QUALITY REPORT

CHITETEZO MBAULA PROJECT – MALAWI

VCS-4144 · VCS · Malawi

Report ID: CM-EE2E7115 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.9
Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS household energy demand project using VMR0006 with a recent monitoring period and a clean verification outcome (no material findings or corrective actions reported). However, key quantitative integrity parameters (leakage deduction, buffer/pooling, and some baseline inputs) are not found in the extracted record, and there are document-to-document inconsistencies on additionality verification and leakage treatment.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4144
Sector	other
Country	Malawi
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VMR0006 1.1
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	Carboncheck (CCIPL)
Verified ERs	43,550 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Contradiction on whether additionality was verified by the VVB (monitoring report says yes; PDD says no).

■ Contradiction on leakage treatment (monitoring report says leakage was quantified; validation report says leakage was not addressed).

■ Leakage deduction percentage and buffer pool contribution are not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in net credited reductions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is reported as confirmed by the VVB in the monitoring report (2024-09-30) using an investment test.

- Leakage deduction and buffer pool contribution are not found in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents.

The monitoring report (2024-09-30) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and that an investment test was used, which supports additionality. Baseline setting is described only as project-specific in the extracted record, and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated, which weakens baseline robustness. Leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report (2024-09-30), but the leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record and leakage treatment is contradicted by the validation report, lowering confidence in net ER integrity. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the monitoring report (2024-09-30), which is a positive signal for implementation quality.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period (2021-08-01—2023-02-16) and verified ERs match claimed ERs (43,550) in the monitoring report (2024-09-30).

- Several core quant parameters are missing from the extracted record (e.g., leakage deduction %, grid emission factor/year, usage rates), reducing MRV transparency.

The monitoring report (2024-09-30) clearly states the monitoring period (2021-08-01—2023-02-16) and reports verified emission reductions equal to claimed (43,550), which is transparent for issuance accounting. The project reports an annual survey as the usage monitoring method in the monitoring report (2024-09-30), which is a recognizable MRV approach for household device projects. However, key quantitative inputs are not found in the extracted record (e.g., usage rates assumed/verified, grid emission factor/year, and leakage deduction percentage), limiting third-party reproducibility from the extracted data alone.

Claim Safety — 5.9 / 10

+ Verified ERs equal claimed ERs (43,550) in the monitoring report (2024-09-30), reducing immediate over-issuance risk for this period.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is contradictory between validation and monitoring documents.

Because verified ERs equal claimed ERs (43,550) in the monitoring report (2024-09-30), there is no immediate discrepancy suggesting over-issuance for the reported period. Still, over-crediting risk cannot be fully screened from the extracted record because usage rates (assumed and verified) are not found, and leakage treatment is inconsistent between the validation report and monitoring report. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so downstream claim constraints and double-claim channel risk cannot be confidently assessed.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with high extraction confidence and no reported corrective actions.

- Some key fields appear inconsistently stated across documents (additionality verification; leakage treatment), indicating reliability/traceability issues.

The extracted record includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document completeness and readability. The monitoring report (2024-09-30) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which typically indicates a clean assurance outcome. However, contradictions between documents on additionality verification and leakage treatment indicate that some statements are not consistently traceable across the document set, reducing documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB verification status inconsistent across documents
Permanence	Energy demand project; no reversal events reported
Leakage	Leakage treatment contradictory; deduction not found
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated in extracted record

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/clearly extract the leakage deduction percentage and the full leakage calculation narrative so net ERs can be independently reproduced.

→ Clarify and reconcile the additionality verification statement across the PDD and assurance documents (validation/verification), including explicit VVB conclusions and references.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- Validation Report
- 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-EE2E7115 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy