

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase I

VCS-2422 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-A7F65642 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project has some core integrity strengths (VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings), but key quantitative elements that drive crediting robustness (baseline approach, leakage deduction, and usage performance) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. Safeguards and stakeholder provisions appear in the monitoring report but are contradicted by the validation report, which raises reliability and greenwashing-risk concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2422
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	60,955 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence that the counterfactual is conservative.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.
- No assumed vs verified usage-rate values are found, despite annual survey monitoring being referenced.
- Safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing are contradicted between the validation report (absent) and monitoring report (present).
- Crediting period dates conflict between the PDD and the monitoring report.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022-07-25).

- Baseline approach and leakage deduction are not found in the extracted record, weakening over-crediting controls.

The monitoring report (2022-07-25) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and leakage is only described as “quantified” without the actual leakage deduction percentage, limiting confidence that credited reductions are conservative. Usage is said to be monitored via annual surveys (monitoring report, 2022-07-25), but no assumed or verified usage-rate values are found in the extracted record, which is a key driver of cookstove ER integrity.

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ VVB is identified (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (monitoring report, 2022-07-25).

- Key quantitative MRV fields (claimed ERs, usage rates, leakage deduction) are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring period (2012-10-26 to 2017-10-25) and VVB name (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd) are clearly identified in the monitoring report (2022-07-25), and total verified ERs are provided (60,955). Transparency is weakened because total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, preventing a clear claimed-versus-verified comparison. Several critical quantification inputs (baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and usage-rate values) are also not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing cross-program claim risk (extracted record).

- Over-crediting risk remains elevated because baseline and usage-performance evidence is not found in the extracted record.

The project is indicated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of CORSIA-related double-claim narratives based on eligibility status. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about broader integrity labeling. Claim safety is constrained by missing baseline and usage-rate evidence in the extracted record, which increases perceived over-crediting/greenwashing risk for cookstove demand-reduction credits.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Contradictions across core disclosures (safeguards and crediting period) reduce confidence in document consistency.

The extracted record shows a relatively strong document set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and a high extraction confidence, supporting completeness. Still, contradictions between the validation report (2022-01-28) and monitoring report (2022-07-25) on safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and FPIC suggest inconsistent disclosure across official documents. The crediting period is also inconsistent between the PDD (2021-01-16) and monitoring report (2022-07-25), which undermines document coherence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Non-reversal project type
● Leakage	Quantified but deduction not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards claimed but inconsistent
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and reconcile the baseline approach used (including key parameters and any reassessment timing) across the PDD, validation, and monitoring documents.

→ Provide the explicit leakage deduction percentage and calculation, and publish assumed vs verified usage-rate results from the annual surveys for the monitoring period.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification 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-A7F65642 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy