

QUALITY REPORT

# Heqing Solar Cooker Project

VCS-1859 · VCS · China

Report ID: CM-0A5B3667 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>5.0</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ Integrity (35%)     | 5.8 |
|                                                              | ■ Transparency (25%)  | 4.6 |
|                                                              | ■ Claim Safety (25%)  | 4.9 |
|                                                              | ■ Documentation (15%) | 4.1 |
|                                                              |                       |     |

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS cookstove avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a stated negligible leakage treatment, which supports moderate integrity. However, the monitoring package shows multiple verification findings and missing evidence on key MRV items, so confidence in the claimed reductions is only moderate-to-low.

## Project Details

|                     |                                                   |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Registry            | Verra (VCS)                                       |
| Registry ID         | VCS-1859                                          |
| Sector              | cookstoves                                        |
| Country             | China                                             |
| Vintage             | 2018                                              |
| Project Methodology | AMS-I.C v.18                                      |
| Crediting Period    | 2011 — 2021                                       |
| VVB                 | SHENZHEN CTI INTERNATIONAL CERTIFICATION CO., LTD |
| Monitoring Period   | 2018 — 2021                                       |
| Confidence          | Medium                                            |
| Documents Reviewed  | 21 documents reviewed                             |
| Scored              | 2026-04-19                                        |

## Red Flags

- The verification report identified several material issues, including a missing comparison between estimated and achieved emission reductions, inconsistent references, and a failure to verify ongoing stakeholder communication.
- The extracted record contains contradictions on leakage treatment and usage monitoring method, and the project relies on self-reported usage with no verified usage rate found.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was tested using an investment test and the VVB confirmed it in the verification report.
- The monitoring report lists multiple material findings and required corrective actions, including missing ex-post versus ex-ante comparison and VVB rotation rule concerns.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the verification report confirms additionality through an investment test, and the monitoring report states leakage is deemed negligible with a 0% deduction. That said, the same monitoring report lists several material findings, including missing comparison of estimated versus achieved reductions, inconsistent references, and unresolved questions around site visits and VVB rotation rules, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting claim.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The monitoring period and crediting period are stated, and the VVB name is identified in the extracted record.
- Total claimed and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the monitoring approach relies on self-reporting without a verified usage rate.

Transparency is limited by missing core quantitative fields in the extracted record: total claimed and verified emission reductions are not found, and the usage rate is only described as self-reported with no verified value. The monitoring period and crediting period are available, but the documentation still leaves important MRV details incomplete, and the medium extraction confidence suggests the record is not fully clean.

### Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + Leakage is described as negligible with a 0% deduction, which is better than an unquantified leakage treatment.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly reassessed standardized baseline, and the record does not provide a verified usage rate to test over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is moderate at best. The project is an avoidance activity with a project baseline and a stated negligible leakage treatment, but the absence of a verified usage rate and the lack of any quantified comparison between expected and achieved reductions increase over-crediting risk.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + The record draws on many documents, with 21 documents used and a medium extraction confidence rather than low.
- The monitoring report contains numerous corrective actions and the extracted evidence list is sparse, with at least one document source shown as unknown.

Documentation quality is mixed: 21 documents were used and extraction confidence is medium, which is acceptable, but the monitoring report itself contains many required corrections and missing explanations. The evidence set also appears incomplete for some key items, with at least one source listed as unknown and several important values not found in the extracted record.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |                                                     |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed investment test                       |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | Avoidance project; reversal risk not applicable     |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | Negligible leakage with 0% deduction                |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Project baseline; reassessment not stated           |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards mentioned |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | CORSIA/CCP status not stated                        |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a complete ex-ante versus ex-post emissions comparison with the underlying calculation spreadsheet and verified emission reduction totals.

→ Resolve the monitoring inconsistencies by documenting the final leakage rationale, the actual usage monitoring method, and a verified usage rate from independent field evidence.

## Documents Reviewed

- HQ2-Iss\_Rep\_01Dec2016 to 30Nov2017\_7th MP.pdf
- Project ID 1859\_PRR\_03-11-2022.pdf
- HQ2-Iss\_Rep\_01Dec2017 to 31Jul2018\_8th MP.pdf
- VCS-Issuance-Representation-v4.1\_1859.pdf
- HQ2-MR\_01Dec2016 to 30Nov2017\_7th MP.pdf
- H2 (VCS1859)-MR-9th MP-v2.3b.pdf
- HQ2-MR\_01Dec2017 to 31Jul2018\_8th MP.pdf
- 1859 - SD Contribution Report.pdf
- Listing Rep-Heqing 2-7 Feb 2019.pdf
- HQ2-Reg\_Rep\_07Jan2019.pdf
- 1859\_Exemption\_Approval.pdf
- VCS-Project-Description-Proj HQ2-v2-clean.pdf
- PDD\_Heqing II.pdf
- VCS Gap Validation\_Verification\_Heqing II 8th V1.1.pdf
- FVR\_Heqing II.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v3.3\_HQII MP7.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1\_1859.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v3.3\_HQII MP8.pdf
- VCS-Validation-Representation-v3.3\_HQII.pdf
- VCS-HQII v1.4.2 (Clean).pdf
- VCS Gap Validation\_Verification\_Heqing II 7th V1.1.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-0A5B3667 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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