

QUALITY REPORT

BQS improved cookstoves for Burundi's schools

VCS-2616 · VCS · Burundi

Report ID: CM-AFDA0C51 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.8

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project has a reasonably solid assurance signal from a recent verification report with no material findings and no corrective actions. However, key quantifications that drive over-crediting risk (baseline approach, leakage deduction, and usage monitoring) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and there are document-to-document inconsistencies that reduce confidence.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2616
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Burundi
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS I.E 5
Crediting Period	2016 — 2023
VVB	LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	263,695 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2016 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in baseline validity for a cookstove crediting calculation.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (validation report says not addressed; monitoring report says quantified), raising data reliability and over-crediting risk.
- No usage monitoring method or usage rates (assumed/verified) were found in the extracted record, despite usage being a key driver of cookstove ERs.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + The verification report (2023-05-15) confirms additionality and reports no material findings and no corrective actions.
- Baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and usage monitoring details were not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in the ER quantification.

The verification report (2023-05-15) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline method and the timing of any baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, which is a major gap for cookstove quantification. Leakage is described as “quantified” in the monitoring report (2022-12-28), but the validation report (2022-11-22) indicates leakage was not addressed, creating uncertainty about whether leakage was consistently treated. No buffer pool information is present (and is generally not central for cookstoves), and no reversal events were found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + A specific monitoring period (2016-01-25 to 2018-12-31) and verified ERs (263,695) are provided, and the VVB is identified (Applus+).
- Key MRV parameters (usage monitoring method, assumed vs verified usage rates, and claimed vs verified ER comparison) were not found in the extracted record.

The project has a clearly stated monitoring period (2016-01-25 to 2018-12-31) and a verified emissions reduction figure of 263,695, as reflected in the extracted verification information (verification report dated 2023-05-15). The VVB is named as LGAI Technological Center S.A. (Applus+ Certification), which supports audit traceability. However, the extracted record does not include the claimed ERs for the same period, preventing a claimed-versus-verified comparison. Critically, the usage monitoring method and both assumed and verified usage rates were not found in the extracted record, limiting transparency on the main driver of cookstove performance.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project applies a national default fraction of non-renewable biomass value of 0.77, which is at least a standardized input rather than an ad hoc estimate.
- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, and leakage handling is contradictory across documents—both increase greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk hinges on baseline assumptions, leakage, and usage; in the extracted record, the baseline method is not stated and usage monitoring details are missing, which increases claim risk. The project uses a national default fraction of non-renewable biomass value of 0.77 (method noted as national default), which is generally safer than an unconstrained project-specific value, but the underlying national reference and applicability are not shown here. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess eligibility-related reputational risk. The contradiction on leakage treatment between the validation report (2022-11-22) and monitoring report (2022-12-28) further elevates the risk that public claims could outpace what is consistently evidenced.

Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ Multiple document types are evidenced (PDD, validation, monitoring, verification, issuance) with 12 documents used and medium extraction confidence.

- Contradictions between core documents (validation vs monitoring; PDD vs monitoring) reduce reliability and should be reconciled with clear citations.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, verification report, and issuance records, with 12 documents used, which is relatively complete for a VCS project. Minimum extraction confidence is medium, suggesting the documents were readable enough for structured extraction but not perfect. The verification report is recent (2023-05-15) relative to the monitoring period, which supports recency of assurance. Nonetheless, contradictions across core documents (leakage treatment and crediting period dates) indicate documentation consistency issues that should be resolved with explicit citations and harmonized statements.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal risk flagged for cookstoves
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across documents
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide explicit baseline description and parameters (including when it was last reassessed) with clear citations to the PDD/monitoring report sections used for ER calculation.

→ Disclose usage monitoring method and the assumed vs verified usage rates for the monitoring period, plus a claimed-versus-verified ER reconciliation table.

→ Resolve and publicly clarify the leakage inconsistency by stating the leakage sources, the quantified deduction percentage applied (if any), and where it is documented in validation vs monitoring.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Review Report
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Representation
- Verification Report

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-AFDA0C51 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy