

## QUALITY REPORT

# Distribution of ONIL Stoves – Mexico, San Felipe Usila 1

VCS-1216 · VCS · Mexico

Report ID: CM-626A911C · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.4**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.2</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.8</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a VCS cookstove distribution project using AMS-II.G with VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage deduction, which supports basic integrity. However, multiple internal inconsistencies across recent documents (especially around credited/verified ERs, fNRB values, and crediting period) materially increase over-crediting and reliability risk. Safeguards and grievance processes appear to be described in the latest monitoring, but older monitoring documentation conflicts with that record.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1216
Sector	other
Country	Mexico
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G 3
Crediting Period	2011 — 2020
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	19,234 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	70 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

## Red Flags

- Large inconsistencies in emissions reductions across documents (claimed and verified figures differ materially between validation/monitoring versions).
- Conflicting fNRB values and methods (local field vs national default; 0.87 vs 0.70 in the same monitoring date), which can strongly affect credited ERs.
- Crediting period is inconsistent across monitoring reports (2011–2020 vs 2020–2030) and the VVB raised a corrective action on crediting-period rule compliance.
- Safeguards/FPIC/grievance are reported in the 2025 monitoring report but contradicted by a 2015 monitoring report, weakening confidence in social safeguard claims.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring record shows additionality was confirmed by the VVB and leakage was treated with a quantified 5% deduction (monitoring report, 2025-01-27).

- Multiple corrective actions and cross-document inconsistencies (sampling approach, crediting-period compliance, implementer status) indicate elevated MRV and governance risk (monitoring report, 2025-01-27).

The monitoring report (2025-01-27) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and leakage was addressed with a quantified leakage deduction of 5%, which supports basic methodological integrity for a cookstove program. However, the same monitoring record lists many corrective actions, including discrepancies in sampling method and questions about crediting-period compliance with VCS v4 rules, which undermines confidence in the robustness of the quantified results. No reversal events are reported in the extracted record, and for an energy-demand project permanence/reversal risk is generally low, but the absence of a stated buffer approach is still an evidence gap.

### Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ Key MRV elements are disclosed, including the monitoring period, VVB name, usage monitoring method, and a reported usage rate (monitoring report, 2025-01-27).

- Reported ER numbers are inconsistent across validation/monitoring versions, reducing the transparency and auditability of the final credited outcome (validation reports 2025-03-18 vs 2025-03-25; monitoring report 2025-01-27).

The monitoring report (2025-01-27) provides a defined monitoring period (2021-01-01 to 2021-10-31), identifies the VVB (KBS Certification Services Pvt. Ltd.), and describes usage monitoring via annual survey with a very high verified usage rate. Transparency is weakened by inconsistent ER figures across documents, making it difficult to reconcile what was ultimately claimed versus verified. The extracted record also lacks some key quantitative context (e.g., no grid emission factor fields populated), though this may be less central for AMS-II.G than for grid-connected projects.

### Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one channel of high-risk claims (extracted record).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated due to conflicting ER totals and fNRB inputs, plus unresolved clarifications requested by the VVB (monitoring report, 2025-01-27; validation reports 2025-03-18/2025-03-25).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of high-profile aviation claims. Nonetheless, claim safety is materially reduced by conflicting ER totals and key inputs: fNRB is reported both as 0.87 and 0.70 in the same-dated monitoring record (2025-01-27), and the fNRB method differs between monitoring reports (local field in 2025-01-27 vs national default in 2020-07-02). These inconsistencies, combined with VVB requests to clarify methodology applicability thresholds and sampling deviations (monitoring report, 2025-01-27), increase over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

## Documentation — 6.8 / 10

+ A substantial document set was available (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence and many documents used (extracted record).

- Numerous corrective actions and internal inconsistencies across document versions reduce confidence that the documentation is internally coherent and final (monitoring report, 2025-01-27).

The extracted record indicates a broad evidence base (59 documents) including a PDD, validation report(s), monitoring report(s), and issuance, with high extraction confidence. However, the monitoring report (2025-01-27) contains a long list of corrective actions, including requests for proof of first/last stove installed, equipment details, spot-check supporting documents, and clarification of implementer status, suggesting documentation gaps at the time of assessment. Conflicting statements across different monitoring vintages (2015 vs 2025) on safeguards/FPIC/grievance also reduce confidence in the completeness and consistency of the documentary trail.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Low reversal risk for energy-demand project
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage quantified with 5% deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance reported but inconsistent over time
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ER table that clearly ties the monitoring-period calculations to the final verified/issued ERs, explaining why validation versions differ (include references to the exact report versions and dates).

→ Resolve and document the fNRB inconsistency by stating a single fNRB value and method for the monitoring period, with supporting field study or justified default selection and VVB confirmation.

→ Clarify and standardize the crediting period across all project documents and demonstrate compliance with VCS crediting-period rules, addressing the VVB corrective action explicitly.

---

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Registration Representation
- Confidential
- Registration Review Report
- Communications Agreement
- Project Description
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation

---

### 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-626A911C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08  
[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)