

QUALITY REPORT

Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 036 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3760 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-270FFC43 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	7.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably documented cookstove project with VVB-confirmed additionality, quantified leakage, and no reported reversal events. However, the record has several reliability issues, including contradictions on usage monitoring, leakage treatment, benefit sharing, and crediting period, which reduce confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3760
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	15 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- Contradictions in the record on usage monitoring method, leakage justification, benefit sharing, and crediting period reduce data reliability.
- No buffer pool percentage is stated, and reversal events are marked as not addressed rather than clearly ruled out.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 7.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AMS-II.G Version 05.0.
- Reversal risk is not cleanly resolved: reversal events are marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is stated.

The monitoring report shows a combined additionality test and states that additionality was verified by the VVB, which supports the project's core integrity case. Leakage is quantified at 0.95%, but reversal handling is weak because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is stated. The baseline is project-based rather than jurisdictional, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2025, which helps, but the overall permanence and baseline robustness remain only moderate.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the 2022 monitoring period, and an annual survey approach for usage monitoring.
- There are contradictions on usage monitoring and leakage treatment, and no verified versus claimed ER totals are available in the extracted record.

The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the 2022 monitoring period, and annual survey-based usage monitoring, which is a positive transparency signal. At the same time, the extracted record does not provide claimed versus verified ER totals, and the contradiction on usage monitoring method versus an earlier self-report approach creates uncertainty about consistency. The absence of a stated CORSIA status and the lack of a clear registry completeness signal also limit transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

- + Leakage is at least quantified, with a leakage deduction of 0.95% and a stated justification.
- The project relies on a project-specific baseline, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval, leaving residual claim-risk uncertainty.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage deduction and the verified usage rate of 90.92%, which suggests the project is not relying on implausibly high usage assumptions. However, the baseline remains project-specific, and the record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP approval, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted facts alone. The contradictions around leakage justification and usage monitoring method further weaken confidence that the credited reductions are fully robust.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + The extracted record draws on 13 documents, including the monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and includes safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several key fields are contradicted across documents, including the crediting period and benefit-sharing description.

Documentation is fairly solid, with 13 documents used, including the monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and the record shows FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing being described. Still, extraction confidence is only medium, and the record contains multiple contradictions, including the crediting period and benefit-sharing description. The presence of many resolved CARs and CLs indicates scrutiny, but it also shows the project required substantial clarification.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No buffer stated; reversal handling unclear
● Leakage	Quantified leakage deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessed later
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of the contradictory usage monitoring, leakage, benefit-sharing, and crediting-period entries, with the most authoritative document cited for each.

→ State the buffer pool treatment, reversal risk handling, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status in the public record.

Documents Reviewed

- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet_v3(12).xlsx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_GS10898K(12).pdf
- CCIPL 1395_FVR(12).pdf
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_v3_Clean(12).docx
- 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-3760
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3760
- 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-270FFC43 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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