

QUALITY REPORT

ASYV 8.5MW Solar PV Project (CPA-001)

GS-1342 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-2A62C1A3 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	6.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a stated leakage deduction of 0%, and no reported reversal events. However, the record also shows a project-specific baseline, unresolved reversal treatment, and several verification findings that were only closed out after corrective actions. Overall confidence is moderate because the documents contain contradictions on credited emissions, leakage treatment, and crediting period dates.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1342
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	AMS-I.D 18.0
Crediting Period	2015 — 2022
VVB	AENOR INTERNACIONAL S.A.U
Verified ERs	20,035 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	18 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

Red Flags

- Credited emissions differ materially between documents, with the verification record showing 20,035 verified versus 15,253 claimed.
- Reversal risk is not clearly addressed and the buffer pool percentage is not stated.
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, with one report calling it negligible and another not addressing it.
- The project is listed under CDM in the extracted record, while CORSIA and CCP status are not stated, leaving dual-claim risk unclear.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which is stronger than an unverified project assertion.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recently reassessed standardized baseline, and reversal events are not addressed.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and shows no reversal events reported, which supports the project's core environmental case. At the same time, the baseline is project-specific, the buffer pool share is not stated, and reversal treatment is marked as not addressed, which weakens permanence and baseline robustness. The verification report also lists multiple corrective actions and clarifications, suggesting the project required substantive documentation fixes before approval.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, and verified versus claimed emissions are available in the extracted record.
- Several key transparency fields are missing, including the usage monitoring method, FNRB method, and CORSIA status.

The record includes a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and both claimed and verified emissions totals, which helps traceability. However, the usage monitoring method, FNRB method, and several other operational details are not found in the extracted documents. Because the documentation is incomplete on these points, transparency is only moderate rather than strong.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + Leakage was assigned a 0% deduction with a justification that it was deemed negligible in the verification report.
- The emissions figures are inconsistent across documents, and the project's registry and eligibility status do not clearly rule out dual-claim risk.

Claim safety is weakened by the material gap between claimed and verified emissions, with the verification report showing 20,035 verified against 15,253 claimed. Leakage is treated as negligible with a 0% deduction in the verification report, but a later monitoring report is cited in the contradictions as not addressing leakage, so I privilege the verification report because it is the higher-assurance assurance document. CORSIA and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out.

Documentation — 6.0 / 10

- + Sixteen documents were used and the extraction confidence is high, which supports the reliability of the record.
- The verification report contains multiple corrective actions and clarifications, indicating the documentation was not fully complete at first pass.

Documentation breadth is fairly good, with multiple official document types listed and sixteen documents used in extraction. The extraction confidence is high, which reduces concern about unreadable source material. Still, the verification report records several corrective action requests and clarifications, showing that the file required cleanup and that some elements were not fully documented at first.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal treatment stated
● Leakage	0% deduction, later inconsistency
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation of claimed versus verified emissions and explain the source of the discrepancy.

→ Provide explicit reversal, buffer pool, and leakage treatment details in the latest monitoring documentation, along with CORSIA and CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01-03-2017 to 31-08-2018_v1.pdf
- (1)10202_PoA MR v5.0_clean.pdf
- 2021 08 18 GWG GS MR 3rd Issuance v3.0.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_23-10-2015 to 25-02-2017_v05.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_23-10-2015 to 25-02-2017_v03.pdf
- 2021 08 18 GWG GS MR 3rd Issuance v4.0_final.pdf
- GWG_LSC_REPORT-_revision_2(clean).pdf
- 2019_01_GS3606_Transition-Annex_GwG_CPA_Ver_3.pdf
- GS Passport_14-10-2016.pdf
- PDD_08-10-2015.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1342
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1342
- (1)FVR_Gigawatt PoA 10202_v2.0_clean.pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_23-10-2015 to 25-02-2017_v05.pdf
- Verification Report_2nd monitoring period_01-03-2017 to 31-08-2018_v2.pdf
- Final FVerR-GS PoA10202-22-12-2021(1).pdf
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_23-10-2015 to 25-02-2017_v04.pdf
- Validation Report_20-10-2016.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-2A62C1A3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13

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