

QUALITY REPORT

IMPROVED COOKSTOVES IN LIBERIA

VCS-4219 · VCS · Liberia

Report ID: CM-9DFF3D10 · Generated: 2026-04-08 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	7.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	7.8

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

Assessment Summary

This is a partial-evidence VCS cookstove project with a public validation report and project description, but no monitoring report or issuance/retirement evidence provided here. The validation is recent and positive, yet cookstove-specific over-crediting risks remain material because the excerpt does not show local fNRB measurement, annual usage verification, or quantified leakage treatment.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-4219
Country	Liberia
Project Methodology	VMR0006 1.1
Crediting Period	2023 — 2030
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	13 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-08

Red Flags

- Cookstove-specific usage persistence and stove-stacking risk are not evidenced in the provided documents.
- No quantified leakage treatment is shown in the excerpt.
- No monitoring report or ex-post verification of delivered reductions is provided.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ Positive validation opinion and resolved 10 CARs / 4 CLs [Validation Report, 29-Apr-2024]

~ Cookstove baseline and usage assumptions are not shown; local fNRB and sustained-use evidence absent [Validation Report]

The validation report (Carbon Check, issued 29-Apr-2024) gives a positive opinion and says 10 CARs and 4 CLs were resolved, which supports some additionality and baseline scrutiny at the design stage. However, the excerpt does not provide the underlying fNRB study, stove usage persistence data, or quantified leakage deductions, so the core cookstove risks of baseline inflation and usage overstatement remain only partially addressed. Because this is a pre-issuance validation rather than an ex-post verification, permanence is not a major issue, but the project still depends on sustained household use that is not evidenced here.

Transparency — 7.1 / 10

+ Public validation report and project description are available from the registry extract

- Monitoring report and issuance/retirement records are not included in the provided evidence

Publicly visible evidence in the prompt includes the SD VISTa validation report and the project description text extracted from the registry, which is stronger than marketplace-only metadata. The report also references public comment, stakeholder interviews, and appendix documents, but the actual monitoring report and issuance/retirement records are not included in the provided materials. That makes transparency solid but incomplete rather than registry-grade.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ Recent registration/validation dates reduce vintage risk [Registry metadata; Validation Report]

- No evidence of CCP eligibility, Article 6 authorization, or corresponding adjustment

The project is on VCS and uses VMR0006, but there is no evidence here of CCP approval, Article 6 authorization, corresponding adjustment, or any buyer-claim guidance beyond the registry-style validation materials. The registration date is 2023-08-21 and the validation report is 2024, so vintage risk is not yet the main issue; the bigger concern is whether the credits will be sold with claims that exceed what the available evidence can support. A buyer could credibly claim support for improved cooking access and likely emissions reduction intent, but not low-risk, fully de-risked offset quality from the evidence shown.

Documentation — 7.8 / 10

+ Validation report, validation representation, and project description are referenced as public registry documents

- No public monitoring report or third-party verification of issued credits in the provided materials

The documentation base is reasonably strong for a design-stage assessment: a validation report, validation representation, and project description are referenced, and the validation report states it reviewed supporting documents and conducted stakeholder interviews. What is missing from the provided evidence is a monitoring report, any third-party verification of issued reductions, and the underlying technical annexes such as the fNRB study or stove performance/usage datasets. Because the project is recent, the absence is more a scope gap than an age problem, but it still limits confidence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
● Permanence	documented evidence
● Leakage	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
● Baseline	mixed evidence / unresolved risk
● Safeguards	documented evidence
● Double-claim	mixed evidence / unresolved risk

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the first monitoring report with annual stove adoption, continued-use, and stove-stacking survey results, plus any measured fuel savings.

→ Disclose the local fNRB study and baseline calculation workbook used for Liberia, including sensitivity analysis and any conservative adjustments.

→ Publish the third-party verification report and registry issuance record once credits are issued, including any leakage deductions and retirement guidance.

Documents Reviewed

- Listing Representation
- SD VISTa Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Registration Review Report
- SD VISTa Project Description
- Draft Project Description
- SD VISTa Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- SD VISTa Validation Report
- Validation Representation
- SD VISTa 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-9DFF3D10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-08 · Generated: 2026-04-08

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