

QUALITY REPORT

Fuel efficient stoves for Ethiopia Programme of Activities CPA 001

GS-489 · GS · Ethiopia

Report ID: CM-8ADEC01D · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

This cookstove PoA has some safeguards and a named VVB, but the evidence base is thin on core carbon-accounting elements like baseline method, additionality test, leakage treatment, and reversal handling. The verification report also flags a mismatch between the GS and CDM emission reduction values, which lowers confidence in the claimed reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-489
Sector	industrial
Country	Ethiopia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G Version 05
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2014 — 2015
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- The verification report says the GS monitoring report emission reductions did not match the CDM monitoring report, and the report had to be adapted.
- Leakage is not addressed in the verification report, while the contradiction log says the PDD had a quantified leakage treatment that was not reflected in the later report.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ The project uses AMS-II.G and was reviewed by Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd., with no material findings beyond the emissions mismatch noted in the verification report.

- Core integrity evidence is missing: no baseline method, no additionality test type, no buffer pool information, and reversal events are not addressed in the available verification record.

The project is based on AMS-II.G and was verified by Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd., but the extracted record does not state the baseline method, the additionality test type, or any buffer pool arrangement. Leakage is marked as not addressed in the verification report, and reversal events are also not addressed, which weakens permanence and accounting robustness.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated, the VVB is named, and the project documents include a verification report and monitoring report among the evidence used.

- The record does not provide claimed versus verified emission reduction totals, and the monitoring approach is only described at a high level as an annual survey.

Transparency is limited because the record does not include claimed versus verified emission reduction totals, and several core monitoring parameters are missing or only broadly described. The monitoring period and VVB are identified, and the monitoring method is described as an annual survey, but that is not enough to fully reconstruct the MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ FPIC and a grievance mechanism are both documented, which helps reduce non-carbon social risk around the project claim.

- Leakage treatment is unclear in the verification report, and the contradiction indicates the PDD had a quantified leakage approach that was not carried through consistently.

Claim safety is moderate to weak because the project's carbon accounting is not fully traceable from the extracted facts, especially around leakage and the missing baseline details. The contradiction log shows the PDD reportedly quantified leakage, while the later verification report says leakage was not addressed; I privileged the verification report because it is later and more specific to the verified issuance context, but the inconsistency still increases over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Four documents were used and the extraction confidence is high, which supports basic document reliability.

- The verification report is from 2016 for a 2014–2015 monitoring period, and the key accounting details needed to assess the project are largely not stated in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is mixed: four documents were used and extraction confidence is high, which is positive, and the project includes a verification report dated 2016 for a 2014–2015 monitoring period. However, many key fields are not found in the available documents, so the record is incomplete for a full quality assessment despite the presence of safeguards documentation.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full baseline and additionality documentation, including the exact test applied and any reassessment history.

→ Publish reconciled GS and CDM emission reduction calculations, with a clear leakage treatment and any verified versus claimed totals.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_15-11-14 to 14-11-15_v3.0.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_15-11-14 to 14-11-15_v3.0.pdf
- GS Passport_22-04-16.pdf
- PDD_07-08-14.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-489
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-489
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_15-11-14 to 14-11-15_v1.0.pdf
- (1)Verification Report_1st monitoring period_15-11-14 to 14-11-15_v1.0.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-8ADEC01D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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