

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 9

VCS-2437 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-78B7F762 · 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%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project has solid third-party involvement (TÜV SÜD) and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, key quantification elements that drive crediting integrity for cookstoves (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and usage assumptions vs. verified usage) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted data, increasing over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2437
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	61,474 tCO ₂ e
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, despite being central to cookstove ER calculations.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.
- Usage is monitored via annual surveys, but assumed and verified usage rates are not found in the extracted record.
- Safeguards and grievance mechanism statements conflict between the validation and monitoring documentation, reducing reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB, and the extracted record shows no material findings or corrective actions.
- Baseline method and leakage deduction value are not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in ER robustness.

The monitoring documentation (2022-08-04) reports 61,474 verified ERs for the 2012-11-08 to 2017-11-07 monitoring period, and the extracted record indicates no material findings or corrective actions. Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), which supports integrity. However, the baseline method and the leakage deduction percentage are not found in the extracted record, even though leakage is described as quantified, which increases uncertainty around whether reductions are conservatively calculated.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

- + Monitoring period (2012-11-08 to 2017-11-07) and verified ERs (61,474) are clearly stated in the monitoring documentation.
- Claimed ERs, baseline details, and usage-rate results are not found in the extracted record, reducing MRV transparency.

Core administrative elements are clear: the registry is VCS, the methodology is AMS-II.G version 03.0.0, the monitoring period is specified, and verified ERs are provided in the monitoring report (2022-08-04). The project also states an annual survey approach for usage monitoring, which is a recognizable MRV practice for cookstoves. Transparency is reduced because the extracted record does not include claimed ERs, baseline method details, or the actual usage-rate results (assumed vs. verified), limiting independent scrutiny of the ER calculation drivers.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

- + The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream claim risks.
- Over-crediting risk remains due to missing baseline method, missing leakage deduction percentage, and missing usage-rate performance figures in the extracted record.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain high-stakes aviation-related claims. Nonetheless, cookstove crediting is highly sensitive to baseline assumptions, leakage treatment, and sustained usage; in the extracted record, the baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and both assumed and verified usage rates are not stated. The reported fNRB value of 87.9 is high and could be appropriate, but the method used to derive it is not found in the extracted record, leaving residual over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

- + A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 10 documents used.
- Contradictions on safeguards and grievance mechanism across documents weaken documentation reliability.

The extracted record references a reasonably complete evidence set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and indicates 10 documents were used with high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is dated 2022-08-04 and covers a defined monitoring period, supporting recency and traceability. Documentation quality is weakened by internal inconsistencies between documents on whether safeguards and a grievance mechanism are in place.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality confirmed by VVB
● Permanence	Non-reversal project type; no reversals reported
● Leakage	Leakage said to be quantified, but deduction not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	Safeguards/grievance inconsistently documented
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach and key baseline parameters used for AMS-II.G in the monitoring/verification package (including any reassessment timing).

→ Report the leakage deduction percentage and the underlying calculation/justification in the monitoring report or annexes.

→ Publish assumed vs. verified usage rates (and survey instruments/sample design) to substantiate sustained stove use and reduce over-crediting concerns.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation 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-78B7F762 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy