QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 23

VCS-2446 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-643D8BE5 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4 Overall Score out of 10		
	Integrity (35%)	6.2
	Transparency (25%)	6.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.4
	Documentation (15%)	7.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a VCS cookstove distribution project using AMS-II.G with VVB involvement and a quantified leakage treatment noted, and no material findings or corrective actions reported. However, key baseline and leakage parameters are not clearly captured in the extracted record, and there are document-to-document inconsistencies on safeguards/FPIC and the crediting period that reduce confidence in data reliability.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2446
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	59,873 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- ■ Baseline approach and reassessment timing are not found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk for an energy-demand project.
- ■ Contradictions between the validation report and monitoring report on whether safeguards/FPIC and a grievance mechanism are in place.
- ■ Crediting period dates conflict between the PDD and monitoring report, creating uncertainty about the exact crediting timeline.
- ■ Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation/verification documentation referenced in the extracted record).

- Baseline method and leakage deduction value are not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to judge baseline validity and leakage conservativeness.

The extracted record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. The monitoring report applies AMS-II.G and notes leakage was treated as quantified, but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, limiting assessment of leakage conservativeness. The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not found in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline validity for a cookstove ER calculation. No material findings or corrective actions are reported in the extracted record, which is a positive signal but does not substitute for missing quantification details.

Transparency — 6.0 / 10

+ Monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-12-06 to 2017-12-05) and a verified ER total is provided (59,873 tCO2e).

- The claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, preventing a clear claimed-versus-verified comparison.

The monitoring period is clearly specified as 2012-12-06 to 2017-12-05 in the monitoring report, and the verified emission reductions are stated as 59,873 tCO2e. The VVB is identified as TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd, supporting traceability of assurance. However, the claimed ER total is not found in the extracted record, so it is not possible to compare claimed versus verified outcomes from the extracted data alone. Usage monitoring is described as annual survey, but the extracted record does not provide the assumed or verified usage rates, limiting MRV transparency.

Claim Safety — 6.4 / 10

+ The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing cross-program claim risk.

- Several core quantification elements (baseline method, leakage deduction %, usage rates) are not found in the extracted record, elevating over-crediting/greenwashing risk.

The project is explicitly marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of CORSIA-related double-claim narratives. The fraction of non-renewable biomass is high (87.9) and is described as calculated using secondary sources, which can be acceptable but increases sensitivity to assumptions if not transparently justified in the underlying documents. Key drivers of over-crediting risk—baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, and usage rates (assumed and verified)—are not found in the extracted record, so claims should be treated cautiously. CCP status is not found in the extracted record, leaving uncertainty about alignment with higher-integrity labels.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ Multiple document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence.

- Internal inconsistencies across documents (safeguards/FPIC, grievance mechanism, crediting period) reduce reliability.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record, and the extraction confidence is high, which supports document completeness. The monitoring report date (2022-10-03) is recent relative to the stated monitoring period and crediting period, suggesting the documentation is maintained. However, contradictions across documents on safeguards/FPIC and the grievance mechanism indicate inconsistent reporting. A further contradiction on the crediting period dates between the PDD and monitoring report reduces confidence in administrative accuracy.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed additionality
● **Permanence**	No reversal risk typical for cookstoves
● **Leakage**	Quantified but % not evidenced here
● **Baseline**	Baseline method not evidenced here
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC inconsistently reported
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach and key parameters used under AMS-II.G (including baseline fuel consumption assumptions) and when/if the baseline was reassessed.

→ Report leakage deduction explicitly (percentage and calculation) and provide the assumed vs. verified usage rates from the annual surveys, with sampling details.

→ Resolve and clearly document safeguards/FPIC and grievance mechanism status consistently across PDD, validation, and monitoring documents, with evidence references.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- 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-643D8BE5 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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