

QUALITY REPORT

Energy Efficient Cook Stove Implementation in India

VCS-2336 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-94C21A62 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a registered VCS cookstove project with VVB-confirmed additionality and some safeguards in place, but the verification report shows multiple findings and several unresolved documentation issues. The biggest concerns are the lack of clear leakage and permanence treatment, plus contradictions in key values such as the FNRB method, FNRB value, benefit-sharing description, and crediting period.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2336
Sector	cookstoves
Country	India
Vintage	2019
Project Methodology	VMR0006 Version 1
Crediting Period	2019 — 2029
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The verification report lists multiple CARs and CLs, including issues with sampling, manufacturer information, and ex-ante versus ex-post emission reduction comparison.
- Key parameters conflict across documents, including the FNRB method and value, benefit-sharing disclosure, and the crediting period, which weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports the project case.

- Leakage deduction is not stated, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal handling is not clearly addressed in the verification report.

The project has a positive integrity signal because the verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and names the VVB, VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd. However, integrity is weakened by the absence of a stated buffer pool contribution, no quantified leakage deduction, and reversal handling that is described as not addressed. The verification report also lists multiple CARs and CLs, including concerns about sampling, manufacturer information, and ex-ante versus ex-post comparison, which reduces confidence in the baseline and MRV robustness.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, and usage monitoring approach are stated in the verification report and related records.

- Total verified emission reductions are not stated, and the report contains several findings that point to incomplete MRV and sampling documentation.

Transparency is only moderate because the monitoring period, VVB identity, and annual survey usage monitoring method are stated in the verification report. At the same time, total verified emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the report includes several findings about incomplete or unclear sampling and monitoring plans. The documentation is therefore present but not fully complete or clean enough for a high score.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

+ The project uses a local-field FNRB approach with a stated value of 74, which can be stronger than a generic default if well supported.

- Contradictions on FNRB method and value, plus unclear leakage treatment and unresolved comparison issues, raise over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is constrained by uncertainty around the core accounting inputs. The extracted record shows a local-field FNRB method and a value of 74, but the contradictions indicate an earlier national-default method and a much lower FNRB value, so the more recent verification report was privileged because it is later and more specific. With no leakage deduction stated and unresolved issues around ex-ante versus ex-post comparisons, the risk of over-crediting remains material.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ There are many extracted documents and the VVB report is recent, dated 2024-12-16.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report records multiple CARs, CLs, and assessment findings that were not fully resolved in the extracted record.

Documentation quality is middling: there are many source documents used and the verification report is recent, but the extraction confidence is only medium. The report itself lists 03 CARs, 04 CLs, and later 05 CARs and 01 CL, plus eight assessment findings and one minor finding, showing that the file is not fully clean. The record also leaves several items not found in available documents, including buffer pool coverage and verified total emission reductions.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not clearly addressed
● Leakage	leakage quantified but deduction missing
● Baseline	project baseline with reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clean reconciliation of the contradictory FNRB method, FNRB value, benefit-sharing disclosure, and crediting period across all project documents.

→ Provide a complete verification package with quantified leakage treatment, clear reversal/buffer handling, and closure of all CARs and CLs.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance deed of rerepresentation_multiple_23.06.2021.pdf
- VCS_PRR_2336_2021Dec07_closure.pdf
- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1_Signed.pdf
- VCS ISSUANCE DEED OF REPRESENTATION.pdf
- VCS_2336_MR_1Apr2022 to 27Jun2023.pdf
- VCS-Joint-PD&MR; India Cookstove_V6.pdf
- VCS-2336_MR_2022-1.pdf
- VCS 2336 ER_Calculations_1April2022 to 27Jun2023.xlsx
- Project 2336_Public Comment Summary_October 2020.pdf
- registration deed of representation_multiple_23.06.2021.pdf
- Listing presentation 05 Aug 2020.pdf
- VCS_V2_PRR_2336_1Apr2022 to 27Jun2023.pdf
- VCS PD_MR_2336_India Cookstove.pdf
- VCS-Joint-Validation-Verification_India Cookstove_27.11.2021.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1.pdf
- VCS 2336_VR_1Apr2022 to 27June2023.pdf
- Verification-Representation-v4.2_signed_2336.pdf
- VCS-Validation-Representation-v4.1.pdf
- Verification report.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-94C21A62 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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