

QUALITY REPORT

VPA - Spouts - 3

GS-1120 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-CFB78090 · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including a stated barrier additionality approach, quantified leakage treatment, and no material findings in the monitoring report. However, key evidence is missing or not stated, including VVB confirmation of additionality, buffer pool coverage, and any clear reversal treatment, which weakens confidence in the crediting claim. The record also contains contradictions on additionality, usage monitoring, and the crediting period, so the more recent monitoring report was privileged where it is more specific, but the inconsistencies still reduce reliability.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1120
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

- **Additionality is not confirmed by the VVB, and the record contains a contradiction between a barrier test and a combined test.**
- **Reversal risk is not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not found, and the crediting period conflicts with an earlier document.**

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report dated 2020-10-14 reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.
- Additionality was based on a barrier test, but VVB confirmation is not found and the record contradicts an earlier combined-test description.

The project shows a barrier-based additionality approach under TPDDTEC, but the VVB did not explicitly confirm additionality in the extracted record. Leakage is at least addressed as quantified, and the monitoring report dated 2020-10-14 reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. Permanence is weaker because reversal events are noted as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period, a usage survey approach, and a quantified FNRB value based on a national default.
- Total ER claimed and verified are not stated, the VVB name is missing, and the extraction confidence is only medium.

The monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period from 2019-09-01 to 2020-08-31 and identifies annual survey-based usage monitoring. The FNRB is stated as 82 using a national default method, which helps interpret the project context. Transparency is reduced because total ER claimed and verified are not found, the VVB name is missing, and extraction confidence is only medium.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + Leakage is described as quantified, and the project uses a project baseline under TPDDTEC rather than an unstated baseline.
- Usage assumptions and verified usage are both 82%, but the record does not show the underlying calculation details, and CCP/CORSIA status is not clearly stated.

Claim safety is moderate at best because the project uses a project baseline and leakage is at least quantified, but the evidence does not show a robust, fully documented over-crediting check. Usage rate assumed and verified are both 82, which is internally consistent, yet the record does not provide the underlying survey detail or a clear public claim status. CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is only noted as not mentioned, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + Five documents were used, and the monitoring report is dated 2020-10-14, which is reasonably recent relative to the crediting period.
- The VVB name is missing, extraction confidence is only medium, and several key fields are not stated in available documents.

Documentation is incomplete but not absent: five documents were used and the monitoring report is dated 2020-10-14. The record still lacks the VVB name, buffer pool information, and several quantified crediting figures, and the extraction confidence is only medium. The crediting period also conflicts with an earlier document, which lowers confidence in the completeness of the file set.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Barrier test present but not VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	Project baseline with no reassessment date
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not clearly stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the VVB verification statement confirming additionality, along with the full baseline and leakage calculations.

→ Disclose buffer pool treatment, reversal handling, and explicit registry status for CORSIA and CCP eligibility.

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_04.07.2019_v8.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1120
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1120
- (1)GS6445 - Spouts_3 - 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-CFB78090 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy