QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove- Phase 15

VCS-2429 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-6D79C2AF · 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%)	5.8
Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS cookstove distribution project monitored over 2012–2017 with third-party verification by TÜV SÜD and no reported material findings or corrective actions. However, key integrity parameters (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and usage-rate performance) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and a crediting-period date discrepancy reduces confidence in data consistency.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2429
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	58,532 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk for an energy-demand project.

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

■ No assumed vs verified stove-usage rates were found in the extracted record despite reliance on survey-based monitoring.

■ Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report and the PDD, indicating documentation inconsistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and usage-rate results were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in quantified ER robustness.

The monitoring report (2022) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline approach and when it was last reassessed were not found in the extracted record, which is a key gap for an AMS II-G cookstove project. Leakage is described as quantified in the extracted record, but the actual leakage deduction value was not found, limiting confidence that leakage was conservatively applied. Usage monitoring is described as annual surveys, but the assumed and verified usage rates were not found in the extracted record, leaving a major uncertainty in realized fuel savings.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period (2012-10-01 to 2017-09-30) and verified ERs (58,532) are clearly stated, and the VVB is identified (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd).

- Claimed ERs, baseline details, and key performance parameters (assumed/verified usage rates) were not found in the extracted record.

Core MRV identifiers are present: the monitoring period (2012-10-01 to 2017-09-30), the VVB name (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), and total verified emission reductions (58,532). The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record, suggesting reasonable public traceability. However, total claimed ERs were not found in the extracted record, preventing a claimed-versus-verified comparison. Several key quantification inputs (baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and usage-rate results) are also not found in the extracted record, reducing transparency into how the 58,532 tCO2e was derived.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Leakage is at least described as quantified and monitoring uses annual surveys, which is better than having no monitoring approach stated.

- CORSIA and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, and missing baseline/leakage/usage-rate specifics increase greenwashing and over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because the baseline method is not found in the extracted record and usage-rate performance (assumed vs verified) is also not found, even though cookstove ERs are highly sensitive to adoption and sustained use. Leakage is at least characterized as quantified, which is preferable to an unaddressed leakage claim, but the missing leakage deduction percentage prevents assessing conservativeness. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily infer whether the unit could be marketed under multiple quality labels. Overall, the project is verifiable under VCS, but the missing quantification specifics increase greenwashing/claims risk for end users.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ Multiple document types are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 11 documents used.

- A crediting-period contradiction between the PDD and monitoring report indicates internal inconsistency that weakens document reliability.

Documentation coverage appears relatively strong: 11 documents were used with high extraction confidence, and the evidence list includes the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance. The monitoring report is dated 2022-12-29, which is reasonably recent relative to the crediting period and provides a clear monitoring window. No corrective actions were required and no material findings were reported, which typically indicates a clean audit trail. Still, an internal inconsistency in crediting-period dates between documents reduces confidence in the precision of administrative details.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	Non-reversal project type
● **Leakage**	Quantified but deduction not evidenced
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not evidenced
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/grievance noted; FPIC not evidenced
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline approach used under AMS II-G and when it was last reassessed, including key parameters driving fuel savings and emissions factors.

→ Provide the leakage deduction percentage and its calculation, plus assumed vs verified stove-usage rates (and survey results) for the monitored period to substantiate realized adoption and savings.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- 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-6D79C2AF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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