

## QUALITY REPORT

# Improved Cook Stoves In Pastoral And Agro-Pastoral Communities In Southern Ethiopia

GS-580 · GS · Ethiopia

Report ID: CM-FEAF14A5 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**4.8**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.1</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>4.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.3</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This cookstove project has some positive integrity signals, including a VVB-reviewed combined additionality test, a quantified leakage deduction of 0%, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the evidence base is weakened by missing verification details, a project-specific baseline, and contradictions on usage rate and monitoring approach that reduce confidence in the claimed emission reductions.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-580
Sector	industrial
Country	Ethiopia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	The Gold Standard Simplified Methodology for Efficient Cookstoves February 2013
Crediting Period	2014-10-12 — null
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

## Red Flags

- Usage rate is inconsistent across documents, with the monitoring report showing 63% while the verification report shows 99%, which raises over-crediting risk.
- Additionality was not confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, and the baseline is project-specific rather than recently reassessed.
- No buffer pool, reversal detail, or registry eligibility status was found in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.1 / 10

+ The project uses a combined additionality test, and leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction in the verification record.

- Additionality was not explicitly confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, and reversal risk is not addressed because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool is reported.

The verification report shows a combined additionality test and a leakage deduction of 0%, which supports some methodological robustness. At the same time, additionality was not explicitly confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, the baseline is project-specific, and reversal risk is not properly evidenced because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool is reported.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The record includes a monitoring period, a named Gold Standard methodology, and public-facing evidence documents such as the PDD, monitoring report, verification report, and stakeholder consultation.

- Key registry and verification details are missing, including the VVB name, verified ERR totals, and CORSIA eligibility status.

The documentation includes a monitoring period, the Gold Standard cookstove methodology, and several source documents, which helps traceability. But transparency is limited by the missing VVB name, missing verified ERR totals, and no stated CORSIA eligibility, so the public record is incomplete.

### Claim Safety — 4.3 / 10

+ The project is a cookstove efficiency activity with a stated leakage deduction of 0%, and safeguards are documented through FPIC and a grievance mechanism.

- The usage rate contradiction between 63% in the monitoring report and 99% in the verification report creates a material over-crediting concern, especially since the assumed usage rate was 80%.

Claim safety is weakened by the contradiction on usage rate: the monitoring report dated 2020-09-29 reports 63%, while the verification report from 2018 reports 99%, and the assumed usage rate was 80%. I privileged the more recent monitoring report because it is closer to the credited monitoring period and likely reflects actual use more reliably, but the discrepancy still raises over-crediting risk. Leakage treatment is a positive factor, and safeguards are present, but the usage inconsistency materially lowers confidence in the claimed climate benefit.

### Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Multiple document types were available, including the PDD, monitoring report, verification report, and stakeholder consultation record.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, the VVB name is missing, and several important fields are not stated in the available documents, including verified ERR totals and buffer pool coverage.

The evidence set is broader than a single report, with the PDD, monitoring report, verification report, and stakeholder consultation all present. However, extraction confidence is only medium, and several key items are not found in the available documents, including the VVB name, verified ERR totals, and buffer pool details, which limits documentation quality.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	Combined test present, VVB confirmation unclear
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool or reversal treatment shown
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage deemed negligible with 0% deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment timing missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear VVB statement on additionality, verified emission reductions, and the rationale for the chosen baseline and usage assumptions.

→ Resolve the usage-rate contradiction with a consistent, audit-ready monitoring trail and disclose buffer pool or reversal-risk treatment.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_12-10-2014 to 31-03-2016\_v2.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_4th monitoring period\_01-04-2018 to 31-03-2019\_v3.docx
- Monitoring Report\_5th monitoring period\_01-04-2019 to 31-03-2020\_v5.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_2nd monitoring period\_01-04-2016 to 31-03-2017\_v2.pdf
- GS3422 Local Stakeholder Consulation Report Feedback\_round2.pdf
- PDD\_31-08-2015.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-580
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-580
- Verification Report\_5th monitoring period\_01-04-2019 to 31-03-2020.docx
- Verification Report\_4th monitoring period\_01-04-2018 to 31-03-2019.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-FEAF14A5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy