

QUALITY REPORT

Fuel Efficient Stoves for North Darfur Women

GS-507 · GS · Sudan

Report ID: CM-75D5CBA3 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.9
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, strong stove usage in monitoring, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, key methodological details are missing or not addressed, especially the baseline method, leakage treatment, and reversal handling, which limits confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-507
Sector	industrial
Country	Sudan
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	The Gold Standard simplified methodology for efficient cook stoves February 2013
Crediting Period	2015 — 2022
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed and no deduction is stated in the available monitoring record.
- The baseline method and baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted documents.
- A contradiction exists in the crediting period start date across monitoring reports, which weakens document reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports the project's case for being non-business-as-usual.

- Leakage justification is marked as not addressed, and reversal risk is also not addressed in the available record.

The project's additionality is stronger than average because the VVB confirmed a barrier test, which is a meaningful positive signal. On the other hand, the available monitoring record does not address leakage or reversal risk, and no buffer pool percentage is provided, so permanence and net climate benefit remain only moderately supported. The baseline method is not stated in the extracted documents, which further weakens the robustness of the crediting logic.

Transparency — 4.9 / 10

+ The monitoring report covers a defined period from 2020-06-01 to 2021-05-31 and reports a verified stove usage rate of 98.5% using annual surveys.

- The VVB name, total ERR figures, and baseline method are not found in the extracted documents, limiting public traceability.

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring window and a quantified usage result, with annual surveys showing a verified usage rate of 98.5%. However, the VVB name is not found, and total ERR claimed versus verified is not available, so the public audit trail is incomplete. The baseline method is also missing, which makes it harder to assess how emissions reductions were derived.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The verified stove usage rate of 98.5% is higher than the assumed 95%, which reduces concern about underperformance in use.

- The project uses a national default for non-renewable biomass at 85, but the leakage treatment is not addressed and CORSIA eligibility is not stated.

Claim safety is helped by the high verified usage rate, which exceeds the assumed usage rate and suggests the intervention is being used as intended. Still, the project's leakage treatment is not addressed, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status in a way that would reduce dual-claim concerns. Because the baseline method is missing, over-crediting risk cannot be assessed with high confidence.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Seven documents were used, including the PDD, monitoring report, stakeholder consultation, and appendix, and extraction confidence is high.

- The record still lacks several core fields, including the baseline method, buffer pool percentage, and VVB name, which suggests incomplete documentation.

Documentation quality is moderate because seven source documents were used and extraction confidence is high, with no material findings or corrective actions reported. The project also documents FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing, which is helpful for social safeguards. Even so, several key technical fields are absent, including the baseline method, buffer pool, and VVB identity, so the file is not fully complete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	no leakage treatment stated
● Baseline	baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the baseline methodology, baseline reassessment history, and any ERR calculation details so the emissions claim can be independently traced.

→ State the leakage treatment, reversal/buffer provisions, and the project's CORSIA and CCP status in the public record.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_11-04-2015 to 31-10-2017_v3.docx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.11.2017 to 30.04.2019_v3.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.05.2019 to 30.05.2020_v4.pdf
- GS2896 - Transition Annex v2.0.pdf
- GS2896 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report_09.03.2014_v1.doc
- PDD_18-11-16.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-507
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-507

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-75D5CBA3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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