

QUALITY REPORT

GS1247 VPA 109 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Kayonza District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1388 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-3E0E02CA · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive safeguards and a quantified leakage treatment, but the record is thin on core carbon-accounting details such as the baseline method and additionality test. The monitoring report also contains contradictions on usage rate and crediting period, which reduces confidence in the reliability of the claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1388
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC v.1
Crediting Period	2015 — 2024
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- No baseline method or additionality test is stated in the extracted documents.
- The monitoring report and PDD disagree on both the verified usage rate and the crediting period.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report states leakage is deemed negligible, which avoids an explicit leakage deduction issue.
- No additionality test or VVB confirmation is found in the extracted record, and the baseline method is not stated.

The monitoring report says leakage is deemed negligible, which is a positive sign, and it also records a verified usage rate from an annual survey. However, no additionality test is identified and the baseline method is not stated in the extracted documents, so the core robustness of the carbon accounting is only partially evidenced.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period and a quantified usage survey result.
- Key registry and accounting fields are missing, including verified and claimed emission reductions, baseline reassessment, and VVB identity.

The monitoring report gives a clear monitoring window and a quantified survey-based usage estimate, which helps traceability. At the same time, the record does not provide verified or claimed emission reduction totals, the VVB name, or a baseline reassessment date, leaving important parts of the public accounting trail incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + The project uses a national default for the non-renewable biomass fraction, which is more defensible than an unstated assumption.
- The verified usage rate of 90% conflicts with an earlier 100% figure, and the crediting period also conflicts between documents.

The use of a national default for the non-renewable biomass fraction is a modest positive for claim defensibility, and the project is not shown to have any reversal events. But the verified usage rate of 90% conflicts with a prior 100% figure in another monitoring document, and the crediting period also differs from the PDD; I privileged the later monitoring report because it is more recent and should reflect the latest verified status.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Two official document types are available, and extraction confidence is high.
- The extracted record lacks several core methodological details, and the monitoring report is the only dated source provided here.

Two official document types are present, and extraction confidence is high, which supports moderate documentation quality. Still, the extracted record omits several key items such as the baseline method, additionality test, buffer pool, and VVB identity, so the documentation remains incomplete for a full-quality assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage deemed negligible
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the baseline methodology, additionality test, and VVB verification details in a complete monitoring package.

→ Resolve the discrepancies between the monitoring report and PDD on usage rate and crediting period, and publish the verified emission reduction totals.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_01.10.2018 to 30.09.2019_v6.pdf
- Monitoring Report_4th monitoring period_01.10.2019 to 30.09.2020_v5.pdf
- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_19.08.2016 to 30.09.2017_v1.pdf
- PDD_17.09.2018_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1388
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1388

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-3E0E02CA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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