QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 16

VCS-2430 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-07B80A1C · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.0
Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove distribution project shows some strong governance signals (VVB involvement, safeguards, and no reported material findings), but key quantification elements that drive credit integrity are missing from the extracted record. In particular, baseline details, leakage deduction value, and verified ER figures are not available here, increasing over-crediting and claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2430
Sector	cookstoves
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS II-G 04.0.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2013
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual.
- ■ Verified emission reductions and any comparison to claimed reductions were not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report (2022) and the PDD (2021), indicating document consistency issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation listed in evidence).

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

The project uses AMS-II.G (version 04.0.0) and the extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd). However, the baseline method and the date of any baseline reassessment were not found in the extracted record, which is a major integrity gap for cookstove ER quantification. Leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report (2022), but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found, limiting confidence that leakage was conservatively applied.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Monitoring period and monitoring approach are stated (annual survey; 2012-10-05—2013-10-04) in the monitoring report (2022).

- Total verified ERs (and any claimed-vs-verified comparison) were not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2022-08-22) clearly states the monitoring period (2012-10-05—2013-10-04) and indicates an annual survey approach for usage monitoring. At the same time, total emission reductions claimed and total emission reductions verified were not found in the extracted record, preventing an independent check of whether issuance aligns with monitored performance. CORSIA eligibility is also not stated in the extracted record, reducing clarity for downstream buyers.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ Leakage is at least described as quantified in the monitoring report (2022), which is better than an unaddressed leakage claim.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, and key ER quantification fields are missing, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Claims risk is moderate because several core quantitative fields that buyers rely on (verified ER totals, baseline method, leakage deduction value, and usage rates assumed vs verified) were not found in the extracted record. While the monitoring report (2022) indicates leakage was quantified and provides a high fNRB value (87.9), the absence of the fNRB method and the lack of usage-rate detail make it hard to judge conservativeness. CCP status and CORSIA eligibility were not found in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity claim frameworks.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ Document set appears relatively complete (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 12 documents used.

- A material inconsistency exists in crediting period dates between the PDD (2021) and monitoring report (2022).

The evidence list includes the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance, with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports a relatively strong documentation score. The monitoring report is dated 2022-08-22, indicating the record includes recent documentation. However, the extracted record contains a crediting-period inconsistency between documents, which reduces confidence in document control and consistency.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Non-reversal energy efficiency activity
Leakage	Quantified but deduction not evidenced
Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose (or extract) the baseline approach, key baseline parameters, and when the baseline was last reassessed, with clear references to the PDD/monitoring report sections.

→ Provide the total ERs claimed and verified for the monitoring period, plus the applied leakage deduction percentage and usage-rate assumptions vs monitored usage, to enable a claimed-vs-verified consistency check.

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-07B80A1C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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