

QUALITY REPORT

Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 043 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3766 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-785F36EF · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
■ Transparency (25%)	6.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ 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, a quantified leakage deduction, and no reported reversal events. However, the record has several reliability issues, including contradictions on usage monitoring, leakage justification, benefit sharing, and crediting period, which reduce confidence in the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3766
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 documents conflict on how usage was monitored, with an annual survey in the monitoring report but self-reporting in an earlier record.
- The crediting period and benefit-sharing description are inconsistent across documents, and the project has no reported buffer pool information.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under AMS-II.G Version 05.0.
- Permanence is not fully evidenced because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool share is stated.

The monitoring report states that additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project's core environmental integrity. Leakage is quantified with a 0.95% deduction, and the report lists no unresolved corrective actions, but reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available. The baseline is project-based, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2024, which helps, but permanence and long-term robustness remain only moderately supported.

Transparency — 6.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period is stated, the VVB is named, and the report includes quantified usage and leakage parameters.
- Total ER claims and verified totals are not found in the extracted record, and one key document was only medium-confidence extraction.

The record identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, the usage monitoring approach, and the quantified leakage treatment, which is helpful for traceability. At the same time, total ER claimed and verified totals are not found in the extracted record, limiting public-facing completeness. The extraction confidence is medium rather than high, so some documentation quality concerns remain.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

- + Leakage is at least quantified, with a leakage deduction of 0.95% and a stated quantified justification.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and the record contains contradictions on leakage justification and usage monitoring.

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 extreme assumptions. However, the baseline is project-specific, and the record shows contradictions on usage monitoring and leakage justification, which raises over-crediting risk. The project is not clearly shown to be CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Multiple evidence documents were used, including a monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and safeguards are explicitly mentioned.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and several important fields are missing or inconsistent across documents, including the crediting period.

The evidence base includes a monitoring report, stakeholder consultation material, and other extracted documents, and the project also reports FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing. Still, the minimum extraction confidence is medium, and several fields are missing or not stated, including buffer pool coverage and total ER figures. The crediting period also conflicts across documents, which weakens documentation reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	no buffer pool stated
● Leakage	quantified 0.95% deduction
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessed in 2024
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled monitoring package that resolves the usage-monitoring, leakage, benefit-sharing, and crediting-period contradictions.

→ Disclose verified issuance totals, buffer pool treatment, and any registry/market eligibility status to reduce double-claim and permanence uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- CCIPL 1395_FVR(19).pdf
- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet_v3(19).xlsx
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_v3_Clean(19).docx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_GS10898K(18).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-3766
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3766
- 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-785F36EF · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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