

QUALITY REPORT

The Breathing Space Improved Cooking Stoves Programme, India - VPA No. 11 Envirofit

GS-891 · GS · India

Report ID: CM-C3A29561 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a household cookstove project with some positive evidence on additionality, safeguards, and VVB review, but the record also shows unresolved leakage treatment and several corrective actions in verification. The project's claim quality is weakened by contradictory source values across documents and by missing or not-addressed items such as reversal handling and buffer protection.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-891
Sector	industrial
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G Version 3
Crediting Period	2015 — 2025
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the most recent monitoring record, despite an earlier validation document indicating it was quantified.
- The verification report records five clarification requests and three corrective action requests, showing material documentation and implementation issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test in the validation record.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the monitoring record, and reversal events are not addressed; no buffer pool percentage is found.

The project has some integrity support because the validation record confirms additionality through a combined test and the VVB also verified additionality. However, the monitoring record leaves leakage justification not addressed, reversal events are not addressed, and no buffer pool is found, which weakens permanence and leakage confidence. The verification report also notes five clarification requests and three corrective action requests, indicating unresolved quality issues in the audit trail.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period is stated, and the project has a named verifier, Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
- Claimed versus verified emission reduction totals are not available in the extracted record, and the monitoring approach relies on annual surveys with some conflicting source values.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period is stated and the verifier is identified as Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. Still, the extracted record does not provide total claimed or verified emission reductions, which limits public traceability of the crediting outcome. The monitoring approach is described as annual surveys, but the source set contains conflicting values for usage monitoring and other parameters, reducing clarity.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- + The verified usage rate of 81.2% is lower than the assumed 95%, which reduces the risk of overstated stove use.
- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not mentioned, and leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is mixed. The verified usage rate of 0.812 is below the assumed 0.95, which is a positive sign against over-crediting, but the project still relies on a project baseline rather than a more standardized recent reassessment. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible and CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-channel claim risk is not fully resolved, and the inconsistent leakage treatment across documents adds further caution.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, verification report, monitoring report, and appendix.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report lists five clarification requests and three corrective action requests.

Documentation quality is fair but not strong. Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, verification report, monitoring report, and appendix, which helps coverage. However, extraction confidence is only medium, the crediting period appears in conflicting forms across documents, and the verification report records several corrective actions, all of which reduce confidence in the completeness and consistency of the file.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality test
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed in latest monitoring record
● Baseline	Project baseline with no reassessment date found
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, quantified leakage assessment in the latest monitoring documentation and reconcile it with earlier validation statements.

→ Publish verified emission reduction totals, buffer or reversal treatment, and a consistent cross-document explanation for all contradictory values.

Documents Reviewed

- GS 916 Transition-Annex- v 3.0 06112019 Clean.pdf
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2015 to 31.07.2017_v2.pdf
- GS 916 MP_4 Monitoring Report version 3.0 12042021(1).pdf
- (1)GS 916 TBS ICS MP_4 ER Calculator version 3.0 12042021(1).xlsx
- GS Passport_03.06.2017_v3.pdf
- GS Passport_13-03-2012.pdf
- GS 916 Transition-Annex- v 3.0 06112019[1].docx
- VPA-DD_TBS ICS VPA 11 V 3.1 21082017 with CP revised.pdf
- PDD_25-09-2012.pdf
- PDD_21.08.2017_v3.1.doc
- PDD_21.08.2017_3.1.pdf
- PDD_10-08-2020.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-891
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-891
- Verification Report_3rd monitoring period_01.08.2015 to 31.07.2017_v2.2.pdf
- Validation Report 28.08.2017_v1.2.pdf
- (1)CCIPL 879 FVR GS review comment Final_clean(1).pdf
- FVR_20.17_cl.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-C3A29561 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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