QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 12

VCS-2416 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-753CD67F · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.5 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.9
	Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project has solid third-party assurance signals (VVB involvement, no material findings, and no corrective actions reported) and a clearly stated monitoring period with a verified issuance volume. However, key integrity-critical parameters (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and additionality test type) are not stated in the extracted record, and there is an internal inconsistency on whether leakage was addressed.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2416
Sector	cookstoves
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS II-G 03.0.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	60,203 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual and over-crediting risk.
- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (PDD says not addressed while the monitoring report says quantified), and the leakage deduction percentage is not stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB and the monitoring record shows no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and additionality test type are not stated in the extracted record, weakening confidence in core quantification assumptions.

The monitoring record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and the baseline reassessment timing is also not found, which limits confidence in the counterfactual for an energy-demand project. Leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report (2022-08-09), but the leakage deduction percentage is not stated, leaving uncertainty about whether any deduction was applied.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period (2012-12-03 to 2017-12-02), VVB name, and verified ERs (60,203) are clearly stated in the monitoring record.

- Claimed ERs, baseline method, and key parameter substantiation (e.g., FNRB method) are not stated in the extracted record, reducing MRV traceability.

The monitoring report (2022-08-09) clearly states the monitoring period (2012-12-03 to 2017-12-02), the VVB name, and the verified emission reductions of 60,203. The usage monitoring method is described as annual surveys, which is at least a defined MRV approach. Still, the claimed ERs are not stated in the extracted record, preventing a direct claimed-versus-verified comparison, and the FNRB method is not stated even though an FNRB value of 87.9 is reported.

Claim Safety — 5.9 / 10

+ Verified issuance quantity is provided and the monitoring approach is described as annual surveys, which can support usage evidence if well executed.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and missing baseline/leakage quantification details increase perceived over-crediting and marketing-claim risk.

Over-crediting risk cannot be fully assessed because the baseline method is not stated in the extracted record and leakage quantification is incomplete (no leakage deduction percentage provided). The monitoring report provides a verified ER total (60,203) and indicates annual survey-based usage monitoring, but the assumed and verified usage rates are not stated, which is important for cookstove performance and sustained-use claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims and labeling.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 11 documents used.

- Some critical fields appear absent or unspecified in the extracted record (baseline method, additionality test type, leakage deduction), indicating documentation gaps despite document availability.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record, and the extraction confidence is high with 11 documents used, supporting document completeness. The monitoring report is dated 2022-08-09 and covers a historical monitoring period (2012-2017), which is acceptable for issuance but raises recency questions for current performance claims. Despite the document set, several key quantification fields (baseline method, additionality test type, leakage deduction percentage, and FNRB method) are not stated in the extracted record, indicating either extraction gaps or incomplete disclosure in the accessible materials.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	No reversal risk indicated for cookstoves
● **Leakage**	Leakage inconsistently documented
● **Baseline**	Baseline approach not stated
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards mentioned; FPIC not evidenced
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach used (including key parameters and when it was last reassessed) and provide a clear claimed-versus-verified ER reconciliation for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve leakage documentation by stating the leakage sources considered, the quantified leakage deduction applied (or justification for 0%), and align the PDD and monitoring report narrative.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification 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-753CD67F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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