

QUALITY REPORT

Cleaner Cooking for Kenyan Families

XEP-cf8ee0 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-BD817643 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ 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, and key quality determinants (baseline, additionality, leakage, monitoring, and verification outcomes) are not available. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the project cannot be robustly assessed and should be treated as high risk until primary documents are reviewed.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	XEP-cf8ee0
Sector	other
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect data

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying evidence

No official documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. With no verification/monitoring reports available, there is no evidence on material findings or corrective actions. This creates a high uncertainty profile for integrity.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified emission reductions are available 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 evidence documents and therefore no VVB identity, monitoring period dates, or reported vs verified emission reductions. MRV methods (including any usage monitoring and sampling) are not found in the extracted record. Low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key transparency information is missing.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline method, fuel/non-renewable biomass assumptions, and usage monitoring are not available

~ CORSIA/CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so double-claim channel risk cannot be screened

Claim safety is low because the extracted record does not include the baseline approach, any non-renewable biomass fraction method/value, or stove usage monitoring—core determinants of over-crediting risk for cleaner cooking projects. Eligibility/status indicators (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) are not found in the extracted record, so potential double-claim channel risk cannot be screened. In the absence of primary documents, marketing or buyer claims would be difficult to substantiate.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents are listed, indicating a major evidence gap

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any absent/partial fields and suggests missing content

Documentation quality is extremely poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates that zero documents were used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable and increasing the chance that important information was not captured. This level of incompleteness would trigger the documentation-related gate rule (documentation < 3.0) that caps transparency post-scoring.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide the Gold Standard PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV methods can be assessed
- Disclose verified ERs by monitoring period (reported vs verified), VVB name, any findings/corrective actions, and the specific non-renewable biomass fraction method/value used

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-BD817643 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy