QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase III

VCS-2424 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-0B8E2301 · 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%)	6.0
Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project shows moderate integrity: the VVB confirms additionality and there were no reported material findings or corrective actions, but key baseline and leakage quantification details are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. Transparency is fairly good given multiple core documents and a stated usage monitoring approach, though several critical parameters (baseline approach, leakage percentage, and usage rates) are not captured here, increasing over-crediting uncertainty.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2424
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	60,724 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, despite being central to cookstove crediting.

■ Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

■ Usage rates (assumed and verified) are not found in the extracted record even though usage monitoring is survey-based and strongly affects ERs.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB.

- Baseline method and leakage deduction value are not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in ER robustness.

Additionality is stronger than average for this project type because the extracted record indicates it was confirmed by the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd) in the validation/verification documentation. However, the extracted record does not provide the baseline method or when the baseline was last reassessed, which weakens confidence in baseline validity for a long monitoring window (2012–2017). Leakage is said to be quantified in the monitoring report (2022), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about whether leakage was applied appropriately.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2022) specifies an annual survey approach for usage monitoring and provides claimed vs verified ER totals.

- Several key quantification inputs (baseline method, leakage percentage, usage rates, and fNRB method) are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report dated 2022-07-26 provides a clear monitoring period (2012-11-20 to 2017-11-19) and discloses both claimed and verified emission reductions (65,625 vs 60,724). It also states that usage was monitored via annual surveys, which is at least a defined MRV approach. Transparency is reduced because key parameters that would allow independent reasonableness checks—baseline approach, leakage percentage, usage rates, and the fNRB method—are not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ Verified ERs (60,724) are lower than claimed ERs (65,625) in the monitoring report (2022), suggesting some conservativeness in verification.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and missing baseline/leakage/usage parameters elevate over-crediting and claims risk.

Over-crediting risk is moderated somewhat by the fact that verified ERs are lower than claimed ERs in the monitoring report (2022), indicating the verifier applied adjustments. Still, the extracted record lacks the baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and both assumed and verified usage rates, all of which are high-sensitivity drivers for cookstove ERs. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so downstream claims (e.g., aviation or CCP-aligned claims) cannot be assessed confidently from the available extraction.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 12 documents used.

~ Safeguards and a grievance mechanism are mentioned, but FPIC and benefit-sharing details are not found in the extracted record.

Documentation appears relatively strong: the evidence list includes the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance records, with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is recent (2022) relative to the monitoring period and crediting period, supporting traceability. Safeguards and a grievance mechanism are mentioned, but FPIC and benefit-sharing details are not found in the extracted record, leaving some social safeguards documentation gaps.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	No reversal risk for energy-demand project
Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not evidenced
Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extraction
Safeguards	Grievance noted; FPIC details missing
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline approach and any baseline reassessment details from the PDD/monitoring report so baseline validity can be independently checked.

→ Provide the leakage deduction percentage and its calculation, plus assumed vs verified usage rates (with survey instruments/sample design) to reduce over-crediting uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation

Report ID: CM-0B8E2301 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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