

QUALITY REPORT

Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 031 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3755 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-78E9BC9D · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, leakage was quantified, and no unresolved material findings are shown in the extracted record. However, the record also shows important evidence gaps around permanence, registry/claim status, and the exact treatment of some monitoring inputs, which keeps confidence moderate rather than strong.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3755
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

- Permanence is not clearly addressed: reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available.
- Claim-safety information is incomplete because CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, and the registry record does not show verified ERR totals in the extracted facts.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AMS-II.G.
- Permanence is weakly documented: reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool share is available.

The project scores moderately well on integrity because the VVB confirmed additionality and the methodology is identified as AMS-II.G, with a quantified leakage deduction of 0.95% in the monitoring report. That said, permanence is not robustly evidenced: reversal events are marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is available in the extracted record. The baseline is project-based rather than a clearly standardized jurisdictional baseline, which is acceptable but not especially strong.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and an annual survey-based usage monitoring approach.
- Verified versus claimed emission reduction totals are not available in the extracted record, limiting public MRV traceability.

Transparency is middling because the monitoring report names the VVB, gives a clear monitoring period, and states annual survey-based usage monitoring. However, the extracted facts do not provide verified and claimed ERR totals, and the registry/claim picture is incomplete because CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is only noted as not mentioned. The absence of these figures limits the ability to independently reconcile issuance and claims.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

- + Leakage was quantified with a 0.95% deduction, which is better than an unquantified or ignored leakage treatment.
- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted facts.

Claim safety is moderate but not high. The quantified leakage deduction supports better over-crediting control, and the verified usage rate of 90.92% is close to the assumed 90%, which reduces concern about a major usage assumption gap. Still, the project-specific baseline and the missing CORSIA/CCP status leave residual greenwashing and double-claim risk unresolved.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

- + Thirteen documents were used, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low.
- The record contains several contradictions across documents, including differing views on usage monitoring, leakage treatment, and crediting period timing.

Documentation quality is fair: the extracted record draws on 13 documents, includes a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and extraction confidence is medium. The project also shows a long list of resolved CARs/CLs, which is helpful, but the record still lacks some key values such as buffer pool coverage and verified versus claimed ERR totals. The contradictions in the merged facts reduce confidence in the completeness and consistency of the documentation set.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No buffer pool shown; reversals not addressed
● Leakage	Quantified leakage deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline; reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards noted
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled registry record showing verified and claimed ERR totals, CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and the final crediting-period history.

→ Document permanence and leakage controls more fully, including buffer pool treatment, reversal monitoring, and the basis for the final leakage deduction.

Documents Reviewed

- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet_v3(7).xlsx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_GS10898K(7).pdf
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_v3_Clean(7).docx
- CCIPL 1395_FVR(7).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-3755
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3755
- CCIPL-912_GS Renewal 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-78E9BC9D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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