

QUALITY REPORT

# Fairtrade Project: Cookstoves for coffee farmers, Ethiopia

GS-967 · Gold Standard · Ethiopia

Report ID: CM-BAAD71E5 · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

## Assessment Summary

The project cannot be assessed with confidence because no official project facts were extracted from the available documents. With no evidence on additionality, baseline, leakage, or monitoring, the credit quality case is extremely weak and the public registry status is not in the public registry. Documentation quality is also very poor, with low extraction confidence and no usable source documents identified.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-967
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Ethiopia
Vintage	2021
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-11

## Red Flags

- No project facts were extracted from official documents, leaving major evidence gaps on additionality, baseline, leakage, and permanence.
- The project is not in the public registry, which weakens transparency and raises claim-safety concerns.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 1.5 / 10

- No evidence was found for an additionality test, baseline method, leakage treatment, or buffer pool arrangement.
- ~ The project is an avoidance cookstove activity, but permanence and reversal handling are not stated in the extracted record.

No additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, or reversal information was found in the extracted record, so the project's core crediting logic cannot be verified. Because the available documents yielded no usable facts, integrity is scored very low and conservatively. The avoidance cookstove category reduces permanence concerns relative to removals, but that cannot offset the missing evidence.

### Transparency — 0.0 / 10

- No monitoring period, VVB name, or verified issuance figures were extracted from the available documents.
- The registry status is not in the public registry, limiting external traceability.

Transparency is extremely weak because no monitoring period, verifier name, or issuance data were extracted from the official documents. The project is also not in the public registry, which limits independent review and public traceability. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence in the documentation trail.

### Claim Safety — 1.2 / 10

- No evidence was found for CCP status, CORSIA eligibility, or any quantified over-crediting controls.
- ~ The absence of extracted baseline and leakage details makes the claim-safety profile highly uncertain.

Claim safety is poor because there is no extracted evidence on baseline validity, leakage treatment, or any third-party eligibility status such as CCP or CORSIA. Without those controls, over-crediting and greenwashing risk cannot be bounded. The lack of public registry presence also makes external claim checking harder.

### Documentation — 0.5 / 10

- No evidence documents were identified and no documents were usable for extraction.
- Extraction confidence was low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

Documentation quality is minimal: no evidence documents were identified, no documents were used, and extraction confidence was low. That means the score is driven by evidence absence rather than positive project performance. The record does not provide enough material to support a reliable assessment.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality evidence found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project, but reversal handling not stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	No leakage treatment found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	No safeguards evidence found
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Registry status not in public registry

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full PDD, validation/verification reports, and monitoring reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and issuance can be checked.

→ Publish registry-linked evidence for issuance status, verifier identity, monitoring period, and any safeguards or grievance documentation.

---

### 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-BAAD71E5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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