QUALITY REPORT

Improved cook stove market development in rural Nepal

VCS-2357 · VCS · Nepal

Report ID: CM-BAC3F599 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.7 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.6
Transparency (25%)	4.3
Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment, but the evidence base is weakened by multiple corrective actions and low extraction confidence. Transparency and documentation are limited by missing baseline reassessment details, missing leakage and buffer information, and several document inconsistencies, including a major discrepancy in verified emission reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2357
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Nepal
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS II.G 11.1
Crediting Period	2018 — 2028
VVB	EcoLance Private Limited
Verified ERs	26,404 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2022
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	22 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- ■ Verified emission reductions differ sharply across documents, with 26,404 claimed in the later verification record versus 46,931 in an earlier record.
- ■ Several corrective actions point to weak sampling transparency, missing monitoring parameter detail, and unclear baseline selection.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test in the verification record.

- The verification report lists multiple corrective actions, including concerns about baseline selection, sampling design, and transparency of efficiency loss application.

The verification record confirms additionality through an investment test and says the VVB accepted the project, which supports the integrity score. However, the same record lists several corrective actions, including concerns about baseline selection, sampling design, and transparency around efficiency loss application, which weakens confidence in the robustness of the crediting approach. Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual deduction is not stated in the extracted record, and buffer pool treatment is also not found.

Transparency — 4.3 / 10

+ The monitoring period and verified emissions are stated in the available verification record, and the project is on the VCS registry.

- Key transparency elements are missing or unclear, including baseline reassessment timing, leakage deduction, and buffer pool treatment, while extraction confidence is low.

The project has a named VVB and a defined monitoring period, and the registry status is available, which helps transparency. Still, important details are missing, including baseline reassessment timing, buffer pool percentage, and the leakage deduction amount, and the extraction confidence is low. The corrective actions also indicate that monitoring parameter disclosure was incomplete in the verification materials.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces one channel of double-claim risk.

- The project uses a project baseline and has unresolved documentation issues, including a large discrepancy in verified emission reductions across documents.

Claim safety is reduced by the use of a project baseline rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline, and by the absence of a stated leakage deduction. The project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers dual-market risk, but the large discrepancy in verified emission reductions between documents raises over-crediting and reporting reliability concerns. The FNRB value is present, but the contradiction shows it was reported differently across documents, so I privileged the later verification record because it is more recent.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

+ A relatively large set of documents was used, and the record includes a recent verification date in 2023.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the evidence record contains several unresolved corrective actions plus contradictions across documents.

Documentation quality is only moderate because 22 documents were used and the record includes a recent verification date, but the extraction confidence is low. Multiple corrective actions show that the verification package lacked clarity on sampling, baseline selection, and monitoring parameters. I also privileged the later 2023 values for safeguards, FNRB, and verified emissions over earlier conflicting figures because they are more recent and appear to come from the later verification cycle.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed investment test
Permanence	No reversal evidence, but buffer treatment not stated
Leakage	Leakage quantified, deduction not stated
Baseline	Project baseline with reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	FPIC, grievance, and benefit sharing documented
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the full leakage calculation, buffer pool treatment, and baseline reassessment history in the verification package.

→ Resolve the emission reduction discrepancy and provide a clearer, district-level sampling justification with complete monitoring parameter disclosure.

Documents Reviewed

- vcs-issuance-representation-single-representor-v4.2-final_VCS2357_MP3_updated_29052023.pdf
- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1_VCS 2357_MP2 (1)_2022.pdf
- VCS-Issuance-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1.pdf
- VCS_V1_PRR_2357_31AUG2023.pdf
- 2357_PRR_22NOV2022.pdf
- VCS-Monitoring-Report-MP 02-Clean.pdf
- Nepal ICS_MR monitored MP 03_VCS_clean.pdf
- VCS_Nepal Practical Action _PDMR_clean (1).pdf
- Verra-SDG-Contributions-Report-Template-v1_VCS2357_MP01_19072023.pdf
- Verra-Registry-Communications-Agreement-single-PP-4753632-v1-SYDDMS (1)_VC2357_updated_17102023.pdf
- VCS-Registration-Representation-Multiple-Representors-v4.1.pdf
- VCS Project Review Report (2357 ICS Development Nepal).pdf
- 2357 Practical Action Validation Deadline Extension approval.pdf
- VCS-Listing-Representation (Multiple)_Practical Action.pdf
- Verra-Registry-Communications-Agreement-single-PP-4753632-v1-SYDDMS _PASign-converted.pdf
- EPL2023-13-VCS_2357 verification deed.pdf
- CCIPL 861_VCS-Validation-Representation-VCS2357.pdf
- EPL2023-13-FVR_VCS 2357_v2.0_clean.pdf
- CCIPL 861_VCS-Verification-Representation-VCS2357.pdf
- VCS Verification deed_VKU.VER.07.22_VCS_2357_Signed_updated_30082022.pdf
- FVR_Joint-VAL-VER_CCIPL 861 clean (1).pdf
- FVR_VKU.VER.07.22_VCS_2357.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-BAC3F599 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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