

QUALITY REPORT

Empowering Kenyan Families with Clean Cooking

XEP-659456 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-CB4A6E94 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core quality determinants (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring performance) cannot be validated. Given the low readability flag and zero documents captured, the project should be treated as high uncertainty with elevated over-crediting and greenwashing risk until primary documents are reviewed.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	XEP-659456
Sector	cookstoves
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring.
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or misread critical details.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ Cookstove projects commonly have material leakage and usage-rate risks, but the extracted record provides no evidence of how these were handled.

No integrity-relevant parameters were found in the extracted record because no official documents were captured (evidence document list is empty). As a result, additionality testing, baseline selection/reassessment, leakage deductions/justification, and any material findings or corrective actions cannot be confirmed. Given the sector (cookstoves), the absence of evidence on usage monitoring and leakage controls is a material uncertainty.

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 weak because the extracted record contains no verification/monitoring documentation (0 documents) and does not provide a VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed-versus-verified emission reduction figures. With minimum extraction confidence flagged as low, even basic registry-style completeness cannot be relied upon from the extracted dataset.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be screened because baseline, fNRB, and usage monitoring methods were not found in the extracted record.

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

Claim safety is low because key over-crediting controls for cookstoves—baseline and fNRB approach, usage monitoring method, and any discrepancies between claimed and verified reductions—were not found in the extracted record. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were also not found, so eligibility-related marketing claims and double-claim risk cannot be screened.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, so the record is not auditable from the provided evidence set.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues that further reduce reliability.

Documentation quality is poor: the extracted record shows zero evidence documents and zero documents used, making independent review impossible from the provided materials. The low extraction confidence further indicates that at least one key source was poorly readable, increasing the likelihood that important details were missed or misinterpreted.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	No baseline method found
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	Eligibility/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so baseline, fNRB, usage monitoring, leakage, and any findings/corrective actions can be validated.

→ Provide registry/public documentation showing VVB identity, monitoring periods, and claimed vs verified emission reductions (including any revisions), plus explicit CORSIA/CCP status.

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-CB4A6E94 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy