

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 8

VCS-2436 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-FD72178D · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.1

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS cookstove distribution project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a defined monitoring period, but several core quantification elements (baseline approach, leakage deduction, and key MRV parameters) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. Corrective actions in the monitoring/verification cycle and a crediting-period date discrepancy reduce confidence in data reliability and claims precision.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2436
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	59,479 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	10 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report (2012-11-01—2022-10-31) and the PDD (2012-12-15—2022-12-14).
- Corrective actions note missing detail on villages and inconsistent monitoring-period statements within the monitoring report package.
- Baseline approach and leakage deduction percentage are not found in the extracted record, despite leakage being described as quantified.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 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, and corrective actions indicate MRV inconsistencies (monitoring report, 2022).

Additionality is indicated as confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record), which supports the integrity case for a cookstove distribution activity. However, the baseline approach is not found in the extracted record, and leakage is only described as “quantified” without the actual leakage deduction percentage (monitoring report, 2022). The monitoring report also includes corrective actions requiring clarification of village coverage and inconsistencies in monitoring-period statements, which weakens confidence in underlying activity data (monitoring report, 2022).

Transparency — 6.2 / 10

- + VVB is identified (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd) and the monitoring period is clearly stated as 2012-11-01 to 2017-10-31 (monitoring report, 2022).

- Total emissions reductions claimed are not found in the extracted record (only verified ERs are provided), and corrective actions suggest internal inconsistencies in monitoring-period reporting (monitoring report, 2022).

The monitoring period is explicitly stated as 2012-11-01 to 2017-10-31 and the VVB is named (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), which improves traceability (monitoring report, 2022). Verified ERs are provided (59,479), but the total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to compare claimed vs verified outcomes. Corrective actions about inconsistent monitoring-period descriptions suggest the public MRV narrative may be confusing or internally inconsistent (monitoring report, 2022).

Claim Safety — 5.1 / 10

- + The project reports an fNRB value of 87.9 and uses annual surveys for usage monitoring (monitoring report, 2022).
- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and key over-crediting controls (baseline method, leakage deduction) are not evidenced.

Over-crediting risk cannot be fully assessed because the baseline approach and leakage deduction percentage are not found in the extracted record, even though leakage is said to be quantified (monitoring report, 2022). The project reports an fNRB value of 87.9 and uses annual surveys for usage monitoring, which is directionally positive but cannot be stress-tested here because assumed vs verified usage rates are not found in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022). CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims and labels.

Documentation — 7.1 / 10

- + Multiple document types are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 10 documents used.
- Corrective actions remain noted (missing village list; monitoring-period inconsistencies), indicating documentation quality gaps (monitoring report, 2022).

The extracted record indicates a relatively complete document set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and a high extraction confidence across 10 documents, supporting a solid documentation score. However, the monitoring report includes corrective actions on missing village identification and inconsistent monitoring-period statements, indicating that key descriptive elements were incomplete or required revision during review (monitoring report, 2022).

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach and the exact leakage deduction percentage (and calculation) in the monitoring/verification package, with clear cross-references to the applied methodology.

→ Resolve date inconsistencies by aligning the monitoring report and database to the PDD crediting period and clearly stating the monitoring period consistently across all sections, including a complete list of villages covered.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- 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-FD72178D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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