QUALITY REPORT

Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 21

VCS-2447 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-A4DA11EB · 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 shows moderate integrity: additionality is confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions are reported, but key baseline and leakage quantification details are missing from the extracted record. Transparency is fairly good due to clear monitoring period, methodology identification, and a verified ER figure, though several core parameters (baseline approach, leakage deduction, usage rates) are not evidenced here. Claim safety is moderate because over-crediting risk remains without usage-rate and leakage-deduction specifics, and CCP status is not stated.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2447
Sector	cookstoves
Country	India
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS II-G 04
Crediting Period	2012 — 2022
VVB	TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd
Verified ERs	60,747 tCO_2e
Monitoring Period	2012 — 2017
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

Red Flags

- Baseline approach is not stated in the extracted record, and the baseline reassessment timing is also not found.

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

- Usage rates (assumed and verified) are not found, despite reliance on annual surveys for usage monitoring.

- Safeguards/FPIC/grievance/benefit-sharing are inconsistent between the validation report and monitoring report, indicating reporting reliability issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (monitoring report, 2022-08-09).

- Baseline method and leakage deduction value are not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in quantified ERs (monitoring report, 2022-08-09).

The monitoring report (2022-08-09) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and it reports no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports procedural robustness. However, the baseline method and the date of baseline reassessment are not found in the extracted record, which weakens confidence in baseline validity. Leakage is described as quantified (monitoring report, 2022-08-09), but the actual leakage deduction value is not found, leaving an integrity gap for net ER calculation.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring period and verified emission reductions are clearly stated (monitoring report, 2022-08-09).

- Several MRV-critical parameters (usage rates, leakage deduction, baseline method) are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2022-08-09) clearly states the monitoring period (2012-12-06 to 2017-12-05), the applied methodology (AMS II-G v04), the VVB name (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd), and the verified ER total (60,747). Usage monitoring is described as annual surveys (monitoring report, 2022-08-09), but the extracted record does not include the assumed or verified usage rates, limiting auditability. Key quantitative fields such as total ER claimed and leakage deduction percentage are also not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 6.0 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing some downstream claim-risk (monitoring report, 2022-08-09).

- Over-crediting risk remains because usage-rate evidence and leakage deduction are not found, and CCP status is not stated in available documents.

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible (monitoring report, 2022-08-09), which reduces certain compliance-claim risks. Still, CCP status is not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot easily assess alignment with higher-integrity labels. Because usage rates (assumed and verified) and the leakage deduction percentage are not found in the extracted record, there is residual over-crediting/greenwashing risk for cookstove performance and sustained adoption assumptions.

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

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

- Contradictions across documents on safeguards and crediting period reduce reliability of the documented narrative.

The extracted record indicates a relatively complete document set (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) and a high extraction confidence, supporting a solid documentation score. However, there are multiple cross-document inconsistencies on whether safeguards, grievance mechanisms, benefit sharing, and FPIC are present, which undermines confidence in the social safeguards narrative. The crediting period is also inconsistent between the PDD (2021-01-28) and monitoring report (2022-08-09), indicating version-control or reporting issues.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Non-reversal project type
Leakage	Quantified but deduction not evidenced
Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced
Safeguards	Safeguards reported but inconsistent
Double-claim	Not CORSIA; CCP status unclear

What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose the baseline approach and when it was last reassessed, with clear citations to the PDD/monitoring/verification sections.

→ Report and justify the leakage deduction percentage and provide the underlying calculation consistent with the stated quantified leakage approach.

→ Publish assumed vs. verified usage rates (and survey instruments/sample design) to substantiate sustained stove adoption and ER calculations.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Monitoring Report
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report
- Verification 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-A4DA11EB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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