

QUALITY REPORT

Happy Meal To Go

CE-affordable-cookstove · Gold Standard · Uganda

Report ID: CM-7DD18603 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This Gold Standard cookstove project shows some strong process elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, and VVB-confirmed additionality), but key quantification elements are inconsistent across documents. Large discrepancies in reported emissions reductions and shifting statements on leakage treatment increase over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CE-affordable-cookstove
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC) 1.0
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	CIRCODU
Verified ERs	2,087,069 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Very large inconsistency in verified emissions reductions across validation reports (2,087,069 vs 729,309), undermining confidence in credited outcomes
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (quantified vs not addressed), creating uncertainty about whether deductions were properly applied

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB, with an additionality assessment described in validation documentation.
- Baseline approach and leakage deduction are not clearly extractable, and multiple cross-document inconsistencies reduce confidence in the quantification.

The validation documentation indicates additionality was assessed and confirmed by the VVB (CIRCODU), which supports additionality robustness. However, the baseline method is not found in the extracted record, and the baseline reassessment timing is also not stated, weakening confidence in baseline validity. Leakage handling is inconsistent across monitoring reports (one states leakage was quantified, another indicates it was not addressed), which raises integrity risk for a cookstove activity where leakage can be material. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, which is positive, but the scale of cross-document ERR inconsistencies suggests underlying quantification or version-control problems.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly stated (2017-10-01 to 2018-09-30) and usage is monitored via annual surveys, with a verified usage rate of 81.25%.
- Claimed vs verified emissions reductions are not internally coherent across documents, limiting traceability of results.

The monitoring report clearly defines the monitoring period (2017-10-01 to 2018-09-30) and describes usage monitoring via annual surveys, with a verified usage rate of 81.25%. The VVB is identified (CIRCODU), and the document set is relatively complete (PDD, monitoring, validation among 14 documents). However, transparency is reduced by the inability to reconcile claimed and verified emissions reductions across different versions of validation documentation. Missing extracted details on baseline method and leakage deduction also limit third-party reproducibility from the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

- + The project uses a national default fraction of non-renewable biomass (0.88), which is at least a defined and auditable parameter choice.
- CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in the extracted record and the ERR figures show major contradictions, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because the extracted record shows major inconsistencies in emissions reduction numbers across validation reports, and leakage treatment is not consistently described across monitoring reports. The project applies a national default fraction of non-renewable biomass of 0.88, which is at least a defined parameter choice, but without the baseline method and leakage deduction clearly captured, it is hard to judge conservativeness. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks. Overall, the combination of missing quantification details and contradictory ERR figures increases greenwashing risk for end-user claims.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ A substantial document set was available (14 documents including PDD, monitoring report, and validation report) with high extraction confidence.

- Despite good coverage, key fields remain missing (baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool), and contradictions indicate document control/versioning issues.

Documentation coverage appears strong: 14 documents were used, including a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, and extraction confidence is high. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2019-09-23), and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. Nonetheless, several key quantification fields are not found in the extracted record (baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, buffer pool percentage), which limits completeness. The presence of multiple contradictory values across documents suggests versioning or document-control weaknesses despite the overall document volume.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality (barrier/investment test versions differ)
● Permanence	Avoidance activity; no reversal events reported in extracted record
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across monitoring reports; deduction not captured
● Baseline	Baseline approach not found in extracted record; reassessment timing not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented; safeguards mentioned
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated in extracted record

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, single reconciled table (with references) showing claimed vs verified ERs for the monitoring period and explain why earlier validation versions differ so materially.

→ Disclose the baseline method and explicit leakage deduction applied (or justify 0% with evidence) in a way that is traceable to the monitoring/verification documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- Full Monitoring Report - 2013
- Full Monitoring Report - 2012
- Monitoring Report 2019
- Gold Standard Monitoring Report 2015-2016
- Gold Standard Monitoring Report 2014-2015
- Gold Standard Project Design Document
- Verification Report 2013
- Gold Standard Verification Report 2015
- Verification Report 2019
- Verification and Certification Report 2015-2016
- Gold Standard Verification Report 2014-2015
- Validation Report
- Verification Report 2015

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-7DD18603 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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