QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 18

VCS-2439 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-1DC387C1 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9 Overall Score out of 10	**Integrity (35%)**	5.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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 verified ERs) were not found in the extracted record. Safeguards and stakeholder provisions appear in the monitoring report but are contradicted by the validation report, which raises reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2439
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 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and baseline reassessment timing were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual.
- ■ Leakage is described as “quantified” but the actual leakage deduction percentage was not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Key safeguards fields (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, safeguards mention) contradict between the validation report and monitoring report.
- ■ Total emission reductions claimed and verified were not found in the extracted record, reducing auditability of outcomes.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022).

- Baseline method and leakage deduction value were not found in the extracted record, weakening over-crediting controls.

The monitoring report (2022) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record (despite the AMS II-G methodology being identified), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is also not found. Leakage is described as “quantified” (monitoring report, 2022), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in net ER integrity.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Monitoring period and monitoring approach are specified, with usage monitored via annual surveys (monitoring report, 2022).

- Total ERs claimed vs verified were not found in the extracted record, limiting third-party reproducibility.

The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2012-10-06 to 2017-10-05, and the monitoring approach includes annual survey-based usage monitoring (monitoring report, 2022). The VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd (monitoring report, 2022), supporting traceability of assurance. However, total emission reductions claimed and total emission reductions verified are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to reconcile issuance with monitored performance.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain downstream claim risks (merged record).

- Missing baseline and leakage deduction values increase over-crediting/greenwashing risk for cookstove crediting.

The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, which reduces the risk of CORSIA-related claim misuse (merged record). CCP status is not found in the extracted record, so voluntary-claims alignment cannot be confirmed. Over-crediting risk remains moderate because the baseline method and leakage deduction value are not found in the extracted record, even though leakage is said to be quantified (monitoring report, 2022).

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and extraction confidence is high (merged record).

- Contradictions between validation and monitoring reports on safeguards-related items reduce confidence in document consistency.

The extracted record shows a reasonably complete document set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports documentation quality. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is directionally positive for audit outcomes. Nonetheless, multiple safeguards-related contradictions between the validation report (2022) and monitoring report (2022) reduce confidence in consistency and completeness of social safeguard documentation.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Non-reversal project type
Leakage	Quantified but deduction not evidenced
Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
Safeguards	Safeguards claims inconsistent across docs
Double-claim	Not CORSIA; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline calculation approach and parameters used under AMS II-G (including any reassessment) and provide a clear baseline justification in the monitoring/verification package.

→ Publish a clear leakage deduction value (percentage) with the underlying calculation and include a reconciliation table showing ER claimed vs ER verified vs issued for the monitoring period.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report

Report ID: CM-1DC387C1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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