

QUALITY REPORT

Institutional Improved Cookstoves for Schools and Institutions in Uganda

GS-742 · GS · Uganda

Report ID: CM-83DFF7B6 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.0
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.5

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

Assessment Summary

Project shows some governance and procedural strengths (VVB-confirmed additionality, named VVB, FPIC and grievance mechanisms reported in recent verification), but large discrepancies in emissions reporting, missing leakage deduction percentage and limited evidence on baseline reassessment undermine confidence and increase over-crediting risk.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-742
Sector	cookstoves
Country	Uganda
Vintage	2022, 2023
Project Methodology	AMS-II.G. 12.0
Crediting Period	2022 — 2027
VVB	4K Earth Science Private. Limited
Verified ERs	1,647 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	42 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Large contradictions in reported emission reductions (total ERR claimed vs verified vary widely across documents).
- Key fields not found or not quantified: leakage deduction percentage, buffer pool percentage, baseline reassessment.
- Low extraction confidence and multiple contradictory historical verification reports reducing data reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + Additionality confirmed by the VVB in the verification report (verification report, 2022-02-16).
- No evidence of baseline reassessment and missing buffer/reversal treatment; reversal events not stated (no baseline reassessment found; buffer_pool_pct not stated).

Additionality is supported by an investment test and explicitly confirmed by the VVB in the verification report (verification report, 2022-02-16). However, the baseline is project-level and there is no record of a recent baseline reassessment (baseline reassessment not stated), buffer pool percentage is not provided, and reversal events are not documented. The absence of a leakage deduction percentage (not stated) despite a later quantified justification increases uncertainty about leakage treatment. These gaps and missing permanence safeguards limit integrity.

Transparency — 4.0 / 10

- + Named VVB (4K Earth Science Private. Limited) and recent monitoring period provided (monitoring report/verification report, 2024 and 2025).
- Major contradictions in reported emissions: claimed 29,262 tCO₂e vs other documents reporting 4,157 tCO₂e and verified figures 1,647–3,950 tCO₂e, reducing reliability (verification report 2020/2022; monitoring report 2020).

The project names the VVB (4K Earth Science Private. Limited) and provides a recent monitoring period (2024). There are 18 supporting documents and a verification report dated 2025-02-28, which is positive. However, large inconsistencies in emission reduction reporting across documents (claimed 29,262 tCO₂e in one verification report vs 4,157 tCO₂e in a monitoring report and verified figures between 1,647 and 3,950 tCO₂e in different reports) materially reduce transparency and trust in the numbers. Low extraction confidence further weakens evidence reliability.

Claim Safety — 2.8 / 10

- + Uses national-default fuel non-renewable biomass factor (fnrb value 0.82) rather than an aggressive project-only value (monitoring/verification reports).
- High over-crediting risk due to inconsistent ERR figures across documents and absence of a stated leakage deduction percentage despite a claimed quantified justification (contradictions and leakage_deduction_pct not provided).

The project uses a national-default non-renewable biomass factor (fnrb = 0.82) which is conservative relative to some project-specific assumptions. It is also not CORSIA-eligible (corsia_eligible = false), reducing double-claim risk. Nevertheless, contradictions in usage monitoring methods (annual survey vs self-report in earlier records) and mismatched ERR figures create a substantial risk of over-crediting. The leakage justification is reported as quantified in the latest verification, but the lack of an explicit leakage deduction percentage leaves the treatment of leakage unclear.

Documentation — 4.5 / 10

- + Multiple documents cited (validation, monitoring, verification; n_docs_used = 18) and recent verification dated 2025-02-28.
- ~ Extraction confidence is low (min_extraction_confidence = low) and one evidence doc is labelled unknown, which reduces confidence in the extracted records.

Documentation is extensive (18 documents, including validation, monitoring and verification reports) and the most recent verification is dated 2025-02-28. The VVB is named and material findings or corrective actions are absent in the extracted records. However, extraction confidence is flagged as low and one evidence entry is 'unknown', which reduces confidence in the completeness and accuracy of the extracted dataset.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	buffer/reversal unclear
● Leakage	justified but deduction missing
● Baseline	project baseline, no reassessment
● Safeguards	FPIC & grievance present
● Double-claim	CORSIA no, CCP status unknown

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a reconciled account of total emission reductions with an explanation for discrepancies between claimed and verified ERR across reports and an updated single authoritative figure.
- Document and publish the leakage deduction percentage, buffer/reversal provisions, and the date and outcome of any baseline reassessment; improve source data quality to address extraction-confidence issues.

Documents Reviewed

- 1. T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_11.10.2021_v05.docx
- 1. T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_13.01.23 v.07.docx
- 1. T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_11.10.2021_v07_clean.docx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_2020.docx
- 02_Simoshi CER calculation_ver 04_12042022.xlsx
- 430_V1.0_IQ_SDG-Impact-Tool_24.03.23.xlsx
- _GS4364 GS4GG Performance Review MP3 Final round-22032022.docx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_01.01.24 to 31.12.24.pdf
- 02_Simoshi CER calculation_ver 04_15062022.xlsx
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_2020_updated.docx
- T-V5.0-Deviation-Request-Form.pdf
- 1. T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_30.12.24 v.04.docx
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.06.2019 to 31.03.2020_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.03.2017 to 31.05.2019_v3.pdf
- 1. T-PerfCert_V1.1-Monitoring-Report_20.12.23 v.02_clean.pdf
- T-PerfCert_V2.0-Project-Annual-Report-Form_01.01.23 to 31.12.23.pdf
- T-PreReview_V1.2-Project-Design-Document_12.04.22_clean.docx
- T-PreReview_V1.2-Project-Design-Document_16.08.22.docx
- registry_page_14.txt
- GS Passport_17.11.2016_v1.pdf
- 430_V1.0_IQ_SDG-Impact-Tool_12.04.22.xlsx
- registry_page_13.txt
- T-V4.0-Deviation-Request-Form_17.03.2022.pdf
- fNRB calculation with tool 20220401.xlsx
- T-PreReview_V1.0-Transition-request-form-project_11.03.22.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-742
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-742
- T-VVB_V.1.0-Audit-Techniques.xlsx
- CCIPL 1239_GS RCP_FVR ver 1.0 clean.pdf
- 2. Simoshi_VER Calculation_verification 6_01.01.24 to 31.12.24 v04.xlsx
- Validation Report_04.12.2015_v2.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01.06.2019 to 19.03.2020_v2.pdf
- GS4364 - GS Verification Report_Clean.pdf
- GS Verification Report_Simoshi-Final_Clean.pdf
- 2. Simoshi_VER Calculation_verification 01.10.21 to 28.02.22 v.03.xlsx
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_01.03.2017 to 31.05.2019_v3.pdf
- 2. Simoshi_VER Calculation_verification 5_01.01.23 to 31.12.23 v03.xlsx
- 2. Simoshi_VER Calculation_verification 3 v.04.xlsx
- CCIPL 1239_GS RCP_FVR_Clean.pdf
- GS Verification Report_Simoshi-Clean(4).pdf
- GS Verification Report_Simoshi-Clean_02.05.23.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-83DFF7B6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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