reduces concern about usage overstatement.
- The latest verification report does not address leakage, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not mentioned.

Claim safety is weakened by the lack of a current leakage treatment in the verification report, even though an older monitoring report described leakage as negligible. The verified usage rate of 99.1% is close to the assumed 99%, which is reassuring, but the project is also marked CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-claim exposure is not fully resolved. I privileged the latest verification report over the older monitoring report for leakage because it is more recent and more authoritative for the monitored period.

### Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + There are multiple evidence documents used, including the PDD, monitoring report, verification report, and appendix materials.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report includes several corrective actions and data mismatches that weaken documentation reliability.

Documentation is fairly strong in breadth because the extracted record references multiple official documents and includes a substantial list of findings and corrective actions. Still, extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report itself shows several data-quality problems that required corrections. The crediting period also conflicts with the PDD, and I privileged the later verification report because it is more recent and specific to the monitoring period, but the contradiction still lowers confidence.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversal events stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not addressed in latest verification
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline; reassessment timing missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, current leakage assessment in the latest verification package and reconcile it with the older monitoring report.

→ Resolve the respondent/database inconsistencies and publish a cleaner audit trail with explicit baseline reassessment timing and registry claim status.

## 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\_06-09\_2015.docx
- PDD\_13-01\_2016.docx
- GS 3112 PoA renewal PoA-DD v3.0 09092022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-767
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-767
- 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-6F2A8091 · 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)