

QUALITY REPORT

GS1247 VPA 154 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Gatsibo District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1446 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-4F778B23 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.5

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.6
■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.4
■ Documentation (15%)	5.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive safeguards and monitoring features, including annual usage surveys, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism. However, key robustness items are missing or weakly documented, including the additionality test, VVB confirmation, buffer pool coverage, and reversal treatment, which limits confidence in the crediting claims.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1446
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC v.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	5 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- No additionality test type or VVB confirmation was found in the extracted record.
- The crediting period differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, which raises a document consistency concern.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.6 / 10

- + The monitoring report states a quantified leakage deduction of 0% and says leakage is quantified.
- Additionality evidence is not stated in the available documents, and reversal events are noted as not addressed.

The monitoring report shows a quantified leakage deduction of 0% and indicates leakage was addressed, which is a positive sign. But the extracted record does not state the additionality test type or any VVB confirmation of additionality, and reversal events are marked as not addressed. The absence of buffer pool information further weakens permanence confidence.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report provides a defined monitoring period and describes annual survey-based usage monitoring.
- No VVB name, claimed-versus-verified ERR figures, or registry completeness details were found in the extracted record.

Transparency is mixed because the monitoring report gives a clear monitoring period and uses annual survey-based monitoring for usage. However, the extracted record does not provide the VVB name, any claimed-versus-verified ERR comparison, or registry completeness details. That leaves important public-facing verification information missing.

Claim Safety — 4.4 / 10

- + Usage was verified at 100% against an assumed 80% rate, which supports the monitored parameter.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and the crediting period inconsistency weakens confidence in the claim.

Claim safety is moderate at best. The verified usage rate is 1 versus an assumed 0.8, which supports the monitored parameter, and the project reports a quantified leakage treatment. Still, the baseline is project-specific, and the crediting period inconsistency between the monitoring report and the PDD creates some over-crediting and reliability risk.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Two official document types were used, and extraction confidence is high.
- The record lacks several core fields, including the VVB name, buffer pool percentage, and additionality test details.

Documentation quality is fair because two official document types were used and extraction confidence is high. Even so, several key fields are missing, including the VVB name, buffer pool percentage, and additionality test details. The project also has a crediting-period contradiction between the monitoring report and the PDD, which reduces confidence in the record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage quantified at 0%
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the VVB verification statement for additionality, baseline validity, and any corrective actions in a complete public record.

→ Document permanence protections, including buffer pool coverage or an explicit explanation of why reversal risk is not material, and resolve the crediting-period discrepancy across documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_06.02.2017 to 05.02.2019_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report_2nd monitoring period_06.02.2019 to 05.02.2020_v6.pdf
- PDD 19.09.2018_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1446
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1446

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-4F778B23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy