

QUALITY REPORT

GS2404 International Water Purification Programme - CPA 3 Chlorine Dispensers in Uganda

GS-652 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-FF4D8390 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.2Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.7
■ Transparency (25%)	5.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.9
■ Documentation (15%)	6.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a credible additionality case and a VVB-confirmed verification record, but several core MRV details are either missing or inconsistent across documents. The main weaknesses are the unresolved crediting-period discrepancy, unclear leakage treatment, and limited visibility into actual usage and issued/verified emission reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-652
Sector	industrial
Country	Uganda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-III.AV Version 03
Crediting Period	2012 — 2040
VVB	China Classification Society Certification Company (CCSC)
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- The crediting period differs between the verification report and the monitoring report, which raises reliability concerns about which period governs the claim.
- Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual deduction percentage is not stated in the extracted record, and usage is self-reported in the verification report.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.7 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under the Gold Standard methodology.

- Reversal risk is not addressed in the extracted record, and no buffer pool share is stated.

The verification report confirms additionality was checked by the VVB, and the project uses a combined test under AMS-III.AV Version 03, which supports the core project rationale. However, reversal events are marked as not addressed, and no buffer pool percentage is provided, so permanence is not well evidenced. Leakage is said to be quantified, but the actual deduction is not visible in the extracted record, limiting confidence in net credit integrity.

Transparency — 5.8 / 10

+ The project has a named verifier, China Classification Society Certification Company, and a defined monitoring period for 2020.

- The extracted record does not state total emission reductions claimed or verified, and the usage monitoring approach is inconsistent between documents.

The project has a named verifier, China Classification Society Certification Company, and a clear monitoring period from 2020-01-01 to 2020-12-31. Still, the extracted record does not state total emission reductions claimed or verified, which weakens traceability of the issuance claim. The monitoring approach also differs across documents: the verification report refers to self-reporting, while the monitoring report refers to an annual survey, suggesting inconsistent MRV description.

Claim Safety — 5.9 / 10

+ The baseline was reassessed in 2022, which is a positive sign for baseline freshness.

- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not mentioned, leaving some dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is moderate because the baseline was last reassessed in 2022 and the project uses a recognized methodology, but the baseline itself is project-specific rather than standardized. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-market claim risk is not fully resolved. The fnrb value of 0.82 is reported, but the contradiction with an older appendix value and the lack of a clear leakage deduction keep over-crediting risk from scoring higher.

Documentation — 6.1 / 10

+ Multiple official documents were used, including the PDD, validation report, verification report, monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation materials.

- One key extraction source was only medium confidence, and the record contains several contradictions that reduce documentation reliability.

Documentation breadth is fairly good, with evidence drawn from the appendix, PDD, validation report, verification report, monitoring report, and stakeholder consultation materials. The extraction confidence is medium, not high, and the record includes several contradictions, especially on additionality test type, usage monitoring method, fnrb method, and crediting period. The verification report also lists several CARs and CLs that were closed, which is acceptable, but it still indicates a non-trivial review burden.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	quantified but deduction not stated
● Baseline	project baseline with reassessment date
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not mentioned

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the actual leakage deduction, total emission reductions claimed and verified, and the basis for the usage monitoring approach in a single reconciled MRV summary.

→ Resolve the crediting-period and methodology-description contradictions across documents and disclose whether any buffer or reversal management applies.

Documents Reviewed

- CPA2 3 9 10_UG_MP7_ER Spreadsheet v2.xlsx
- CPA2 3 9 10_V02-Monitoring-Report_GS Performance Review_clean.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.02.2015 to 30.09.2015_v2.pdf
- GS2735_CPA2_Renewal_fNRB Calculation_20220427.xlsx
- GS3668_CPA3_Renewal_Stakeholder Consultation Report_V02_20220614.docx
- GS2404_PoA_Transition Annex_R1response.docx
- GS3668_Deviation Request Form_FINAL.pdf
- GS3668_Deviation Request Form_FINAL(1).pdf
- GS2404_IWPP_Renewal_SDG Impact Tool.xlsx
- GS3668_CPA 3_Transition Annex_R1response.docx
- GS Passport_09-27-2013.pdf
- GS Passport_14-12-2015.pdf
- GS2404_IWPP_Renewal_POA DD_V02_20220614.docx
- PDD_27-03-2015.pdf
- PDD_10-02-2012.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-652
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-652
- GS2404_GS4GG PoA RCP validation report - International Water Purification Programme_Final.pdf
- GS4GG VCR__Uganda(1).pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.02.2015 to 30.09.2015_v2.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-FF4D8390 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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