QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 17

VCS-2444 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-80FEE403 · 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%)	5.8
	Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and there were no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, key quantifications that affect over-crediting risk (notably leakage deduction and usage-rate performance) are not clearly stated in the extracted data, and there is a crediting-period inconsistency between documents.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2444
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	60,070 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

■ Crediting period dates conflict between the monitoring report (2012-10-02—2022-10-01) and the PDD (2013-01-01—2022-12-31), raising data reliability concerns.

■ Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

■ Usage is monitored via annual survey, but neither assumed nor verified usage rates are found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in ER robustness.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation listed; VVB: TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd).

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

The monitoring report (2022-10-03) indicates the project applies a project-specific baseline approach and reports 60,070 tCO2e verified for the stated monitoring period. Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd) per the extracted record, and no material findings or corrective actions are reported. However, although leakage is described as quantified in the monitoring report, the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, and baseline reassessment timing is also not stated—both weaken robustness.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-12-04—2017-12-03) and a verified ER total is provided (60,070 tCO2e) in the monitoring report (2022-10-03).

- Key MRV parameters (assumed/verified usage rates and ERR claimed) are not found in the extracted record, limiting auditability.

The monitoring period (2012-12-04—2017-12-03) and total verified emission reductions (60,070 tCO2e) are clearly captured from the monitoring report (2022-10-03), supporting basic traceability. Usage monitoring is described as annual survey, but neither the assumed usage rate nor the verified usage rate is found in the extracted record, which limits the ability to independently judge performance assumptions. The total ERs claimed are also not found in the extracted record, reducing transparency on any claim-to-verify delta.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

~ The project uses a project-specific baseline approach and baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which can elevate over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk remains moderate because the baseline is project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in the extracted record (monitoring report/PDD set). Leakage is said to be quantified, but without the leakage deduction value in the extracted record it is hard to judge conservativeness. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, which increases uncertainty for buyers making high-integrity or compliance-adjacent claims.

Documentation — 7.6 / 10

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

- One document is listed as unknown and a key project attribute (crediting period) is inconsistent across documents.

The evidence set is relatively complete on paper, with PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance listed, and 12 documents used with high extraction confidence. The monitoring report is dated 2022-10-03 and covers a historical monitoring period, indicating documentation exists for verification/issuance. Documentation quality is reduced by an 'unknown' document entry and by an internal inconsistency on the crediting period across the monitoring report and PDD.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	Non-reversal project type
● **Leakage**	Quantified but deduction not shown
● **Baseline**	Project-specific; reassessment unclear
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards and grievance noted; FPIC unclear
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the leakage deduction percentage and the underlying calculation in the monitoring/verification documentation, and ensure it is consistently reflected across reports.

→ Report assumed vs verified usage rates (and survey design/response rates) for the monitoring period to allow independent assessment of over-crediting risk.

→ Resolve and publicly clarify the crediting period discrepancy between the PDD and monitoring report, including any formal VCS registration/crediting-period approval references.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- 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-80FEE403 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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