

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 10

VCS-2438 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-E3649689 · 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%)	6.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project has a solid procedural backbone (VVB involvement, no reported material findings, and a defined monitoring period), but key quantification elements that drive credit integrity—especially leakage deduction and usage performance—are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. Safeguards-related statements also conflict between the validation and monitoring documents, which increases reliability and reputational risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2438
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	58,939 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Leakage is described as “quantified” but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, creating over-crediting risk.
- Key safeguards items (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, safeguards mention) conflict between the validation report (2022-02-26) and monitoring report (2022-08-26).
- Usage rate (assumed and verified) is not found in the extracted record despite cookstove ERs being highly sensitive to sustained use.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022-08-26).

- Leakage is said to be quantified but the leakage deduction value is not found in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022-08-26).

The monitoring report (2022-08-26) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural integrity. However, the baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which weakens robustness over a long crediting period (2012-11-20 — 2022-11-19). Leakage is described as “quantified” in the monitoring report (2022-08-26), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, leaving a material integrity gap for cookstove crediting.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-11-20 — 2017-11-19) and a verified ER total is provided (58,939) (monitoring report, 2022-08-26).

- Usage performance metrics (assumed and verified usage rates) are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency for a cookstove program (monitoring report, 2022-08-26).

The monitoring report (2022-08-26) clearly states the monitoring period (2012-11-20 — 2017-11-19) and provides a verified emissions reduction total of 58,939. The VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd, which supports audit traceability. However, the extracted record does not include total ERs claimed, nor does it include assumed or verified usage rates, despite the report stating an annual survey monitoring approach; this limits the ability to independently assess MRV strength from the extracted facts.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is not CORSIA-eligible, reducing some downstream claim and eligibility-related risks (registry extract).

- Over-crediting risk remains because leakage and usage-rate parameters are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record (monitoring report, 2022-08-26).

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces certain eligibility-driven marketing and double-claim concerns. Still, claim safety is constrained by missing key drivers of cookstove quantification in the extracted record—especially usage rates and the explicit leakage deduction—raising residual over-crediting/greenwashing risk if public claims are made without these details. CCP status is not stated in available documents, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple core documents are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high (evidence list; extracted record).

- Contradictions between validation and monitoring documents on safeguards-related items reduce confidence in narrative consistency (validation report 2022-02-26 vs monitoring report 2022-08-26).

The extracted record indicates a strong document set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports completeness. The monitoring report is relatively recent (2022-08-26) and includes the monitoring period and verified ERs. However, multiple safeguards-related elements are inconsistent between the validation report (2022-02-26) and monitoring report (2022-08-26), which reduces confidence in documentation consistency even if later documents contain more detail.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Non-reversal project type
● Leakage	Quantified but deduction not evidenced
● Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	Safeguards claimed but inconsistent across docs
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and clearly evidence the leakage deduction percentage and its calculation (including inputs and uncertainty) in the monitoring/verification package.

→ Provide explicit assumed and verified usage-rate results (survey design, sample size, stove stacking treatment, and any discounting) for the monitoring period.

→ Resolve safeguards inconsistencies by aligning the validation and monitoring narratives (or issuing an addendum) documenting FPIC, grievance mechanism operation, and benefit-sharing implementation with dates and evidence.

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-E3649689 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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