

QUALITY REPORT

GS1247 VPA 153 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Gatsibo District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1445 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-B65D2E7B · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2Overall Score
out of 10

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| ■ Integrity (35%) | 5.6 |
| ■ Transparency (25%) | 4.8 |
| ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 5.2 |
| ■ Documentation (15%) | 5.0 |

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive safeguards and monitoring evidence, including FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and no reversal events reported in the monitoring period. However, key core items such as the baseline method, additionality test, and VVB identity are not stated in the extracted record, which limits confidence in the crediting claim.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Registry | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | GS-1445 |
| 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

- No baseline method or additionality test is stated in the extracted documents.
- The crediting period differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, creating a documentation reliability issue.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + The monitoring report states no reversal events were reported during the 2019-02-06 to 2020-02-05 period.
- The baseline method and additionality test are not found in the extracted record, and no VVB-confirmed additionality is stated.

The monitoring report dated 2020-06-16 reports no reversal events during the monitoring period, which supports permanence for this avoidance-style project. But the extracted record does not state the baseline method, the additionality test type, or any VVB confirmation of additionality, so the integrity case is only moderate. Leakage is described as quantified, but the actual deduction percentage is not available in the extracted facts.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period and a quantified usage survey approach.
- Total verified emissions reductions and total claimed emissions reductions are not stated, and the VVB name is not found.

Transparency is limited by missing core reporting details: the VVB name is not found, and total claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated. On the positive side, the monitoring report gives a clear monitoring period and uses an annual survey for usage monitoring, which improves traceability. The absence of the actual emissions figures keeps the disclosure quality below strong-project standards.

Claim Safety — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report reports a quantified leakage treatment and a verified usage rate of 100% against an assumed 80% rate.
- The project is not shown to be CORSIA-ineligible, and CCP status is not mentioned, leaving dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is mixed. The monitoring report shows a verified usage rate of 100% versus an assumed 80%, which is favorable, and it also indicates quantified leakage treatment. However, the baseline method is not stated, and the record does not show CORSIA ineligibility or CCP approval status, so dual-claim and over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out confidently.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + Two core document types are available, and extraction confidence is high.
- The PDD and monitoring report disagree on the crediting period, and several key fields are not stated in available documents.

Documentation quality is moderate because two official document types are present and extraction confidence is high. Still, several important fields are missing from the extracted record, including the baseline method, additionality test, VVB name, and emissions totals. The crediting period also differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, and I privilege the more recent monitoring report for the period statement because it is later and operationally current.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ● Additionality | No additionality test stated |
| ● Permanence | No reversals reported |
| ● Leakage | Quantified but deduction not stated |
| ● Baseline | Baseline method not stated |
| ● Safeguards | FPIC and grievance mechanism present |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the baseline method, additionality test evidence, and VVB confirmation in a single reconciled project dossier.

→ Publish verified emissions totals, leakage deduction percentage, and a reconciled crediting period across the PDD and monitoring report.

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-1445
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1445

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-B65D2E7B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy