

## QUALITY REPORT

# Biogas for Better Life Uganda

GS-1646 · Gold Standard · Uganda

Report ID: CM-DD9E560F · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.6

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.4
■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

## Assessment Summary

This is a certified Gold Standard biogas avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality, no reported reversals, and safeguards that are at least partially documented. However, key baseline and leakage details are incomplete, and the record contains material contradictions in reported ER totals and some safeguard-related fields, which reduces confidence in the claims.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1646
Sector	biogas
Country	Uganda
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Energy Consumption 1.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2022
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Verified ERs	24,489 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	17 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

## Red Flags

- The record shows large contradictions in reported emission reductions, with different documents citing 24,489 verified versus 34,966 verified, and 12,126 claimed versus 38,103 claimed.
- Baseline method and leakage treatment are not fully specified in the extracted record, and the leakage justification changed across documents from quantified to deemed negligible.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project is a Gold Standard certified biogas avoidance activity.

- Baseline method is not stated in the extracted record, and leakage treatment is only described as deemed negligible rather than clearly quantified in the latest verification report.

The verification report from TÜV NORD CERT GmbH confirms additionality, and the project is an avoidance-type biogas activity with no reversal events reported. At the same time, the extracted record does not state the baseline method, and leakage is only described as deemed negligible in the verification report rather than clearly quantified. Those gaps keep the integrity score moderate rather than strong.

### Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period is stated, the VVB is named as TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, and the project has a documented verification report.

- The record contains conflicting ER figures across documents, and several core parameters such as baseline reassessment timing and leakage deduction are not stated.

Transparency is helped by a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and the presence of validation, monitoring, PDD, and verification documents. However, the record shows conflicting emission reduction totals across documents, and baseline reassessment timing is not stated. The medium extraction confidence also limits how fully the documentation can be trusted.

### Claim Safety — 4.4 / 10

+ The project is an avoidance project with no reported reversal events, which lowers permanence-related claim risk.

- The contradictory claimed and verified ER totals create over-crediting uncertainty, and CORSIA/CCP status is not stated in the extracted record.

Claim safety is supported by the project being an avoidance project with no reported reversals and by the Gold Standard certification status. But the large discrepancies between claimed and verified emission reductions across documents raise over-crediting concerns, and the extracted record does not state CORSIA or CCP status. The leakage treatment also appears to have shifted from quantified in an earlier verification to deemed negligible later, which adds uncertainty.

### Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Multiple official document types were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and verification materials, with medium extraction confidence.

- Some key fields remain unstated, and the contradictions indicate that the documentation set is not fully internally consistent.

The evidence base is reasonably broad, with 17 extracted facts drawn from validation, monitoring, PDD, and verification documents. Still, the extraction confidence is only medium, several important fields are not stated, and the record contains contradictions that reduce documentation reliability. The more recent verification report was privileged for current operational facts such as the VVB, monitoring period, and reported safeguards because it is the latest clearly dated source in the set.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage deemed negligible, not quantified
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards present but inconsistently documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, reconciled table explaining the differences between claimed and verified emission reductions across all document versions.

→ State the baseline methodology, leakage deduction, and any reassessment schedule explicitly in the latest public monitoring and verification materials.

## Documents Reviewed

- 24nov21 BSUL VPA03 MR MPIV V1.3 .docx
- T-PerfCert\_v3.0-Project-Annual-Report\_02122024\_VPA003.pdf
- 03FEB23\_BSUL\_VPA03\_MR\_MPV\_V1.7.docx
- Monitoring Report\_2nd monitoring period\_01.09.2017 to 31.03.2019\_v1.3.docx
- Monitoring Report\_3rd monitoring period\_19.05.2019 to 30.04.2020\_V1.4.pdf
- (1)Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_19.04.2015 to 31.08.2017\_v3.pdf
- DEV\_237 Deviation Request (2).pdf
- VAL\_REP\_VPA003\_ABC\_170303\_v2.pdf
- GS Passport\_11.05.2015\_v1.pdf
- PDD\_21.02.2017\_v2.3.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1646
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1646
- (1)Verification Report\_1st monitoring period\_19.04.2015 to 31.08.2017\_v3.pdf
- Validation Report\_03.03.2017\_v2.pdf
- Verification Report\_2nd monitoring period\_01.09.2017 to 31.03.2019\_v1.pdf
- CCIPL 1359 VPA 03 FVR clean.pdf
- Verification Report\_3rd monitoring period\_19.04.2015 to 31.08.2017\_v1.pdf

**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-DD9E560F · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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