QUALITY REPORT

Up Energy Improved Cookstoves Programme, Uganda – CPA No 045 supported by Republic of Korea

GS-3768 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-F09A27EB · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.1 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.4
	Transparency (25%)	5.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	6.1
	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, but it still has meaningful evidence gaps. The main weaknesses are the project-specific baseline, missing buffer pool information, and contradictions around usage monitoring, leakage treatment, and crediting period that reduce confidence in the record.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3768
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

■ The project uses a project-specific baseline and the last reassessment timing is only partially clear, which weakens baseline robustness.

■ There are contradictions in usage monitoring method, leakage justification, and crediting period across documents, which lowers reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the core eligibility case.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and buffer pool coverage is not stated.

The monitoring report confirms additionality was verified by the VVB, which is a strong positive for integrity. Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0.95%, and no reversal events are reported, but reversal handling is still described as not addressed in the extracted record. The baseline is project-specific, and the last reassessment is only partially evidenced as 2024, so baseline robustness is acceptable but not strong.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and a quantified usage rate from annual survey monitoring.

- Total emissions reductions claimed versus verified are not stated, and the record contains method contradictions that reduce clarity.

The monitoring report names 4K Earth Science Private Limited as the VVB and covers the 2022 monitoring period, with annual survey-based usage monitoring and a verified usage rate of 90.92%. However, total emissions reductions claimed and verified are not stated in the available documents, which limits public traceability. The record is also weakened by contradictions in the monitoring method and other fields, so transparency is moderate rather than high.

Claim Safety — 6.1 / 10

+ Leakage is quantified with a 0.95% deduction, which is better than leaving leakage unaddressed.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which increases dual-claim exposure, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage deduction and by the fact that the verified usage rate is close to the assumed 90% value, reducing obvious over-crediting risk. On the other hand, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible, which raises dual-market claim exposure, and the crediting period is inconsistent across documents. The use of a project-specific baseline and only partially clear reassessment timing also leave some room for conservative skepticism.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

+ Multiple documents were used, including the monitoring report and stakeholder consultation material, and extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- Several key fields are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage and total verified emissions reductions.

Documentation is fairly complete, with 13 documents used, a named VVB, a monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation evidence. The extraction confidence is medium, not low, so readability was acceptable overall. Still, several important items are not stated in available documents, including buffer pool coverage and total verified emissions reductions, and the record contains multiple contradictions that reduce documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	No reversal events, but buffer not stated
Leakage	Quantified leakage deduction
Baseline	Project-specific baseline
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible status

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a reconciled emissions statement showing total claimed versus verified reductions, with a clear explanation of any differences.

→ Clarify the conflicting monitoring, leakage, and crediting-period entries in a single updated verification package and state buffer pool treatment explicitly.

Documents Reviewed

- CCIPL 1395_FVR(21).pdf
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_GS10898K(20).pdf
- T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_v3_Clean(21).docx
- GS VPAs 10898 MP1 ER Sheet_v3(21).xlsx
- 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-3768
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3768
- CCIPL-912_GS Renwal POA FVR TC.pdf
- (1)CCIPL 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-F09A27EB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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