QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 24

VCS-2442 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-CC1E2CF9 · 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 credible MRV setup (annual usage surveys) and VVB involvement, with no material findings or corrective actions reported. However, key baseline and leakage quantification details are missing in the extracted record, and multiple cross-document inconsistencies (especially on safeguards and crediting period dates) reduce confidence and increase over-crediting/claims risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2442
Sector	cookstoves
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS II-G 04.0.0
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	TUV SUD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	59,605 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 assessment of baseline validity and over-crediting risk.
- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (monitoring report says quantified, PDD says not addressed).
- ■ Safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing are stated in the monitoring report but contradicted by the issuance record, indicating data reliability issues.
- ■ Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report and the PDD.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2022-10-04) reports no reversal events and the verification record shows no material findings or corrective actions.

- Baseline method and leakage deduction are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage handling is contradicted between the PDD and monitoring report.

Additionality is indicated as confirmed by the VVB in the extracted record, supporting additionality robustness, and the monitoring report (2022-10-04) reports no reversal events. However, the baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline validity for an AMS-II.G cookstove activity. Leakage is problematic: the monitoring report (2022-10-04) indicates leakage was quantified, but the PDD (2022-08-16) is recorded as not addressing leakage, and the leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report (2022-10-04) specifies the monitoring period (2012-10-09 to 2017-10-08) and describes annual survey-based usage monitoring, with a named VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia).

- Total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, preventing a claimed-versus-verified cross-check.

The monitoring report (2022-10-04) clearly states the monitoring period (2012-10-09—2017-10-08) and the usage monitoring method (annual survey), and the VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd. Verified ERs are available (59,605), but the total ERs claimed are not found in the extracted record, limiting transparency on whether issuance aligns with monitoring claims. Several fields central to MRV interpretation (usage-rate assumed and usage-rate verified) are not stated in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, reducing aviation-claim channel risk.

- Key drivers of cookstove crediting (baseline approach, leakage deduction, and usage-rate assumptions vs. verification) are not stated in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The extracted record indicates the project is not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims. Still, over-crediting risk remains because baseline method details are not found in the extracted record and leakage treatment is inconsistent between the PDD and monitoring report. The FNRB value is reported as 87.9, but the method used to derive it is not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in this key parameter for biomass-related cookstove crediting.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are present (PDD, validation, monitoring, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 12 documents used.

- Several contradictions across documents (safeguards and crediting period dates) reduce reliability of the documentary record.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record, with high extraction confidence and 12 documents used, which supports completeness. No material findings or corrective actions are recorded, which is consistent with a clean verification/issuance pathway. However, repeated contradictions between the monitoring report and issuance record on safeguards-related items reduce confidence that these elements are consistently documented across the project file.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality (test type not specified)
Permanence	Non-reversal project; no reversals reported
Leakage	Leakage inconsistently documented; deduction not evidenced
Baseline	Baseline approach not evidenced in extracted record
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance contradicted across documents
Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach and key baseline parameters used under AMS-II.G (including any reassessment timing) in a clearly referenced section of the monitoring/verification package.

→ Provide a clear leakage calculation (or justified zero-leakage rationale) with the explicit leakage deduction applied, and reconcile the PDD vs monitoring-report inconsistency.

→ Publish/record both ERs claimed and ERs verified for the monitoring period in the same place to enable straightforward cross-checking.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification Report
- Verification 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-CC1E2CF9 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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