

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase IV

VCS-2425 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-549AE7ED · 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 shows generally solid procedural integrity, with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions reported. However, key quantifications that affect over-crediting risk (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and usage rates) are not clearly stated in the extracted record, and there is a crediting-period date discrepancy between documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2425
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	60,215 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report (2012-10-04—2022-10-03) and the PDD (2012-12-15—2022-12-14), raising data reliability concerns.
- Baseline approach and leakage deduction percentage are not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the credited reductions.
- Usage rates (assumed and verified) are not stated in the extracted record despite reliance on annual surveys, increasing over-crediting risk for cookstove projects.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).
- Baseline approach and leakage deduction percentage are not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in baseline validity and leakage treatment.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness (validation/verification documentation referenced). The monitoring report (2022-09-05) reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a positive signal for MRV controls. However, the baseline approach is not found in the extracted record, and while leakage is described as quantified, the actual leakage deduction percentage is not stated, reducing confidence in the conservativeness of credited reductions.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-10-04—2017-10-03) and the VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd (monitoring report, 2022).
- Total claimed reductions are not found in the extracted record, limiting cross-checking against the verified 60,215 tCO₂e.

The monitoring report (2022-09-05) clearly states the monitoring period (2012-10-04—2017-10-03), identifies the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), and provides verified ERs of 60,215 tCO₂e. Usage monitoring is described as annual surveys, and the fraction of non-renewable biomass is provided (87.9) with a stated approach (calculated using secondary sources). Transparency is weakened because the total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, preventing a direct claimed-versus-verified comparison.

Claim Safety — 5.9 / 10

- + The monitoring report reports verified emission reductions of 60,215 tCO₂e and indicates leakage was quantified (monitoring report, 2022).
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and key drivers of cookstove crediting (baseline and usage rates) are not clearly evidenced here.

Cookstove crediting is sensitive to baseline assumptions, leakage, and usage; in the extracted record, the baseline method and both assumed and verified usage rates are not stated, which elevates over-crediting/greenwashing risk. The monitoring report (2022-09-05) indicates leakage was quantified, but without the leakage deduction percentage it is hard to judge whether the quantification was conservative. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily infer whether additional claims/labels might be applied downstream.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

- + Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 12 documents used.
- A core project parameter (crediting period) is inconsistent across documents, indicating documentation coherence issues.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong: the extracted record lists a PDD (2021-01-14), validation report, monitoring report (2022-09-05), and issuance records, with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence. The presence of safeguards elements (FPIC conducted and a grievance mechanism) suggests social documentation was addressed in project materials. A notable weakness is internal consistency: the crediting period differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, which reduces confidence in document coherence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No reversal risk indicated for energy-demand project
● Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not evidenced here
● 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

→ Provide the explicit baseline approach used under AMS II-G (including key parameters and any reassessment timing) and link it to the monitoring calculations.

→ Disclose the leakage deduction percentage and calculation details, and report assumed vs. verified usage rates (including survey design, sample size, and uncertainty treatment) alongside claimed vs. verified ER totals.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- 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-549AE7ED · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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