

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase II

VCS-2423 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-5D3EB4AA · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This cookstove project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, quantified leakage treatment, and no material findings in the verification report. However, key baseline and permanence details are not stated in the extracted record, and the documentation quality is weakened by low extraction confidence and a major crediting-period contradiction across documents. Overall, the project looks moderately credible but not especially robust on disclosure and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2423
Sector	cookstoves
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS II-G 03.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2017
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd
Verified ERs	59,385 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- The crediting period differs between documents, with the later verification report showing a much shorter period than the earlier document; this creates a reliability concern.
- Baseline method, buffer pool treatment, and reversal history are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in permanence and baseline validity.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Baseline method and last reassessment are not stated, and buffer pool treatment is not found in the extracted record.

The verification report confirms additionality was checked by the VVB, and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. Leakage is at least addressed in a quantified way, which is a positive sign for cookstove accounting. On the negative side, the baseline method and any buffer pool or reversal treatment are not stated in the extracted record, so permanence and baseline robustness cannot be fully verified.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

- + The verification report identifies TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd. as the VVB and provides a defined monitoring period.
- Total claimed reductions are not available in the extracted record, and the low extraction confidence suggests at least one key document was hard to read.

The verification report names TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt. Ltd. and gives a monitoring period from 2012-11-14 to 2017-11-13, which supports some traceability. However, the extracted record does not provide the total claimed reductions, and several key MRV fields are missing or not stated. The low extraction confidence also suggests at least one source document was difficult to read, which lowers transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + Leakage is described as quantified, which is better than leaving leakage untreated.
- The project is a cookstove activity, but usage rates are not verified in the extracted record and CORSIA/CCP status is not stated.

Claim safety is helped by the fact that leakage is quantified rather than ignored, and the project is a standard cookstove activity under AMS II-G. Still, the extracted record does not state the usage rate verified in monitoring, so there is some over-crediting uncertainty for stove adoption and continued use. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available record.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

- + Twelve documents were used, and the verification report is dated 2022-10-17, which is relatively recent for the extracted monitoring period.
- The extracted record shows low extraction confidence and only one evidence document is explicitly identified, which weakens documentation reliability.

The record indicates 12 documents were used, and the verification report date of 2022-10-17 suggests reasonably recent documentation relative to the monitoring period. That said, the extraction confidence is low, which reduces confidence in completeness. The extracted record also leaves several important fields unstated, including baseline details and buffer pool treatment, so the documentation set is only moderately complete.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	buffer and reversal treatment not stated
● Leakage	leakage quantified but not fully detailed
● Baseline	baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the baseline method, reassessment history, and any buffer pool or reversal treatment details in a single consolidated project summary.

→ Provide a clear reconciliation of the conflicting crediting-period dates and disclose verified usage rates, claimed reductions, and market-eligibility status.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation Phase II.pdf
- R_V1_PRR_2423_17October2022_dl.pdf
- Monitoring Report Version 04.pdf
- Emission Reduction Sheet V03.xlsx
- Communications Agreement 8522.pdf
- Registration Representation Phase II.pdf
- Listing Representation 8522.pdf
- Project Desing Document Version 04.pdf
- VCS PDD_8522.pdf
- Joint Validation and Verification Report Version 04.pdf
- Validation Representation.pdf
- Verification Representation.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-5D3EB4AA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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