

QUALITY REPORT

Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 034 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3758 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-305ADE2C · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.9
■ Claim Safety (25%)	6.1
■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

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

Assessment Summary

This is a moderately credible cookstove project with VVB-confirmed additionality, quantified leakage, and no unresolved material findings in the monitoring report. However, several key items are either missing or contradictory across documents, including the crediting period, usage monitoring approach, and the FNRB method, which weakens confidence in the documentation and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3758
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

- The crediting period is contradictory across documents, and the more recent value was privileged, which raises reliability concerns.
- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be fully ruled out from the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AMS-II.G.
- Reversal risk is not clearly addressed: reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found in the extracted record.

The project scores reasonably well on integrity because the monitoring report confirms additionality through a combined test and the VVB is named as 4K Earth Science Private Limited. Leakage is not ignored: the report states a quantified deduction of 0.95%, and there are no unresolved material findings because all listed CARs and CLs were closed successfully. The main weakness is permanence: reversal events are marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.9 / 10

- + The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and a quantified usage rate based on an annual survey.
- Total ERs claimed and verified are not stated, and the record contains contradictions on the usage monitoring method and FNRB approach.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring report provides a clear monitoring period, a named verifier, and a usage rate derived from an annual survey. At the same time, total emissions reductions claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, which limits public comparability. The record also contains contradictions on the usage monitoring method and the FNRB approach, which reduces confidence in the consistency of the reporting.

Claim Safety — 6.1 / 10

- + Leakage is quantified with a 0.95% deduction, which is better than an unaddressed or zero-deduction case.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized or recently reassessed, and the record does not provide CORSIA or CCP status.

Claim safety is acceptable but not strong. The quantified leakage deduction supports a more conservative crediting approach, and the verified usage rate is high at 90.92%, which helps reduce over-crediting concerns. However, the baseline remains project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and the extracted record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, leaving some dual-claim and market-claim uncertainty.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

- + The record includes multiple document types, a named VVB, and a medium extraction confidence rather than low.
- Several fields remain missing or only partially specified, and the crediting period contradiction reduces confidence in the completeness of the documentation.

Documentation quality is middling: the extracted record includes a monitoring report, stakeholder consultation material, and a named VVB, with medium extraction confidence. The project also has a recent monitoring period and a later baseline reassessment year of 2025, but the record does not provide all key quantitative fields. The contradiction on the crediting period is especially important, and I privileged the more recent value because it appears in the later-dated extraction, but that still signals a reliability issue.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	quantified 0.95% deduction
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions statement with total credits claimed and verified, plus a clear explanation of which document controls for each conflicting field.

→ Provide explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, buffer pool treatment, and reversal handling, supported by the latest verification or registry documentation.

Documents Reviewed

- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet_v3(10).xlsx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_GS10898K(10).pdf
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_v3_Clean(10).docx
- CCIPL 1395_FVR(10).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-3758
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3758
- 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-305ADE2C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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