

## QUALITY REPORT

# Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 025 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3749 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-AFBE3101 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.6**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>6.1</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.4</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.0</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some solid integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and no reported reversal events in the extracted record. However, there are material documentation gaps and contradictions around the crediting period, leakage treatment, and usage-rate figures, which reduce confidence in the claims. Overall this looks like a moderate-quality cookstove programme with meaningful but not severe reliability concerns.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3749
Sector	industrial
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G Version 05.0
Crediting Period	2024 — 2029
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	14 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

## Red Flags

- The extracted record shows contradictions on the crediting period, with one document indicating 2024-12-05 to 2029-12-04 and another indicating 2014-07-22 to 2026-07-21.
- Leakage justification is not addressed in the extracted record, even though a leakage deduction is reported.
- The corrective actions note a missing SDG outcome and safeguarding principles assessment in the PoA-DD.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AMS-II.G.

- Leakage justification is not addressed in the extracted record, and reversal risk is not clearly discussed beyond the absence of reported events.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB, 4K Earth Science Private Limited, verified it. The project also reports a leakage deduction of 0.95% and no reversal events in the extracted record, which are positive signs. That said, leakage justification is not addressed, buffer pool coverage is not stated, and the reversal treatment is not clearly documented, so permanence and leakage robustness are only moderate.

### Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and the annual survey method used to monitor usage.

- The extracted record does not provide verified versus claimed emission reductions, and the crediting-period contradiction weakens reporting clarity.

The monitoring report provides the monitoring period, the VVB name, and an annual survey method for usage monitoring, which supports basic MRV transparency. However, the extracted record does not include total claimed versus verified emission reductions, and the crediting-period contradiction creates uncertainty about which project timeline is operative. Because the record is incomplete on key registry-style figures, transparency is only middling.

### Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project reports a quantified leakage deduction of 0.95% and a verified usage rate of 90.92%, which supports some conservatism in the calculations.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and the leakage rationale is not explained.

The project appears somewhat conservative because it reports a verified usage rate of 90.92% and a quantified leakage deduction of 0.95%. Still, the baseline is described as project-based, the leakage rationale is not explained, and the FNRB value of 0.82 is only modestly below the national default-style framing implied by the methodology context. These factors leave some over-crediting risk unresolved.

### Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ Twelve documents were used, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- The record contains unresolved contradictions on key fields and the corrective actions show missing safeguards-related content in the PoA-DD.

The extracted record draws on 12 documents and includes a monitoring report, stakeholder consultation material, and safeguard-related references, which is a decent documentation base. Even so, the extraction confidence is only medium, and the corrective actions show missing SDG outcome and safeguarding principles content in the PoA-DD. The contradictions on usage rate, leakage justification, benefit sharing, and crediting period further reduce documentation reliability.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed combined test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversal events, but buffer not stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Deduction reported, justification missing
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance present, SDG assessment missing
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of the contradictory crediting-period, usage-rate, and leakage entries, with document hierarchy explained.

→ Provide a complete leakage rationale, buffer-pool or reversal treatment, and the missing SDG/safeguards assessment in the project documentation.

## Documents Reviewed

- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet\_v3(24).xlsx
- T-PerfCert\_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form\_GS10898K(1).pdf
- 1.A. GS10898 - PoA TRF and KPID V03.0 04102021\_Clean.docx
- T-PreReview\_V2.2\_POA-Design-Document\_v.4\_Clean(1).pdf
- T-PreReview\_V2.2\_POA-Design-Document\_v.5\_CL.docx
- RECH\_Ex-ante ER sheet\_10911\_v.2.xlsx
- GS 10898 -Design-Consultation-Report.pdf
- GS 10898 Renewal PoA DD ver 2.0 24022022.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3749
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3749
- CCIPL 1395\_FVR [10-04-2023]-Clean(1).pdf
- CCIPL-912\_GS Renwal POA FVR TC.pdf
- (1)CC IPL 912\_FVR POA - Clean.pdf
- VPA RCP FVR - clean.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-AFBE3101 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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