

QUALITY REPORT

GS1247 VPA 157 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Kayonza District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1443 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-46AE96F0 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
■ Documentation (15%)	5.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including a stated project baseline, a grievance mechanism, and a monitoring method based on annual surveys. However, key robustness items are missing or weakly documented, including no verified additionality test, no leakage deduction, no buffer pool information, and reversal risk not addressed. The record also contains contradictions on usage rate and crediting period, which reduce confidence in the reported figures.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1443
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC v.1 Version 1
Crediting Period	2015 — 2022
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- No additionality test or VVB confirmation is stated in the extracted record.
- Leakage is described as negligible, but no quantified deduction is provided and reversal risk is not addressed.
- The monitoring report and PDD disagree on both the usage rate and the crediting period, creating reliability concerns.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report describes leakage as negligible and reports no material findings or corrective actions required.
- Additionality is not shown to be verified by the VVB, and reversal events are marked as not addressed.

The project has some integrity support from the monitoring report, which states leakage is deemed negligible and reports no material findings or corrective actions required. But additionality is not confirmed by a VVB in the extracted record, and reversal risk is explicitly not addressed, which weakens permanence and overall robustness. The use of a project baseline helps somewhat, but the absence of a reassessment date leaves baseline quality only partially supported.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The record includes a defined monitoring period and an annual survey approach for usage monitoring.
- The VVB name, total verified emissions reductions, and total claimed emissions reductions are not found in the extracted documents.

Transparency is moderate because the monitoring period is clearly stated and usage monitoring is described as an annual survey. However, the extracted documents do not provide the VVB name, and neither total verified nor total claimed emissions reductions are available. That limits public traceability and makes it harder to check the reported outcomes against registry-level evidence.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline and reports a high verified usage rate of 90% in the monitoring report.
- The assumed usage rate was 100% in one record but 90% in another, and the crediting period also conflicts between documents.

Claim safety is weakened by missing or incomplete evidence on additionality, leakage quantification, and permanence. The monitoring report gives a verified usage rate of 90%, but the contradiction list shows an earlier 100% value in another monitoring report, which raises over-crediting concerns. The project is not shown to be CCP-approved or CORSIA-eligible in the extracted record, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available evidence.

Documentation — 5.2 / 10

- + Two core document types were used, and extraction confidence is high.
- Several important fields are not stated, including the VVB name, additionality verification, and buffer pool percentage.

Documentation quality is fair but incomplete. Only the PDD and monitoring report are listed as evidence documents, and while extraction confidence is high, several key fields remain unstated, including the VVB name, buffer pool percentage, and additionality verification. The crediting period also conflicts with the PDD, which suggests the documentation set is not fully consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No verified additionality evidence
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Negligible but unquantified
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	Partial safeguards documented
● Double-claim	Eligibility status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a VVB-verified additionality assessment and a clear explanation of the baseline method and any reassessment schedule.

→ Quantify leakage treatment, document permanence safeguards such as buffer pool coverage or reversal management, and reconcile the conflicting usage-rate and crediting-period records.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_01.10.2017 to 30.09.2018_v5.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_01.10.2018 to 30.09.2019_v2.pdf
- PDD 17.09.2018_v1.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1443
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1443
- Kayonza_MP4_MR_v5 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-46AE96F0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy