

QUALITY REPORT

Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 026 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3750 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-14E7A3CB · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

This is a moderately documented cookstove project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and no reported reversal events in the extracted record. However, the evidence set has reliability issues: several key items are contradicted across documents, the usage monitoring approach changed, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not mentioned, which keeps claim safety below strong levels.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3750
Sector	industrial
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G Version 05.0
Crediting Period	2024 — 2029
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2021
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- Contradictory records on usage rate, leakage treatment, benefit sharing, and crediting period reduce confidence in the extracted facts.
- The project is CORSIA-eligible and CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-claim risk is not fully resolved from the available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

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

- Reversal risk is not clearly managed in the extracted record: reversal events are noted as not addressed and no buffer pool share is stated.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB verified it, which is a meaningful positive for integrity. The project also reports a quantified leakage deduction of 0.95% and no reversal events are described, but reversal handling is not clearly addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available. The baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, which is acceptable but less robust than a recent jurisdictional baseline.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring report identifies the verifier, the monitoring period, and a quantified leakage deduction of 0.95%.

- Key disclosure fields are missing or inconsistent, including total ERs claimed versus verified and the monitoring method, which is contradicted by later records.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report names the verifier, gives the monitoring period, and provides a leakage deduction figure. However, total ERs claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring method is inconsistent across documents, with the monitoring report showing self-report while later material refers to an annual survey. That inconsistency reduces confidence in the public-facing MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The baseline was reassessed in 2025 and the project applies a quantified leakage deduction, which supports claim robustness.

- Usage monitoring is inconsistent across documents, and the project is CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not mentioned, leaving some double-claim uncertainty.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage deduction and the 2025 baseline reassessment, which suggest some effort to keep the accounting current. Still, the usage-rate evidence is inconsistent across documents, and the project is marked CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not mentioned, so the dual-claim picture is incomplete. The project therefore looks usable but not especially low-risk for conservative claims.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Multiple evidence documents were used, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and the extraction confidence is not low.

- Several material items are contradicted across documents, including the crediting period and leakage justification, which weakens documentation reliability.

Documentation is fair rather than strong: there are multiple source types, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low. At the same time, several important items are contradicted, including the crediting period, leakage justification, benefit sharing, and usage monitoring method. Those contradictions reduce reliability even though the file set is not sparse.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Quantified 0.95% deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessed in 2025
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled monitoring and verification summary that resolves the contradictions on usage rate, leakage justification, benefit sharing, and crediting period.

→ Disclose verified ER totals, buffer pool treatment or equivalent permanence safeguards, and explicit CCP/CORSIA claim status in a single current registry-facing document.

Documents Reviewed

- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_v3_Clean(2).docx
- CCIPL 1395_FVR(2).pdf
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_GS10898K(2).pdf
- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet_v3(2).xlsx
- 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-3750
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3750
- 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-14E7A3CB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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