QUALITY REPORT

Himalayan Rocket Stove Project in India

GS-2754 · Gold Standard · India

Report ID: CM-04597E39 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.1
	Transparency (25%)	5.4
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and no reported reversal events. However, the record contains important inconsistencies on FNRB, usage assumptions, and the crediting period, and the extraction confidence is low, which weakens confidence in the documentation and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-2754
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption Version 3.11
Crediting Period	2019 — 2024
VVB	EcoLance Pvt. Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

■ The FNRB value and method conflict across documents, with the monitoring report using a local field value of 90 while the validation report cited a national default of 30.

■ The crediting period differs between documents, and the monitoring report appears to show an earlier period than the validation report, creating uncertainty about which issuance window applies.

■ Low extraction confidence and several closed corrective actions indicate the documentation set is not fully clean or easy to verify.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB in the validation record, which supports the project's core eligibility case.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and the FNRB evidence is internally inconsistent across documents.

The validation record confirms additionality by the VVB, which is a meaningful positive signal. The monitoring report also reports a quantified leakage deduction of 5% and no reversal events, supporting permanence and leakage treatment. On the other hand, the baseline is project-specific, and the FNRB inputs are inconsistent across documents, which reduces confidence in the robustness of the crediting logic.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, a quantified leakage deduction, and a stated usage monitoring method based on annual surveys.

- Total ERR claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, and the low extraction confidence reduces trust in the completeness of the public documentation.

The monitoring report identifies EcoLance Pvt. Ltd. as the VVB, gives a monitoring period from 2023-03-01 to 2024-07-04, and describes annual survey-based usage monitoring. However, the extracted record does not state total ERR claimed or verified, and the low extraction confidence suggests at least one key document was difficult to read. That combination limits transparency even though the reporting structure is reasonably detailed.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The monitoring report states a leakage deduction of 5% and no reversal events were reported, which helps reduce over-crediting risk.

- The project relies on a project-specific baseline and the FNRB inputs conflict between a local field value of 90 and a national default of 30, which weakens claim robustness.

Claim safety is helped by the stated 5% leakage deduction, the reported 75% usage rate, and the absence of reported reversal events. Still, the project uses a project-specific baseline and the FNRB evidence conflicts between the monitoring report and validation report, with 90 from local field work versus 30 from a national default. Those contradictions increase the risk of over-crediting or overstated climate benefit.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD, and several corrective actions were closed.

- The extraction confidence is low, one document source is unidentified, and key fields such as total ERR figures and buffer pool coverage were not found in the available record.

The evidence set includes a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD, and several corrective actions were closed, which is a positive sign that issues were at least addressed. But the extraction confidence is low, one source is unidentified, and important items such as total ERR figures and buffer pool coverage were not found in the available record. The crediting period also conflicts across documents, which further weakens documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	No reversals reported
Leakage	5% leakage deduction stated
Baseline	Project-specific baseline
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled statement explaining the FNRB discrepancy and clearly justify which value applies for issuance.

→ Provide a clean, cross-referenced schedule of total ERR claimed and verified, along with the correct crediting period and registry status.

Documents Reviewed

- 10797 MP_2_CP_1_MR v_2.2_27.10.2025_clean.pdf
- HRS ER_Ver05_13.03.2025.xlsx
- 302722_56247_contract_2.pdf
- HRS MR_Ver05.1_19.02.25_Clean.pdf
- DEV_772.pdf
- 302722_52891_contract_3.pdf
- Project Annual Report Form_ GS GS ID- 10797_HRS .pdf
- GS 10797_IQ_SDG-Impact-tool_30.12.24.xlsx
- HRS-01.07.2020 Final.pdf
- ER Sheet_June_2021.xlsx
- 10797_MP_2_CP_1_ER_Ver02.2_27.10.2025.xlsx
- 10797_RCP2_ER VER-04_10.04.25.xlsx
- GS 10797_HRS_PDD_Ver10.1_13.05.25_clean.pdf
- HRS_PDD_Ver06_01022023 clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-2754
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-2754
- GS10797_FVR_EPL2454_Round1_Clean.pdf
- FVR_ GS 10797_MP1_v3.2_CL.pdf
- Validation report-Clean 10797.pdf
- GS 10797_RCP Validation report_CP2_GSR2_clean.pdf

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-04597E39 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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