

## QUALITY REPORT

# VPA - Spouts - 2

GS-1119 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-E8228A27 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.4

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.2
■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage approach, but key permanence and baseline details are incomplete. Transparency is limited by missing verification totals, missing registry eligibility status, and contradictions in the monitoring record that reduce confidence in the documentation.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1119
Sector	industrial
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC Version 3.1
Crediting Period	2017 — 2022
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

## Red Flags

- Reversal risk is not addressed: no buffer pool percentage is stated and reversal events are marked as not addressed.
- The record contains contradictions on the usage monitoring method and crediting period, which weakens confidence in the reported monitoring history.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a barrier test, which supports the project's core additionality claim.
- Permanence is weakly documented because no buffer pool share is stated and reversal events are not addressed in the monitoring report.

The monitoring report dated 2020-10-14 shows additionality was confirmed by the VVB through a barrier test, which is a meaningful positive signal. However, baseline reassessment timing is not stated, the buffer pool percentage is missing, and reversal events are marked as not addressed, so permanence and baseline robustness are only moderately supported. Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual deduction percentage is not found in the extracted record.

### Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period and identifies the annual survey approach for usage monitoring.
- Key disclosure gaps remain because the verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated, and the VVB name is not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report covers 2019-09-01 to 2020-08-31 and says usage was monitored through an annual survey, which helps traceability. Still, the verified and claimed emission reduction totals are not stated, the VVB name is not found, and CORSIA eligibility is not stated, all of which limit public-facing transparency. The medium extraction confidence also suggests some source material was not fully clear.

### Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The project uses a quantified leakage approach and reports a national default method for non-renewable biomass, which is better than an unbounded baseline assumption.
- Claim safety is weakened because the assumed usage rate of 60% differs from the verified 82%, and the record does not state CORSIA or CCP status.

Claim safety is helped by the use of a project baseline under TPDDTEC and a quantified leakage treatment, plus a national default approach for non-renewable biomass with a verified usage rate of 82%. That said, the assumed usage rate of 60% differs materially from the verified 82%, which raises over-crediting concerns. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available record.

### Documentation — 4.3 / 10

- + The record includes five extracted documents and reports no material findings or corrective actions in the monitoring report.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the contradictions on usage monitoring and crediting period suggest the document set is not fully consistent.

The extracted set includes five documents, and the monitoring report reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. Even so, the VVB name is missing, extraction confidence is only medium, and the record contains contradictions on the usage monitoring method and crediting period. I privileged the later monitoring report dated 2020-10-14 over the earlier 2017-07 reference because it is more recent and likely supersedes the earlier project documentation, but the inconsistency still lowers reliability.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified but deduction missing
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Grievance and safeguards noted, FPIC not stated
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified and claimed emission reduction totals, the VVB name, and the exact leakage deduction used in the issuance calculation.

→ Document buffer pool treatment, reversal risk management, FPIC status, and resolve the contradictions on usage monitoring and crediting period with a clear document hierarchy.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_01.09.2017 to 31.08.2019\_v5.pdf
- GS5705 PoA Design Consultation Report.pdf
- (1)GS5705 PoA-DD\_13.05.19\_v17.docx
- PDD\_11.01.2019\_v5.docx
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1119
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1119
- (1)GS6444 - Spouts\_2 - Monitoring Report\_V09.docx

### 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-E8228A27 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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