

QUALITY REPORT

Empowering Nigerian Households with Clean Cooking

XEP-d11636 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-D9D94B41 · 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 assessed. Given the evidence gaps and low extraction confidence, the project should be treated as high uncertainty and higher risk of over-crediting until primary documents are reviewed.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	XEP-d11636
Sector	cookstoves
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents used), preventing assessment of baseline, additionality, leakage, and monitoring quality
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missed or misread critical details

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

~ Cookstove projects are sensitive to usage and baseline assumptions, but no evidence was available to evaluate these risks

No PDD, monitoring report, or verification report content was available in the extracted record (0 documents used), so additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any non-conformities cannot be checked. Because cookstove crediting is highly dependent on baseline and usage assumptions, the absence of these details materially increases integrity uncertainty. Low extraction confidence further increases the chance that key integrity-relevant statements were missed.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verification/monitoring results were found in the extracted record

- Registry/public-data completeness cannot be evaluated because no evidence documents were provided

Transparency is very limited because no evidence documents were provided and no MRV details (monitoring period, verifier identity, or verification outcomes) were found in the extracted record. With low extraction confidence, even basic registry-style completeness cannot be relied upon from the extracted dataset. As a result, the project's MRV quality and public traceability cannot be substantiated here.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information was found on baseline parameters, leakage justification, or verified vs claimed emission reductions

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

Claim safety is weak under this record because there is no extracted information on claimed versus verified emission reductions, baseline parameters, leakage, or usage monitoring—common drivers of over-crediting in cookstove projects. Eligibility indicators (such as CORSIA or CCP status) were not found in the extracted record, leaving potential double-claim/market-eligibility risks unresolved. Given these gaps, marketing claims should be treated as high-risk until primary documents are reviewed.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major documentation gap

- Extraction confidence is low, reducing reliability even if some information exists outside the extracted record

Documentation quality is very poor: the extracted record lists no evidence documents and indicates 0 documents were used. The minimum extraction confidence is low, implying at least one key source was poorly readable and reducing trust in completeness. This combination suggests the assessment is constrained by missing/uncertain source material rather than project performance.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification report so baseline, additionality, leakage, and MRV procedures can be assessed

→ Disclose verifier identity, monitoring period, and claimed vs verified emission reductions (including any findings/corrective actions) to enable an over-crediting and claim-safety check

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-D9D94B41 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy