

QUALITY REPORT

# Efficient Cooking Stoves for Somali Households

XEP-233367 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-9B3744EA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>1.4</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ Integrity (35%)     | 2.0 |
|                                                              | ■ Transparency (25%)  | 0.5 |
|                                                              | ■ Claim Safety (25%)  | 2.0 |
|                                                              | ■ Documentation (15%) | 0.8 |
|                                                              |                       |     |

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core integrity elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring) cannot be validated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claim substantiation is high based on evidence gaps alone.

## Project Details

|             |               |
|-------------|---------------|
| Registry    | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | XEP-233367    |
| Sector      | other         |
| Vintage     | 2025          |
| Confidence  | Low           |
| Scored      | 2026-04-02    |

## Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record because no documents were captured.

~ Efficient cookstove projects commonly require careful baseline and usage monitoring, but the monitoring approach is not stated in available documents.

No integrity-relevant details were found in the extracted record because no evidence documents were captured (no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report). As a result, additionality testing, baseline selection/reassessment, leakage treatment, and any material findings or corrective actions cannot be validated. Given the project type (cookstoves), these omissions are material because usage and baseline assumptions typically drive credit volumes.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed emission reductions were found in the extracted record.

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no documents and therefore no VVB identity, monitoring period, or comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. There is also no information on monitoring methods (e.g., usage monitoring) or registry completeness indicators in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are merely absent rather than unreadable.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline method, leakage justification/deduction, and usage monitoring are not stated in available documents.

~ CORSIA/CCP status was not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/eligibility risk unresolved.

Claim safety is weak due to the inability to check for common over-crediting drivers in cookstove projects, including baseline fuel use, fraction of non-renewable biomass, leakage, and stove usage rates. No CORSIA eligibility or CCP status was found in the extracted record, so eligibility-related claim risk cannot be screened. With no verification/monitoring evidence available, any climate claims would be difficult to substantiate.

### Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were captured in the extracted record (no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report available).

- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability for at least one key source.

Documentation quality is very poor: the extracted record lists zero evidence documents and indicates low extraction confidence. Without at least a PDD and a verification/monitoring report, the project's design, MRV procedures, and third-party assurance cannot be assessed. This also triggers the post-scoring gate rule where transparency would be capped because documentation is below 3.0.

Risk Indicators

|                        |                                   |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | No additionality assessment found |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | Reversal/buffer not documented    |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | No leakage treatment found        |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Baseline method not found         |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | Safeguards not documented         |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | CORSIA/CCP status not stated      |

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV procedures can be assessed.
- Disclose key quantified parameters and verification outcomes (claimed vs verified ERs, monitoring period, usage monitoring method, leakage deduction/justification, and VVB name), plus CORSIA/CCP status if applicable.

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-9B3744EA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy