

QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 22

VCS-2441 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-7AFA1321 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.6
	■ Transparency (25%)	6.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS cookstove distribution project with VVB involvement and a quantified leakage approach, and the extracted record shows no material findings or corrective actions. However, key integrity-critical parameters (baseline approach, leakage deduction value, and usage-rate assumptions/verification) are not stated in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk. A crediting-period date discrepancy between the PDD and monitoring report also reduces confidence in data consistency.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2441
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
Verified ERs	60,865 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Baseline approach and reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual and over-crediting controls.
- Leakage is described as quantified but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not stated in the extracted record.
- Usage-rate assumed and usage-rate verified are not stated in the extracted record despite reliance on annual surveys for monitoring.
- Crediting period dates conflict between the PDD (2021) and monitoring report (2023), indicating document inconsistency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).
- Baseline method and leakage deduction value are not stated in the extracted record, weakening confidence in quantified emission reductions.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced) and reports no material findings or corrective actions. However, the baseline method and the timing of any baseline reassessment are not stated in the extracted record, which is a major integrity gap for a cookstove ER calculation. Leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report (2023), but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not stated in the extracted record, reducing confidence that leakage was conservatively applied.

Transparency — 6.4 / 10

- + Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-10-08 to 2017-10-07) and a verified ER total is provided (60,865).
- Claimed ERs, usage-rate metrics, and key calculation parameters are not stated in the extracted record, limiting reproducibility.

The monitoring report (2023-12-11) clearly states the monitoring period (2012-10-08 to 2017-10-07) and provides total verified emission reductions of 60,865. The project also discloses the monitoring approach as annual surveys in the extracted record. But the total claimed ERs, usage-rate assumed, and usage-rate verified are not stated in the extracted record, making it difficult to independently reconcile how the verified total was derived.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + fNRB is explicitly quantified at 87.9% and described as calculated using secondary sources.
- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and missing baseline/leakage/usage details elevate over-crediting and claims risk.

The monitoring report (2023) provides an fNRB value of 87.9% and notes it was calculated using secondary sources, which can be acceptable but is sensitive to assumptions and national default comparisons that are not provided in the extracted record. Missing baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and usage-rate metrics increase the risk of over-crediting and therefore the risk of unsafe claims. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily assess eligibility-based claim constraints from the extracted data alone.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

- + Multiple document types are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 12 documents used.
- A crediting-period contradiction between the PDD and monitoring report indicates documentation inconsistency.

The evidence set is relatively strong: the extracted record lists a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance, with 12 documents used and high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is recent (2023-12-11) relative to the monitoring period and crediting period. However, an internal inconsistency on the crediting-period dates between core documents reduces documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Non-reversal project type
● Leakage	Quantified but deduction not shown
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
● Safeguards	Safeguards mentioned; FPIC unclear
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach used under AMS II-G (including key parameters and any reassessment) and provide a clear calculation trail from activity data to the 60,865 verified ERs.

→ Report the leakage deduction percentage and its quantified basis, and publish usage-rate assumed vs. usage-rate verified results from the annual surveys (including sample design and uncertainty).

Documents Reviewed

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

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-7AFA1321 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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