

## QUALITY REPORT

# PoA for the Reduction of emission from non-renewable f...

CNN-3e70ca · Gold Standard · Africa

Report ID: CM-5DA06FD3 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.9**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.3
■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

## Assessment Summary

This Gold Standard PoA shows some core integrity elements (VVB-confirmed additionality via a barrier analysis and no reported material findings in the validation record), but key quantifications needed to judge over-crediting risk are missing in the extracted record. In particular, baseline and leakage parameters, monitoring period/ERR figures, and fNRB details are not available here, which weakens confidence in the climate claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CNN-3e70ca
Sector	biomass
Country	Africa
Vintage	2013
Project Methodology	AMS I.E, AMS-III.AV 10.1, 8.0
Crediting Period	2019 — 2026
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, limiting assessment of baseline validity and over-crediting risk.
- No extracted values for fNRB, usage rates (assumed or verified), monitoring period, or verified ERs—core drivers of cookstove crediting accuracy.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not provided in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The validation report (2021) confirms additionality using a barrier analysis and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline approach and key quantifications (leakage deduction, fNRB value, reassessment timing) are not found in the extracted record.

The validation report (2021-02-13) confirms additionality via a barrier analysis and indicates no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports basic integrity. However, the extracted record does not state the baseline method, when (or whether) the baseline was last reassessed, or the leakage deduction percentage despite stating leakage was quantified. Buffer pool and reversal information are also not found in the extracted record, though this is an avoidance cookstove PoA where reversal risk is typically lower than sequestration projects.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The VVB is identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. / Applus+), and an annual survey is stated as the usage monitoring method in the validation record.

- Monitoring period and claimed/verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

The VVB is clearly identified in the validation report (2021), and the usage monitoring approach is described as an annual survey. But the monitoring period is not found in the extracted record, and neither claimed nor verified emission reductions are available, preventing cross-checks of MRV outcomes. Key parameters commonly disclosed for cookstove crediting (such as fNRB and usage rates) are also not present in the extracted record.

### Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

+ Leakage is at least described as quantified in the extracted record, which is preferable to an unaddressed leakage claim.

- fNRB method/value and usage-rate assumptions/verification are not available in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting and greenwashing risk for cookstove claims.

For cookstove programs, over-crediting risk is strongly influenced by fNRB assumptions and actual stove usage; both the fNRB method/value and usage rates (assumed and verified) are not found in the extracted record. Although leakage is described as quantified, the absence of the actual leakage deduction percentage makes it impossible to judge conservativeness. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about downstream claim channels and associated reputational risk.

### Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are referenced (validation report and PDD among the evidence set), and the validation report is relatively recent (2021).

- Extraction confidence is only medium and several critical fields are missing from the extracted record (e.g., monitoring period, ERs, baseline method).

The evidence set includes a validation report and a PDD, with five documents used overall, and the validation report is dated 2021-02-13, which is reasonably recent relative to the 2019–2026 crediting period. However, the minimum extraction confidence is only medium, and many critical quantitative fields (monitoring period, ERs, baseline method, fNRB, leakage deduction) are missing from the extracted record. This reduces confidence that the available documentation is complete and decision-useful for credit quality assessment.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier analysis
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance type, but reversal/buffer not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified claim, but deduction not provided
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not evidenced
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards mentioned, but FPIC/grievance not evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and cite the baseline approach (including key parameters and when it was last reassessed) and provide the monitoring period with claimed vs verified ER totals from monitoring/verification reports.

→ Provide fNRB method and value used (and any national default comparison), plus usage-rate assumptions and verified usage results (survey design, sample size, uncertainty) and the explicit leakage deduction percentage.

## Documents Reviewed

- approval
- CDM-POA-REN-FORM (PoA 7359)-1.pdf
- PoA DD form version 29 - 25.01.2021 Clean.pdf
- 210213 - Final Validation RCP Report (FVR) - PoA 7359 - v02.0 - Clean.pdf

### 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-5DA06FD3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)