

QUALITY REPORT

The Butterfly Effect

CE-the-butterfly-effect · Gold Standard · Mexico

Report ID: CM-E5DB4642 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This Gold Standard cookstove project shows some strong social safeguard elements (FPIC and a grievance mechanism) and reports no material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, key quantification elements that drive credit integrity for cookstoves (baseline approach, leakage deduction, and usage performance) are missing from the extracted documents, and there is a material inconsistency in the fraction of non-renewable biomass value between the PDD and monitoring report.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CE-the-butterfly-effect
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Mexico
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption (TPDDTEC) 3.1
Crediting Period	2019 — 2024
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Fraction of non-renewable biomass is inconsistent between documents (0.8628 in the monitoring report vs 86.28 in the PDD), raising over-crediting and data reliability concerns.
- Baseline approach and leakage deduction are not stated in the extracted record, despite leakage being described as “quantified”.
- No verified usage rate is provided, even though usage is monitored via annual surveys—this limits confidence that claimed reductions reflect real-world stove adoption and sustained use.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2020).

- Baseline approach, leakage deduction, and reversal/buffer provisions are not stated in the extracted record (PDD and monitoring report).

The monitoring report (2020) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports integrity at a high level. However, the extracted record does not state the baseline approach used, when (or whether) the baseline was last reassessed, or any quantified leakage deduction, all of which are central to cookstove credit integrity (PDD, 2020-08-12; monitoring report, 2020). As an avoidance project, reversal risk is typically low, but the extracted record does not provide any buffer or reversal treatment details, so conservatism is warranted.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated and the usage monitoring approach is described as annual surveys (monitoring report, 2020).

- Key MRV outputs (claimed and verified emission reductions, VVB name) are not found in the extracted record (PDD and monitoring report).

The monitoring report (2020) clearly states the monitoring period (2019-04-16 to 2021-06-30) and describes usage monitoring via annual surveys, which is a positive MRV transparency signal. At the same time, the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified, nor the VVB name, limiting independent scrutiny and registry-style completeness from the available documents (PDD, 2020-08-12; monitoring report, 2020).

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- Material inconsistency in the fraction of non-renewable biomass value between the PDD and monitoring report increases over-crediting risk (PDD, 2020-08-12; monitoring report, 2020).

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence for downstream claims screening (PDD and monitoring report).

Cookstove crediting is highly sensitive to the fraction of non-renewable biomass, and the extracted record contains a major inconsistency: the monitoring report (2020) lists 0.8628 while the PDD (2020-08-12) lists 86.28, which cannot both be correct as a fraction. This contradiction increases the risk of over-crediting and weakens confidence in downstream claims. In addition, CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily screen for aviation/CCP-related claim constraints based on the available information (PDD and monitoring report).

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Extracted record shows high readability/parse confidence and includes both a PDD and a monitoring report (extracted metadata).

- Several core quantitative fields are missing (e.g., baseline method, ERR totals, VVB name), indicating incomplete extractable documentation for scoring (PDD and monitoring report).

Two core documents are present (PDD and monitoring report) and the extraction confidence is high, which supports a mid-range documentation score (extracted metadata). However, multiple key quantitative and attribution fields are not found in the extracted record (baseline method, ERR totals, VVB name, leakage deduction), suggesting the available documentation (or the extracted content) is incomplete for a robust quality assessment (PDD, 2020-08-12; monitoring report, 2020). No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2020).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project but buffer/reversal details not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage said to be quantified, but deduction not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide (or extract) the baseline approach and parameters used for crediting, including when the baseline was last reassessed, and publish the total emission reductions claimed and verified for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve and clearly document the fraction of non-renewable biomass value (fraction vs percent), including the method/source used to derive it, and report the verified usage rate (not just the monitoring method).

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report 2020
- Project PDD 2020

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-E5DB4642 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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