

QUALITY REPORT

Cookstoves for Kids

CE-cookstoves-for-kids · Cool Effect

Report ID: CM-526FE2B6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

0.9 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.5
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.5

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality attributes (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be substantiated. Given the evidence gap and low extraction confidence, the project scores very low across all dimensions and carries high over-crediting and greenwashing risk until documents are provided.

Project Details

Registry	Cool Effect
Registry ID	CE-cookstoves-for-kids
Sector	cookstoves
Vintage	Recent
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable or not captured, undermining reliability of any potential claims

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

- ~ Cookstove projects often require careful usage monitoring and leakage treatment, but neither could be assessed without documents

No project design or assurance documents were available in the extracted record (no evidence documents; 0 documents used), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be evaluated. For a cookstove project, the absence of stated usage monitoring and leakage treatment is a major integrity concern, but the primary issue is the complete evidence gap. With minimum extraction confidence marked low, even the absence of data may reflect unreadable or missing documents, further reducing confidence.

Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or error/uncertainty information was found in the extracted record

- Registry/public reporting completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided

Transparency is very weak because the extracted record contains no verification/monitoring documentation and does not identify a VVB, monitoring period, or any quantified uncertainty/error checks. Registry completeness and public data availability cannot be assessed without any listed evidence documents. The low extraction confidence further suggests that even if documents exist, they were not reliably captured for review.

Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- No information was found on baseline methodology, fuel/non-renewable biomass assumptions, or verified usage rates—key drivers of over-crediting risk in cookstoves

- ~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved

Claim safety is low because the extracted record provides no information on baseline methodology, non-renewable biomass fraction assumptions, or verified stove usage—parameters that strongly influence credited reductions in cookstove projects. No information was found on CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, leaving eligibility and double-claim risk unresolved. In the absence of substantiating documents, any marketing or climate claims would be high risk.

Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were included and 0 documents were used in extraction

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability or missing capture of key sources

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents used. Minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable or not captured, which materially undermines auditability. Without core documents (PDD, monitoring report, verification report), the project cannot be independently assessed.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the project design document and the most recent monitoring and verification reports (including VVB identity, monitoring period, and any findings/corrective actions) so additionality, baseline, and MRV can be assessed
- Disclose cookstove-specific MRV details (usage monitoring method and results, non-renewable biomass fraction approach, leakage assessment/deduction, and uncertainty/error checks) and publish them in the registry entry

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-526FE2B6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy