

QUALITY REPORT

One Pot Meals

CE-one-pot-meals · Gold Standard · Uganda

Report ID: CM-245180B2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.0
■ Documentation (15%)	6.4

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

Assessment Summary

This cookstove avoidance project has VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings, but key baseline and leakage parameters are not clearly evidenced in the extracted record. A major discrepancy in verified emission reductions across documents raises over-crediting and data reliability concerns. Safeguards and grievance provisions appear weak or inconsistently documented.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	CE-one-pot-meals
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G. 05.0
VVB	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Verified ERs	440,618 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large contradiction in verified ERs between the validation report (440,618) and the monitoring report (209,813), increasing over-crediting and reliability risk
- Baseline approach and reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the counterfactual
- Safeguards/FPIC and grievance mechanism are absent or inconsistently documented across documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality is confirmed by the VVB in the validation report.
- Baseline approach and leakage deduction are not clearly stated in the extracted record, weakening confidence in quantified ERs.

The validation report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports additionality robustness. However, the baseline method and when it was last reassessed are not stated in the extracted record, making it hard to judge baseline validity for a cookstove programme. Leakage is described as “quantified,” but the actual leakage deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record, limiting confidence that leakage was conservatively treated.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + Monitoring period and the VVB are identified, and a usage monitoring approach (annual survey) is described in the monitoring report.
- Claimed vs verified ERs and cross-document ER figures are inconsistent, reducing MRV clarity and comparability.

The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period (2021-01-01 to 2021-07-21) and identifies the VVB as Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. The monitoring report also describes usage monitoring via annual survey and reports a high verified usage rate (94.2%). Transparency is reduced by inconsistent ER figures across documents and a mismatch between claimed and verified totals in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 4.0 / 10

- + The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, reducing certain double-claiming/dual-eligibility risks.
- Contradictory verified ER totals and missing baseline details elevate over-crediting and greenwashing risk.

The project is stated as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of certain high-profile aviation-related claims. Still, baseline details are not stated in the extracted record, and the ER numbers show major inconsistencies across documents, both of which increase over-crediting risk. The use of a national default fNRB (0.82) is common for cookstoves, but without clearer baseline and leakage quantification in the extracted record, claims should be treated cautiously.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + Core documents are present (monitoring report and validation report) with high extraction readability and no corrective actions reported.
- Several critical fields are missing or inconsistent (baseline method, leakage deduction, safeguards), indicating incomplete/unclear documentation.

The extracted record includes at least a monitoring report and a validation report, and the minimum extraction confidence is high, supporting document usability. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, which is a positive signal for audit outcomes. Nonetheless, several critical items are missing (baseline method, leakage deduction percentage, buffer/pooling or reversal treatment) and safeguards information is inconsistent, indicating documentation gaps.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal events reported
● Leakage	Leakage said to be quantified, but deduction not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not evidenced in extracted record
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism not evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA-eligible

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish/clarify the baseline approach (including key parameters and when it was last reassessed) and reconcile it explicitly to the monitoring period ER calculation.

→ Provide a clear leakage deduction value and calculation, and document safeguards implementation (FPIC, grievance mechanism) consistently across monitoring and validation materials.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Verification Report
- 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-245180B2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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