

## QUALITY REPORT

# Improved Cookstoves for Communities

VCS-2922 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-CC816E40 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**6.7**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.6
■ Transparency (25%)	6.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.1
■ Documentation (15%)	7.6

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

## Assessment Summary

This VCS cookstove project shows moderately strong additionality support (investment test confirmed by the VVB) and has documented social safeguards elements (FPIC and a grievance mechanism). However, leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents and key quantitative parameters (notably leakage deduction and verified usage rate) are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, increasing over-crediting risk.

## Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2922
Sector	cookstoves
Country	India
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	VMR0006 1.1
Crediting Period	2021 — 2028
VVB	VKU Certifications Pvt. Ltd.
Verified ERs	66,258 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-07

## Red Flags

- Leakage is described as “quantified” in the monitoring report (2024) but was “not addressed” in the validation report (2023), raising reliability concerns about leakage treatment.
- No leakage deduction percentage is found in the extracted record despite leakage being described as quantified.
- Verified stove usage rate is not found in the extracted record, even though monitoring relies on annual surveys.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.6 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was tested via an investment test and confirmed by the VVB (VKU Certifications).

- Leakage handling is inconsistent across documents and the leakage deduction value is not found in the extracted record, weakening confidence in net ERs.

Additionality appears reasonably supported: the project applies an investment test and additionality is confirmed by the VVB (VKU Certifications) as reflected in the extracted record from the validation/verification documentation. The baseline is project-specific (VMR0006), and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which is a moderate robustness gap. Leakage is a key weakness: the monitoring report (2024) characterizes leakage as quantified, but the validation report (2023) indicates it was not addressed, and no leakage deduction percentage is found in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Monitoring approach is stated (annual survey) and a specific monitoring period is provided (2023-01-01 to 2024-05-31) in the monitoring report (2024).

- Key reconciliation items are missing in the extracted record (claimed ERs and verified usage rate), limiting independent checks against the verified 66,258 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

The monitoring report (2024-10-16) clearly states the monitoring period (2023-01-01 to 2024-05-31) and the usage monitoring method (annual survey), which supports basic MRV transparency. The verified ER figure is available (66,258 tCO<sub>2</sub>e), but the claimed ER figure is not found in the extracted record, reducing traceability of the verification outcome. In addition, the verified usage rate is not found in the extracted record, limiting the ability to assess whether survey results support the credited reductions.

### Claim Safety — 6.1 / 10

+ The project uses a local field-based fNRB approach with a high reported value (91.19), which is at least method-specified rather than defaulted.

- CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in the extracted record, and leakage quantification is not consistently evidenced, increasing greenwashing/over-crediting risk.

Over-crediting risk is moderated by the fact that fNRB is derived from local field methods and a specific value is reported (91.19), as reflected in the extracted record. However, the absence of a stated verified usage rate and the missing leakage deduction percentage make it difficult to judge whether credited reductions are conservatively netted. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claim constraints and double-claim signaling cannot be confidently assessed.

### Documentation — 7.6 / 10

+ Multiple document types are present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, issuance) with high extraction confidence and 16 documents used.

- Some critical quantitative fields are still not found in the extracted record (e.g., leakage deduction %, usage rate assumed/verified), indicating completeness gaps.

Documentation coverage is relatively strong: the extracted record indicates 16 documents used with high extraction confidence, including a PDD, validation report, monitoring report, and issuance record. The monitoring report is recent (dated 2024-10-16) and aligns with an active crediting period (2021-11-20 to 2028-11-19). Nonetheless, several critical quantitative fields are not found in the extracted record (claimed ERs, leakage deduction %, usage rate assumed/verified), indicating that key decision-useful details are either missing or not captured clearly.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	Investment test confirmed by VVB
● <b>Permanence</b>	Non-reversal project type; no reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment inconsistent; deduction not evidenced
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Disclose and clearly report the leakage deduction percentage and the underlying leakage quantification in the monitoring/verification package, and reconcile it with the validation report's earlier treatment.

→ Publish verified stove usage metrics (e.g., usage rate, stacking/displacement evidence) and provide a clear claimed-vs-verified ER reconciliation table for the monitoring period.

## Documents Reviewed

- Registration and Issuance Review Report
- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Draft 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-CC816E40 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-07 · Generated: 2026-04-08

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)