

QUALITY REPORT

TUIK RUCH LEW IMPROVED COOKSTOVE PROJECT FOR LAKE ATITLAN

VCS-2077 · VCS · Guatemala

Report ID: CM-DDE62FFB · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS cookstove project with some positive evidence on additionality, leakage treatment, and safeguards, but the documentation is uneven and the verification report raised many findings. The project appears to have a quantified leakage deduction and VVB-confirmed additionality, yet the low extraction confidence, multiple CARs/CLs, and several unresolved documentation gaps reduce confidence in the claimed credits.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2077
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Guatemala
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	CDM AMS-II.G. Small-scale Methodology: Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass Version 11.1
Crediting Period	2018 — 2039
VVB	AENOR
Verified ERs	975 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The verification report records multiple findings, including six clarification requests and two corrective action requests, plus missing annexes and weak stakeholder documentation.
- There are contradictions across documents on leakage treatment, additionality test framing, FPIC, and benefit sharing, which weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a barrier-based additionality test in the verification report.
- The verification report lists numerous findings, including missing annexes, unclear stakeholder processes, and seven corrective actions, which weakens confidence in the project design and monitoring.

The project has some positive integrity signals: the verification report says additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project used a barrier test. However, the same report lists many findings, including missing annexes, weak stakeholder identification, unclear consultation processes, and mitigation gaps for local vendors, which undermines confidence in the project's overall robustness.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The project has a named verifier, AENOR, and a defined monitoring period from 2018-09-01 to 2020-03-09.
- The extracted record shows low extraction confidence and only one evidence document is clearly identified, with total credits claimed not found in the available record.

Transparency is mixed. The verifier is named as AENOR and the monitoring period is stated, but the extracted record has low extraction confidence and the total credits claimed are not found in the available data. The documentation also appears incomplete, with only one evidence document clearly identified in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 5%, and the project uses a local field approach for non-renewable biomass fraction.
- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which keeps dual-channel claim risk relevant, and the contradiction on leakage deduction versus an earlier 95% figure raises over-crediting concerns.

Claim safety is moderate at best. The project applies a quantified leakage deduction of 5% and uses a local field method for the non-renewable biomass fraction, which is better than relying only on defaults. Still, the contradiction showing an earlier 95% leakage figure versus the later 5% value, plus CORSIA eligibility being true, keeps over-crediting and dual-claim risk elevated.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

- + FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and safeguards are all mentioned in the extracted record.
- Low extraction confidence, many corrective actions, and missing or inconsistent documentation elements indicate a weak paper trail for a project with a long crediting period.

Documentation quality is weak. The record shows low extraction confidence, and the verification report itself required multiple clarification requests and corrective actions. Positive items such as FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are mentioned, but several key details are either not stated or were inconsistent across documents.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	Avoidance project; reversal risk not applicable
● Leakage	Quantified 5% deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline stated; reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present, but stakeholder proces
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a complete, internally consistent document set with all annexes, the missing causal chain, and a reconciled explanation of the leakage and additionality contradictions.

→ Publish clearer monitoring evidence for stove usage, stakeholder consultation, and safeguards, including how findings and corrective actions were closed.

Documents Reviewed

- RV1_PRR_2077_24MAR21.pdf
- TRL-SD-VISta-Monitoring-Report-Sep12018-Mar92020-V1.5.pdf
- TRL-VCS-Monitoring-Report-Sep12018-March92020-v1.2.docx
- (4) Causal Chain SD Vista.png
- SD_VISta_Registration_Representation_Single_Representor_TRL_2020_11_24.pdf
- TRL Project Area.kml
- VCS-Registration-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1.pdf
- SD-VISta-Project-Implementaion-Representation-Single-Representor_TRL_2020_11_24.pdf
- TRL Listing Representation.pdf
- Espanol-TRL-VCS-Project-Description-v1.0.pdf
- TRL-VCS-Project-Description-v1.3.docx
- TRL-SD-VISta-Project-Description-v1.4.pdf
- TRL-VCS-Project-Description-v1.0 (1).pdf
- VCS-Validation-Representation-v4.1.pdf
- TRL Onil SD VISta Verification Representation_20201020.pdf
- SD VISta_TRL Onil_Verification_Report_v3.pdf
- SD_VISta_Validation_Representation.pdf
- SD VISta_TRL Onil_Validation_Report_v3.pdf
- Val-Ver report TRL 20200821.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-DDE62FFB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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