

## QUALITY REPORT

# ONIL Stoves Guatemala Uspantan

VCS-1721 · VCS · Guatemala

Report ID: CM-E0D89E41 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.2

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project shows some integrity strengths (VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage deduction), but multiple internal inconsistencies across documents raise over-crediting and reliability concerns. Safeguards and stakeholder provisions appear described in the monitoring report, yet are contradicted by the issuance record, reducing confidence in social claims and overall data quality.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-1721
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Guatemala
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VMR0006 1.1
Crediting Period	2020 — 2030
VVB	KBS Certification Services Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	173,300 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2010 — 2018
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	55 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- Major inconsistencies in reported emission reductions (claimed and verified) across documents, including two different claimed totals in the same-dated validation report.
- Safeguards, FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing are stated in the monitoring report but shown as absent in the issuance record, creating credibility risk for social claims.
- Key baseline governance details are missing (no baseline reassessment date found) despite a long monitoring period.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation/verification documentation.

- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record; multiple ERR contradictions undermine confidence in quantified results.

The project is an avoidance cookstove activity using VMR0006 with additionality confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record). Leakage is treated with a quantified approach and a 5% deduction (monitoring report, 2025-01-21), which is stronger than assuming zero leakage. However, the baseline is project-specific and no baseline reassessment timing is found in the extracted record, and the large inconsistencies in emission reduction totals across documents reduce confidence in the integrity of quantified outcomes.

### Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Monitoring describes an annual survey approach and reports a very high verified usage rate (monitoring report, 2025-01-21).

- Emission reduction figures and key parameters (e.g., fNRB and crediting period) conflict across project documents, reducing MRV clarity.

The monitoring approach is described as annual surveys and a very high verified usage rate is reported (monitoring report, 2025-01-21). The VVB is identified (KBS Certification Services Pvt Ltd), and no material findings are reported in the monitoring report. Transparency is weakened by conflicting values for key parameters (e.g., fNRB and crediting period) and by contradictory claimed/verified ER totals across validation/monitoring/issuance-related records, making it difficult to reconcile what was actually monitored and issued.

### Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ERR totals and conflicting fNRB values across monitoring reports (2024-12-15 vs 2025-01-21).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of problematic aviation-related claims. Nonetheless, over-crediting/claims risk remains material because the claimed and verified emission reductions are inconsistent across documents, and even the fNRB value differs between monitoring reports (0.913 in 2024-12-15 vs 0.7982 in 2025-01-21). These inconsistencies increase the chance that public claims could exceed what is robustly supported by the underlying MRV.

### Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ A relatively large document set was available (45 documents including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Corrective actions and clarifications were required (CARs/CLs and missing year-wise ER breakup), indicating documentation/MRV weaknesses.

The extracted record indicates broad documentation coverage (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance; 45 documents) and high extraction confidence, supporting a mid-to-strong documentation score. However, the monitoring report notes corrective actions/clarifications were needed, including providing a year-wise ER breakup for 2017 and 2018 and closure of multiple CARs/CLs (monitoring report, 2025-01-21). The presence of multiple cross-document contradictions also signals documentation control issues even if many documents exist.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	Avoidance project; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage quantified with 5% deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance contradicted by issuance record
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled ER table (by year and monitoring period) that clearly explains the 193,352 vs 32,021 claimed discrepancy and aligns claimed, verified, and issued totals with document references.

→ Resolve and document safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing status consistently between monitoring and issuance records, including links to the grievance process and FPIC evidence.

→ Provide a clear justification for the selected fNRB value (and any updates) and document when/why the crediting period changed, with registry-consistent references.

## Documents Reviewed

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

**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-E0D89E41 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)