

QUALITY REPORT

Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 037 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3761 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-1C224442 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.9Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.4
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a reasonably documented cookstove project with VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and no reported reversal events, but several key items are either missing or inconsistent across documents. The main caution is reliability: the record contains contradictions on usage monitoring, leakage treatment, benefit sharing, and crediting period, which weakens confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3761
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	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- The record contains multiple contradictions, including different values for usage monitoring, leakage treatment, benefit sharing, and the crediting period.
- No buffer pool percentage is stated, and reversal risk is marked as not addressed in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses the AMS-II.G methodology with a combined additionality test.
- Leakage is only partly supported by the record: a 0.95% deduction is stated, but the contradiction log also shows a later source saying leakage was not addressed.

The project has some solid integrity signals: the VVB confirmed additionality, the methodology is identified as AMS-II.G Version 05.0, and the monitoring record states a quantified leakage deduction of 0.95%. However, reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record, no buffer pool percentage is stated, and the contradiction log shows a later source saying leakage was not addressed, so the integrity score is held below strong-project territory.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is stated for 2022, and the project identifies the VVB as 4K Earth Science Private Limited.
- Total ER claims and verified totals are not found in the extracted record, and the usage monitoring approach is inconsistent across documents.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period is stated and the VVB is named, but key registry-style figures such as total ERs claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record. The usage monitoring method is also inconsistent: one document supports an annual survey, while another later source refers to self-reporting, which reduces clarity and confidence in the MRV trail.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

- + The verified usage rate is very close to the assumed usage rate, which reduces but does not eliminate over-crediting concern.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, and the record shows a contradiction on leakage justification that weakens claim reliability.

Claim safety is middling. The verified usage rate of 90.92% is close to the assumed 90%, which is reassuring, and the project applies a small quantified leakage deduction. Still, the baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and the contradiction on leakage justification means the risk of over-crediting cannot be dismissed.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + Sixteen documents were used, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism are mentioned.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the record contains several unresolved contradictions, including the crediting period and benefit-sharing description.

Documentation is fair but not strong. Sixteen documents were used, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and the record mentions FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing. Even so, extraction confidence is only medium, and the contradiction log shows conflicting statements on the crediting period, benefit sharing, usage monitoring, and leakage treatment, which lowers documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No buffer stated; reversal risk unclear
● Leakage	Quantified deduction, but contradictory treatment
● 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 monitoring and verification pack that resolves the contradictions on usage monitoring, leakage treatment, benefit sharing, and the crediting period.

→ State the buffer pool treatment, reversal handling, and complete ER issuance/verification totals in a single public registry-linked document.

Documents Reviewed

- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_GS10898K(13).pdf
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_v3_Clean(13).docx
- CCIPL 1395_FVR(13).pdf
- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet_v3(13).xlsx
- 1.A. GS10898 - PoA TRF and KPID V03.0 04102021_Clean.docx
- ER Sheet 24 to 45(14).xlsx
- T-PreReview_V2.2_POA-Design-Documents_v.4_Clean(1).pdf
- T-PreReview_V2.2_POA-Design-Documents_v.5_CL.docx
- GS11526 - CDM 9956 VPA 037 TRF_Clean(2).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-3761
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3761
- CCIPL-912_GS Renewal POA FVR TC.pdf
- (1)CC IPL 912_FVR POA - Clean.pdf
- CCIPL 912_FVR_VPA (1-23) - 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-1C224442 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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