

## QUALITY REPORT

# GS1247 VPA 152 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Gatsibo District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1444 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-CF129841 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.8**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including no material findings in the monitoring report and no reported reversals during the monitoring period. However, key robustness details are missing or only partially documented, especially around additionality testing, leakage treatment, and third-party verification specifics, which limits confidence in the claimed climate benefits.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1444
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC v.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

## Red Flags

- Additionality is not clearly evidenced in the extracted record, and the VVB confirmation is not stated.
- Leakage deduction is not quantified in the available facts, even though leakage is marked as quantified.
- The crediting period and reversal treatment differ between documents, which reduces reliability.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ The monitoring report states no temporary deviations, no permanent changes, and no reported reversal events during the monitoring period.

- Additionality testing is not stated in the extracted record, and VVB confirmation of additionality is also not found.

The monitoring report states that no temporary deviations occurred, no corrections to project information or fixed parameters were applied, and no permanent changes were made during the monitoring period. It also reports no reversal events, which is positive for permanence, but the extracted record does not state the additionality test type or whether the VVB explicitly confirmed additionality. Leakage treatment is not clearly quantified in the facts provided, so the overall integrity case remains only moderate.

### Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring report is dated 2020-06-16 and covers a defined monitoring period from 2019-02-06 to 2020-02-05.

- The VVB name, claimed versus verified emission reductions, and registry-level completeness details are not found in the available documents.

The monitoring report is dated 2020-06-16 and covers 2019-02-06 to 2020-02-05, which gives some temporal clarity. However, the VVB name is not found, and the extracted record does not provide claimed versus verified emission reduction totals, limiting public traceability and auditability. The registry is identified as Gold Standard, but the available facts do not show a complete emissions accounting trail.

### Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report shows a verified usage rate of 100% against an assumed 80%, which suggests the project monitored actual use rather than relying only on assumptions.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and the leakage deduction is not quantified in the extracted facts despite leakage being described as quantified.

The project uses a project-specific baseline, and the baseline reassessment timing is not stated, which weakens confidence in over-crediting controls. On the positive side, the monitoring report shows a verified usage rate of 100% compared with an assumed 80%, suggesting the project measured actual behavior rather than relying only on conservative assumptions. Still, the leakage deduction is not quantified in the extracted facts, so claim safety is only moderate.

### Documentation — 5.6 / 10

+ Two official document types were used, and the monitoring report reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.

- Key fields remain missing, including the VVB name, additionality verification, and several quantitative claim checks; one key document was also not fully readable in the extracted record context.

The evidence set includes a PDD and a monitoring report, and the monitoring report reports no material findings and no corrective actions required. Even so, several important fields are missing, including the VVB name, additionality verification, and quantitative claim reconciliation values. The extraction confidence is high, but the underlying documentation remains incomplete for a stronger score.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality evidence found
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversals reported
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage not clearly quantified
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment unclear
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Partial safeguards documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the VVB statement and the underlying additionality test results, including the test type and conclusion.

→ Disclose quantified leakage treatment, claimed versus verified emission reductions, and a clear reconciliation of the crediting-period discrepancy across documents.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_2nd monitoring period\_06.02.2019 to 05.02.2020\_v6.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_06.02.2017 to 05.02.2019\_v1.pdf
- PDD 19.09.2018\_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1444
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1444

### 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-CF129841 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)