

QUALITY REPORT

Charcoal Stoves in Kenya

CM-c459bf · Gold Standard · Kenya

Report ID: CM-0F2AECE3 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.2

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

Assessment Summary

This Gold Standard cookstove programme has some core integrity elements in place, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards (FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key quantifications that drive credit quality—especially verified emission reductions, baseline details, and leakage deduction—were not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CM-c459bf
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Kenya
Vintage	2022, 2023
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G 03.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2032
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Verified and claimed emission reductions were not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess over-crediting risk for the 2022 monitoring period.
- Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, despite a long crediting period (2012–2032).
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (Carbon Check).

- Baseline approach and leakage deduction value were not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in quantified ERs.

The monitoring package indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd., which supports additionality robustness (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). The project uses AMS-II.G (version 03.0), which is a standard cookstove methodology, but the baseline approach and the date of any baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record (PDD/validation details not captured here). Leakage is described as quantified, yet the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2023), which weakens confidence in net ER conservativeness.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ Monitoring period (2022) and the usage monitoring approach (annual survey) are clearly stated in the monitoring report (2023).

- Claimed vs verified ER totals were not found in the extracted record, reducing MRV transparency.

The monitoring report (dated 2023-11-08) clearly specifies the monitoring period (2022-01-01 to 2022-12-31) and states that usage was monitored via annual survey, which is a recognizable MRV approach for cookstoves. However, the extracted record does not include total emission reductions claimed or verified for the period, preventing a basic cross-check of issuance quantities against monitoring results. Registry-level eligibility flags (such as CORSIA) were also not found in the extracted record, limiting completeness for public-facing claims review.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims screening.

~ Leakage is described as quantified, but without the deduction value it is unclear how conservatively leakage was treated.

Over-crediting risk cannot be screened effectively because the extracted record does not provide claimed or verified ER totals for the 2022 monitoring period (monitoring report, 2023). Key cookstove risk drivers—such as the fNRB method and fNRB value, and any assumed vs verified usage rate—were not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty around baseline fuelwood renewability and sustained adoption. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, which raises uncertainty for buyers needing to avoid higher-risk claim channels.

Documentation — 6.2 / 10

+ Multiple core documents were available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with medium extraction confidence.

- Several key quantitative fields (ERs, baseline method, leakage deduction, fNRB method/value) were not found in the extracted record.

Three core document types are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report), and the most recent document date (2023-11-08) is reasonably current relative to the 2022 monitoring period. Extraction confidence is medium, suggesting the documents were readable enough for partial capture but not fully complete. Despite this, several critical quantitative and methodological elements (ER totals, baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, fNRB method/value) were not found in the extracted record, indicating material documentation gaps for quality assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project (no reversal pool needed)
● Leakage	Quantified but deduction value missing
● Baseline	Baseline approach not found in record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not found in record

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the monitoring/verification tables showing total ERs claimed and verified for 2022, including any uncertainty deductions and the final issuance request.
- Disclose the baseline specification and key parameters (including fNRB method/value and any baseline reassessment timing) and report the explicit leakage deduction percentage applied.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / 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-0F2AECE3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy