QUALITY REPORT

# Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 20

VCS-2440 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-209FAF82 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **6.0** Overall Score out of 10 | Integrity (35%) | 5.6 |
| | Transparency (25%) | 6.2 |
| | Claim Safety (25%) | 5.4 |
| | Documentation (15%) | 7.4 |

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project has VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified approach to leakage is referenced, but several core quantifications (baseline approach, leakage deduction, and usage rates) are not present in the extracted record. Safeguards-related statements also conflict between the validation and monitoring documents, which reduces confidence in non-carbon claims and overall data reliability.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| **Registry** | Verra (VCS) |
| **Registry ID** | VCS-2440 |
| **Sector** | cookstoves |
| **Country** | India |
| **Vintage** | Stale |
| **Project Methodology** | AMS II-G 04.0 |
| **Crediting Period** | 2012 — 2022 |
| **VVB** | TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd |
| **Verified ERs** | 61,485 tCO2e |
| **Monitoring Period** | 2012 — 2017 |
| **Confidence** | Medium |
| **Documents Reviewed** | 12 documents reviewed |
| **Scored** | 2026-04-07 |

## Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual and over-crediting risk controls.
- ■ Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.
- ■ Key cookstove driver (stove usage) is not quantified in the extracted record (no assumed or verified usage rate values).
- ■ Safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing are contradicted between the validation report and monitoring report.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.6 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022-08-16).

- Baseline method and leakage deduction are not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk (monitoring report, 2022-08-16).

The monitoring report (2022-08-16) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and the leakage deduction percentage is also not found even though leakage is described as quantified (monitoring report, 2022-08-16). No material findings or corrective actions are reported, which is positive for process quality but does not substitute for missing core quantifications.

### Transparency — 6.2 / 10

+ Clear monitoring period and VVB identity are provided, and verified ERs are stated as 61,485 tCO2e (monitoring report, 2022-08-16).

- Claimed ERs, baseline method, and usage-rate quantification are not found in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency (monitoring report, 2022-08-16).

The monitoring report (2022-08-16) provides a defined monitoring period (2012-10-07 to 2017-10-06), names the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), and reports verified emission reductions of 61,485 tCO2e. Transparency is weakened because the extracted record does not include total claimed ERs, the baseline method, or any numeric usage-rate assumptions/verification values, despite stating annual survey-based usage monitoring (monitoring report, 2022-08-16).

### Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (monitoring report, 2022-08-16).

- fNRB is high (87.9) but the method used is not stated in the extracted record, and usage/leakage quantification is missing, elevating over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible (monitoring report, 2022-08-16), which lowers the risk of higher-stakes aviation claims. Over-crediting risk remains moderate because the extracted record lacks the baseline method, the leakage deduction percentage, and quantified usage-rate results, all of which are central to cookstove credit integrity. The fNRB value is reported as 87.9, but the method used to derive it is not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in this key parameter.

### Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) and extraction confidence is high (document set, 12 docs).

- Multiple cross-document contradictions (safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing and crediting period dates) reduce reliability.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record, with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence, supporting a relatively strong documentation score. However, contradictions between the validation report (2022-05-23) and monitoring report (2022-08-16) on safeguards, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and FPIC indicate inconsistent reporting across official documents. These inconsistencies reduce confidence in the completeness and reliability of non-carbon and safeguards documentation.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed additionality |
| **Permanence** | Non-removal; no reversal risk indicated |
| **Leakage** | Quantified stated, deduction not shown |
| **Baseline** | Baseline method not evidenced here |
| **Safeguards** | Safeguards/FPIC contradicted across docs |
| **Double-claim** | Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach and parameters used (including any reassessment timing) in the public documentation set for this monitoring period.

→ Publish the numeric leakage deduction applied and the underlying calculation/justification, consistent with the statement that leakage was quantified.

→ Report quantified stove usage results (assumed and verified usage rates) from the annual surveys and show how they feed into ER calculations.

## Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- 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-209FAF82 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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