

QUALITY REPORT

GS1247 VPA 151 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Gatsibo District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1451 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-6670E13D · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.1 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive safeguards and a documented monitoring approach, but the evidence is incomplete and there are reliability concerns. Additionality is not clearly demonstrated in the extracted record, leakage is only described as negligible, and the monitoring report includes a forward action request for missing household questionnaires.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1451
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC v.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2024
Monitoring Period	2020 — 2021
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.
- The monitoring report flags missing questionnaires for several households, which weakens confidence in the usage survey evidence.
- The crediting period and usage rate differ between documents, indicating inconsistency across sources.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report says leakage is deemed negligible, which is better than an unaddressed leakage issue.
- No additionality test type or VVB confirmation is stated in the available documents, and reversal risk is not addressed.

The monitoring report states a project baseline and says leakage is deemed negligible, which supports the project somewhat. However, no additionality test type is stated and there is no VVB confirmation of additionality in the extracted record, so the core integrity case is only moderate. Reversal risk is also not addressed, and the absence of a buffer pool or reversal treatment limits permanence confidence.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is clearly stated for 2020-02-06 to 2021-02-05, and the project uses an annual survey for usage monitoring.
- The VVB name, verified and claimed emission reductions, and registry completeness details are not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring period is clearly identified, and usage is monitored through an annual survey, which helps traceability. On the other hand, the VVB name is not found in the extracted record, and the claimed versus verified emission reduction figures are not available. That leaves the public audit trail incomplete despite the presence of monitoring documentation.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The verified usage rate is 0.9, which is close to the assumed 0.8 and suggests some empirical monitoring.
- The baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, and the record does not show quantified leakage deductions or CORSIA/CCP status.

The verified usage rate of 0.9 is close to the assumed 0.8, which reduces but does not eliminate over-crediting concern. Still, the baseline is project-specific rather than clearly standardized, leakage is only described as negligible without a quantified deduction, and CORSIA or CCP status is not stated. Those gaps keep claim safety at a middling level.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

- + Two document types were used, and the extraction confidence is high.
- The monitoring report includes a forward action request for missing questionnaires, showing incomplete supporting documentation.

The record draws from a PDD and a monitoring report, and the extraction confidence is high, which supports basic documentation quality. But the monitoring report includes a forward action request for missing questionnaires for several households, showing that the evidence set is incomplete. The crediting period also conflicts with the PDD, and I privilege the later monitoring report because it is more recent and project-specific, though the inconsistency still lowers confidence.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality test found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a VVB-confirmed additionality assessment and the underlying test evidence.

→ Publish complete monitoring questionnaires, quantified leakage treatment, and a clear statement on reversal/buffer arrangements.

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
- Monitoring Report_3rd monitoring period_06.02.2020 to 05.02.2021_v4.pdf
- PDD 19.09.2018_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1451
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1451

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-6670E13D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy