QUALITY REPORT

# Distribution of Improved cook stove - Phase 19

VCS-2448 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-1E217C05 · 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 is a VCS cookstove distribution project using AMS-II.G with VVB-confirmed additionality and documented social safeguards (FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, key quantification elements that drive credit integrity for cookstoves (baseline approach, leakage deduction, and usage-rate assumptions/results) were not found in the extracted record, and there is a documented inconsistency in the stated crediting period across documents.

## Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| **Registry** | Verra (VCS) |
| **Registry ID** | VCS-2448 |
| **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** | 60,086 $tCO_2e$ |
| **Monitoring Period** | 2012 — 2017 |
| **Confidence** | Medium |
| **Documents Reviewed** | 11 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), indicating internal document inconsistency.

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

■ Usage monitoring is described (annual survey), but neither assumed nor verified usage rates were found in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk for cookstoves.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The monitoring/verification record shows additionality confirmed by the VVB and no material findings or corrective actions reported.

- Baseline approach and key quantifications (leakage deduction and usage rates) were not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence in ER robustness.

The monitoring report (2022-11-10) indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB and reports no material findings and no corrective actions, which supports procedural integrity. For cookstoves, integrity depends heavily on baseline definition, leakage treatment, and demonstrated usage; the baseline method and leakage deduction percentage were not found in the extracted record, and neither assumed nor verified usage rates were found despite an annual survey being referenced in the monitoring report. Permanence/reversal risk is generally low for energy-demand projects, and no reversals were reported in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ VVB is identified (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd) and the monitoring period is clearly stated (2012-10-02—2017-10-01) in the monitoring report.

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

The monitoring period is clearly specified as 2012-10-02 to 2017-10-01 in the monitoring report (2022-11-10), and the VVB is named (TÜV SÜD South Asia Pvt Ltd). The verified ER total is provided (60,086), but the claimed ER total was not found in the extracted record, limiting transparency on the verification delta. Key MRV parameters commonly disclosed for cookstoves (usage-rate assumptions and verified usage) were also not found in the extracted record, reducing auditability.

### Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report indicates leakage was treated as quantified and provides an fNRB value of 87.9, which supports a structured emissions accounting approach.

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, and missing usage-rate parameters elevate greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk is moderated by the presence of VVB involvement and a stated usage monitoring approach (annual survey) in the monitoring report (2022-11-10). However, the absence of extracted usage-rate values (assumed and verified) and the missing leakage deduction percentage make it difficult to judge whether credits are conservatively quantified. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status were not found in the extracted record, so downstream claim constraints cannot be confirmed from the available extraction.

### Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ Multiple document types are evidenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence across 11 documents.

- A core project parameter (crediting period) is inconsistent between the PDD and monitoring report, reducing reliability.

The evidence set includes the PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance records, with 11 documents used and high extraction confidence, which supports documentation completeness. Safeguards are comparatively well covered in the extracted record (FPIC conducted, grievance mechanism present, and benefit sharing described). A notable weakness is an internal inconsistency in the crediting period between the PDD (2021-01-28) and the monitoring report (2022-11-10), which reduces confidence in document consistency.

## Risk Indicators

| | |
|---|---|
| ● **Additionality** | VVB-confirmed additionality |
| ● **Permanence** | Energy-demand project; no reversals indicated |
| ● **Leakage** | Quantified in narrative, but deduction not evidenced |
| ● **Baseline** | Baseline approach not evidenced |
| ● **Safeguards** | FPIC and grievance mechanism documented |
| ● **Double-claim** | CORSIA/CCP status not evidenced |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and extract the baseline approach and key calculation parameters (including baseline fuel consumption and stove efficiency assumptions) from the PDD/monitoring report to enable independent ER reconstruction.

→ Report the quantified leakage deduction percentage and provide the assumed and verified usage rates (with survey design, sample size, and results) for the monitored period, and reconcile the crediting-period dates across the PDD and monitoring report.

## Documents Reviewed

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



Report ID: CM-1E217C05 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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