

QUALITY REPORT

The Clean Energy Cooking Initiative

VCS-3030 · VCS · India

Report ID: CM-2C4B68FF · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.0
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.5
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project shows reasonably strong additionality confirmation and a quantified leakage deduction, but gaps remain in baseline reassessment, buffer treatment, and documentation confidence. Several contradictions across source documents and low extraction confidence reduce reliability of some inputs.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3030
Sector	other
Country	India
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	VMR0006: Methodology for Installation of High Efficiency Firewood Cookstoves Version 1.1
Crediting Period	2022 — 2029
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+ Certification)
Verified ERs	57,966 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory records on the free nonrenewable biomass method (local field vs national default) undermining baseline inputs
- Low extraction confidence and 'unknown' evidence documents — source traceability is weak

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.0 / 10

+ Additionality confirmed by the VVB (verification report, 2024-10-21) using a combined test

- No buffer pool percentage stated and baseline reassessment not found; reversal events not addressed in available records

The verification report (2024-10-21) confirms additionality using a combined test and the VVB (Applus+) approved the project, which supports integrity. The project uses a project-specific baseline methodology (VMR0006) and applies a quantified leakage deduction of 5% (monitoring/verification report). However, no buffer pool percentage is stated and baseline reassessment date is not found in the extracted record, and reversal events are not documented — these are weaknesses for permanence and baseline robustness.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ VVB named (LGAI Technological Center, Applus+) and monitoring period and verified ERR are reported (verification report, 2024-10-21)

- Evidence documents are listed as 'unknown' and minimum extraction confidence is low, reducing traceability

Key verification outputs are present: VVB name, monitoring period (2022-11-20 — 2023-04-30), and total emissions reductions claimed equal those verified (57,966), which is positive for MRV transparency. On the other hand, the extracted evidence documents are labeled 'unknown', minimum extraction confidence is low, and provenance for some inputs (e.g. earlier documents) is unclear, limiting traceability and reproducibility.

Claim Safety — 6.5 / 10

+ Usage monitoring verified a 100% usage rate versus a 95% assumed rate (monitoring report / verification report), which is conservative for claims

- Contradictions exist on FN/RB method (local field vs national default) and earlier very low assumed usage in an older document, raising overcrediting concerns

The project appears relatively conservative on usage: an assumed usage rate of 95% versus a verified 100% suggests no upward bias in usage assumptions. Leakage was quantified and a 5% deduction applied. Nonetheless, contradictions in the free nonrenewable biomass approach (local field vs national default) and conflicting historical assumed usage values (1.825% in an older extract) introduce a risk of overcrediting or unreliable baseline parameterisation.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ Recent verification report dated 2024-10-21 and 15 documents nominally used; all CARs/CLs reported were raised and closed

- Min extraction confidence is low and evidence_docs are not clearly identified, indicating weak source transparency

There is a recent verification report (2024-10-21) and 15 documents were reportedly used, and all corrective action requests were closed, which supports documentation completeness. However, the minimum extraction confidence is low and the evidence document list is not clearly identified, reducing confidence in the extraction and source linkage.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	buffer/risks unclear
● Leakage	quantified deduction
● Baseline	project baseline; reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or link the source evidence documents (full verification and monitoring reports) to resolve contradictions and raise extraction confidence

→ Provide explicit buffer treatment and a documented baseline reassessment date; clarify the FN/RB method choice with supporting field data or national default justification

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation.pdf
- VCS_RV1_PRR_3030_21OCT2024.pdf
- Ex-ante ER_3030_V.3.xls
- Ex-post ER_3030_V.3.xlsx
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- PD-MR_3030_V5 - Clean.pdf
- Registrartion Representation - Signed.pdf
- VCS 3030_fNRFB_Madhya Pradesh_PRR-2.xlsx
- India OutlineFilled.kml
- Communications-Agreement 3030 - Signed..pdf
- Deceleration letter 3030.pdf
- Phase 11_VCS PD&MR;_V01_31052022_Clean.pdf
- VCS-Accession-Listing-Representation 3030 - Signed.pdf
- Phase 11_VCS-Listing-Representation-Single-Representor-v4.1.pdf
- FVR_VCS 3030 - Clean.pdf
- VCS-Validation-Representation-v4.1.pdf
- VCS-Verification-Representation-v4.1.pdf

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-2C4B68FF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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