

QUALITY REPORT

Installation of high efficiency wood burning cookstoves in Mozambique

VCS-2351 · VCS · Mozambique

Report ID: CM-405DE322 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	6.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This cookstove project shows several integrity positives: additionality is confirmed by the VVB, leakage is treated with a quantified deduction, and no material findings were reported. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (especially around ER quantities and safeguards/leakage statements) raise reliability and over-crediting concerns, reducing confidence in the reported outcomes.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2351
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Mozambique
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	VMR0006 1.14
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	VKU Certification Pvt.Ltd.
Verified ERs	64,089 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	49 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Conflicting emissions reductions figures across documents (e.g., 64,089 vs 7,357) create over-crediting and data reliability risk.
- Safeguards/FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are stated as present in one document but absent in another, weakening social safeguard confidence.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (quantified vs not addressed), despite leakage being material for cookstove supply-chain/market effects.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an activity-based test.
- Baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents.

The validation/verification record confirms additionality via an activity-based test, which supports additionality robustness. The monitoring report (2024-08-25) applies a quantified leakage approach with a 5% deduction, which is directionally appropriate for cookstove programs. However, the baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record, and the presence of multiple inconsistencies across documents reduces confidence in the integrity of the quantified results.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + Monitoring includes usage monitoring via annual surveys, and the verified and claimed ER totals match in the extracted record (64,089).
- Key reported figures and narrative elements conflict across documents (notably ER totals and leakage/safeguards statements), reducing MRV clarity.

The monitoring report (2024-08-25) describes usage monitoring via annual surveys and reports a 90% usage rate, with claimed and verified ER totals shown as equal in the extracted record (64,089). The VVB is identified (VKU Certification Pvt. Ltd.), and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2021-01-27 to 2021-08-31). Transparency is weakened by conflicting values across documents for ER totals and for whether leakage and safeguards were addressed, making it harder for third parties to reconcile what was actually assessed and credited.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream claim risks.
- Contradictory ER totals and inconsistent leakage treatment increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk for end users.

The project is explicitly stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain high-stakes compliance claims. Still, over-crediting risk is elevated because the extracted record contains contradictory ER totals (64,089 vs 7,357) and inconsistent statements on whether leakage was addressed (monitoring report says quantified; a validation report extract says not addressed). CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty for buyers seeking high-integrity labels.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

- + A relatively large document set was used (40) including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, with high extraction confidence.
- Corrective/clarification requests were raised and later closed, indicating initial documentation/MRV weaknesses.

The extracted record indicates a broad evidence base (40 documents) including PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document completeness. The monitoring report (2024-08-25) notes one corrective action request and two clarification requests that were resolved, suggesting the VVB did identify issues and they were addressed. Documentation quality is nonetheless impacted by the presence of multiple contradictions across documents on core items (ER totals and safeguards/leakage narratives).

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed activity-based additionality
● Permanence	No reversal risk flagged; none reported
● Leakage	Leakage deducted but inconsistently documented
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance stated, but conflicting records
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a single reconciled ER accounting table (by monitoring period) that explains why some documents show 64,089 while others show 7,357, and align claimed vs verified totals across all public reports.

→ Provide consistent, auditable safeguard evidence (FPIC records, grievance logs, benefit-sharing description) and ensure the same safeguard statements appear across PDD, validation, and monitoring/verification reports.

→ Clarify leakage treatment consistently in validation and monitoring/verification documentation, including the quantified basis for the 5% deduction and any sensitivity checks.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Listing Representation
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- SD VISTA Draft Project Description
- Verification Report
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification 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-405DE322 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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