

QUALITY REPORT

# Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase VI

VCS-2427 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-1FEC8105 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>6.5</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ Integrity (35%)     | 6.2 |
|                                                              | ■ Transparency (25%)  | 6.8 |
|                                                              | ■ Claim Safety (25%)  | 5.8 |
|                                                              | ■ Documentation (15%) | 8.1 |
|                                                              |                       |     |

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project has solid procedural signals (VVB involvement, no reported material findings, and safeguards elements like FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key integrity-critical quantifications (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and usage assumptions vs. measured usage) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, which increases over-crediting risk for an energy-demand methodology.

## Project Details

|                     |                                   |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Registry            | Verra (VCS)                       |
| Registry ID         | VCS-2427                          |
| Sector              | cookstoves                        |
| Country             | India                             |
| Vintage             | Stale                             |
| Project Methodology | AMS II-G 04.0.0                   |
| Crediting Period    | 2012 — 2022                       |
| VVB                 | Earthood Services Private Limited |
| Verified ERs        | 55,045 tCO2e                      |
| Monitoring Period   | 2012 — 2017                       |
| Confidence          | Medium                            |
| Documents Reviewed  | 10 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.
- Usage rate assumptions and verified usage rates are not found in the extracted record despite reliance on survey-based monitoring.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the evidence set).
- Baseline approach and leakage deduction value are not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in quantified ER robustness.

The project uses AMS-II.G (version 04.0.0) and reports 55,045 tCO<sub>2</sub>e verified for the 2012-12-15 to 2017-12-14 monitoring period in the monitoring report (2021-08-24). Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (Earthood Services Private Limited), which supports integrity. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and while leakage is described as quantified, the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found, which weakens confidence in the conservativeness of credited reductions.

### Transparency — 6.8 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-12-15 to 2017-12-14) and the VVB is identified as Earthood Services Private Limited.
- Key MRV parameters (assumed vs. verified usage rates, claimed ERs) are not found in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility.

The extracted record provides clear identifiers (VCS registry, VCS-2427; VVB name; monitoring period; methodology and version) and indicates annual survey-based usage monitoring in the monitoring report (2021-08-24). Transparency is reduced because total emission reductions claimed are not found in the extracted record, preventing a claimed-versus-verified cross-check. In addition, assumed and verified usage rates are not found, limiting the ability for third parties to reproduce the ER calculation from the extracted facts alone.

### Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + Safeguards elements are present (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing described), reducing reputational risk.
- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and missing baseline/leakage quantification elevates over-crediting risk.

Greenwashing risk is moderated by safeguards signals: FPIC is indicated as conducted, a grievance mechanism is present, and benefit sharing is described (as reflected in the extracted record from the project documentation set). Over-crediting risk remains material because the baseline approach is not stated and leakage quantification is not fully evidenced (no leakage deduction value found), both of which are central to cookstove credit quality. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily position the credits against higher-integrity claims frameworks.

### Documentation — 8.1 / 10

- + Document set appears relatively complete (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 10 documents used.
- ~ The latest extracted document is a monitoring report dated 2021-08-24 for a 2012–2017 monitoring period, creating some recency/traceability friction.

The evidence set includes core document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and the extraction confidence is high, supporting a strong documentation score. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is consistent with a clean assurance trail. Some documentation friction remains because the extracted monitoring report date (2021-08-24) is several years after the stated monitoring period end (2017-12-14), and several key quantified parameters are still not captured in the extracted facts.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |                                        |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | VVB-confirmed additionality            |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | Non-reversal project type              |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | Quantified but deduction not evidenced |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | Baseline approach not evidenced        |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | FPIC and grievance mechanism present   |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | CORSIA/CCP status not stated           |

## What Would Improve This Score

- Disclose the baseline scenario description and key baseline parameters (including any reassessment timing) in a clearly referenced section of the monitoring/verification package.
- Report and cross-reference the leakage deduction percentage and the assumed vs. measured stove usage rates (including survey design, sample size, and uncertainty treatment) to enable independent replication.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- 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-1FEC8105 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy