

QUALITY REPORT

Bangladesh Apon Chula Improved Cookstove Program II

VCS-3168 · VCS · Bangladesh

Report ID: CM-9AA4E695 · Generated: 2026-04-15 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This cookstove project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality, quantified leakage treatment, and documented safeguards in the latest validation report. However, key baseline and monitoring details are missing, the extraction confidence is low, and several core claims cannot be independently checked from the available record, which limits confidence in the credit quality.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-3168
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Bangladesh
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	VMR0006 1.1
Crediting Period	2022 — 2032
VVB	Earthood Services Limited
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-15

Red Flags

- The baseline method is not stated in the extracted record, and monitoring-period and ERR figures are also not available.
- The record shows low extraction confidence and contradictions on safeguards, which were resolved in favor of the newer 2025 validation report but still reduce reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, Earthood Services Limited, in the 2025 validation report.
- + Leakage is quantified with a 0.95% deduction under VMR0006 methodology version 1.1.

The validation report from Earthood Services Limited confirms additionality, which supports the project's core crediting logic. Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0.95%, and the methodology is identified as VMR0006 version 1.1. On the negative side, the baseline method is not stated in the extracted record, buffer pool coverage is not found, and reversal events are marked as not addressed, which weakens permanence and baseline confidence.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB and a recent validation report dated 2025-07-14.
- Total ERR claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, and the monitoring period is not stated.

Transparency is moderate because the record identifies the VVB and includes a recent validation report dated 2025-07-14, but key monitoring outputs are missing. Total ERR claimed and verified are not available, and the monitoring period is not stated, so the public-facing evidence trail is incomplete. Annual survey usage monitoring is mentioned, but the actual usage-rate results are not found in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 3.9 / 10

- + Leakage is explicitly quantified rather than left unaddressed.
- The baseline approach is not stated, which makes over-crediting risk harder to assess.

Claim safety is constrained by missing baseline and performance data. The quantified leakage deduction is a positive sign, and the high FNRB value of 0.91 is consistent with a cookstove context, but the absence of verified usage-rate figures and ERR totals makes it difficult to judge over-crediting risk. Because the baseline method is not stated, the project's emission reduction claim cannot be independently stress-tested from the extracted record alone.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

- + The record draws on multiple document types, including a PDD and validation report, with 12 documents used.
- Extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable.

Documentation quality is mixed: the record draws from 12 documents and includes both a PDD and a validation report, which is helpful. However, extraction confidence is low, meaning at least one key document was poorly readable, and several important fields are missing, including the monitoring period, baseline reassessment timing, and verified ERR values. The latest validation report is more recent than the older unknown-date material, so it was privileged for safeguards and additionality-related facts.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No buffer pool or reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	Quantified leakage deduction
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the baseline methodology, monitoring period, and verified emission reduction totals in a single accessible monitoring package.

→ Provide clearer documentation on reversal risk treatment, buffer arrangements if any, and the full usage-rate evidence from the annual surveys.

Documents Reviewed

- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Listing Representation
- SD VISta Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- SD VISta Draft Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation 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-9AA4E695 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-15 · Generated: 2026-04-15
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy