


QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 13

VCS-2417 · VCS · India

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



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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove distribution project shows decent procedural quality: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and the monitoring period has verified ERs with no reported material findings. However, key quantification details that drive over-crediting risk (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and usage assumptions vs. measured usage) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and there is an internal inconsistency on whether leakage was addressed.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2417
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	60,837 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	8 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual and ER calculation.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (monitoring report says quantified; PDD indicates not addressed), and the leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).
- Baseline method and leakage deduction value are not found in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is contradictory between the monitoring report and PDD.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), and the monitoring report shows no material findings or corrective actions. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in the counterfactual for an AMS II-G cookstove project. Leakage is described as “quantified” in the monitoring report (2022-08-16), but the PDD (also dated 2022-08-16) indicates leakage was not addressed, and the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record—this inconsistency reduces integrity.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-10-03 to 2017-10-02) and verified ERs are reported (60,837 tCO₂e).
- Key MRV parameters (usage rate assumed vs. verified, and the exact leakage deduction) are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring period (2012-10-03 — 2017-10-02) and verified ERs (60,837 tCO₂e) are clearly captured, and the VVB is identified (TÜV SÜD). The usage monitoring method is stated as annual survey in the monitoring report (2022-08-16), which is a recognizable MRV approach for cookstoves. Still, the extracted record does not provide the assumed usage rate or the verified usage rate, limiting transparency on the key driver of ERs.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + Verified issuance quantity is provided (60,837 tCO₂e), reducing ambiguity on what was credited.
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and missing baseline/leakage quantification increases over-crediting and marketing-claim risk.

Because baseline method details and leakage deduction values are not found in the extracted record, there is elevated risk that credited reductions could be overstated relative to real-world stove adoption and sustained use. The monitoring report reports verified ERs (60,837 tCO₂e), but without usage-rate results and leakage deduction clarity, it is harder to judge conservativeness. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so downstream claim constraints cannot be confirmed.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

- + Multiple document types are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 8 documents used.
- Some critical fields remain unspecified in the extracted record (baseline method, leakage deduction percent, usage rates), indicating incomplete extractable detail despite document availability.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record, with 8 documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. The monitoring report is dated 2022-08-16 and covers a defined monitoring period within the crediting period (2012-10-03 — 2022-10-02), indicating recency and traceability. Nonetheless, several critical quantitative elements (baseline method, leakage deduction percent, usage rates) are not found in the extracted record despite the document set, suggesting gaps in extractable completeness.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Non-reversal energy efficiency activity
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent across docs
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and extract the baseline approach and key baseline parameters used under AMS II-G (including any default factors and data sources) and document when the baseline was last reassessed.

→ Provide quantified leakage deduction (percent and calculation) and publish usage results (assumed vs. monitored/verified usage rates) from the annual surveys to substantiate credited ERs.

Documents Reviewed

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

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