

## QUALITY REPORT

# GS1247 VPA 19 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Gatsibo District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1501 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-D5212F03 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.3**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.8</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.0</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>6.4</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive safeguards and a quantified leakage treatment, but the evidence base is incomplete on core quality items like additionality verification and VVB identity. A major inconsistency exists on usage rate assumptions: the monitoring report uses 100% while the PDD used 80%, and I privilege the more recent monitoring report because it is later and project-specific, but the contradiction still lowers confidence. Overall, this looks like a moderate-quality file with meaningful evidence gaps rather than a clearly high-integrity crediting case.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1501
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC v.1 v.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2021
Monitoring Period	2017 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

## Red Flags

- No additionality test or VVB confirmation is stated in the extracted record.
- The PDD and monitoring report conflict on usage rate assumptions, which raises over-crediting risk.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ The monitoring report states a quantified leakage treatment with a leakage deduction of 0% and no material findings reported.

- Additionality testing is not stated and VVB confirmation is not found in the available documents.

The monitoring report dated 2019-02-06 shows no material findings and no corrective actions required, which supports a cleaner verification outcome. Leakage is treated quantitatively with a leakage deduction of 0%, but permanence is not fully evidenced because buffer pool information is not found and reversal events are marked as not addressed. Additionality is weakly documented because no test type or VVB confirmation is stated in the available record.

### Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the file includes multiple source documents including the PDD, stakeholder consultation, and monitoring report.

- Total claimed and verified emission reductions are not stated, and the VVB name is not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring period is clearly defined, and the evidence set includes the PDD, stakeholder consultation, and monitoring report, which helps traceability. However, the extracted record does not state total claimed or verified emission reductions, and the VVB name is missing. The registry is identified as Gold Standard, but the public-facing completeness of the file remains limited by these gaps.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ The monitoring report uses a recent project-specific baseline and reports a quantified leakage approach.

- The PDD and monitoring report disagree on usage rate assumptions, with 80% in the PDD versus 100% in the monitoring report, which increases over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is mixed because the project has a quantified leakage treatment and a recent project baseline, but the baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized jurisdictional baseline. The contradiction on usage rate assumptions is important: the monitoring report uses 100% while the PDD used 80%, and I privilege the later monitoring report because it is more recent and directly tied to the monitored period. Even so, that discrepancy raises over-crediting risk and reduces confidence in the claimed savings.

### Documentation — 6.4 / 10

+ The extraction confidence is high, and the monitoring report is dated 2019 with a defined crediting period and monitoring period.

- Key documentation fields are missing, including the VVB name, additionality verification, and buffer pool information.

Documentation quality is moderate: the extraction confidence is high, the monitoring report is dated, and the crediting period and monitoring period are both available. Safeguards are better documented than many files, with FPIC conducted, a grievance mechanism present, and benefit sharing described. Still, the record lacks the VVB name, additionality verification, and buffer pool details, which prevents a stronger documentation score.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No VVB-confirmed additionality found
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool evidence
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified leakage treatment
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessed in 2019
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the VVB name and explicit verification language for additionality, baseline validity, and emission reductions.

→ Resolve the usage-rate contradiction with a documented rationale and publish the claimed versus verified emission totals.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_04-11-2014 to 05-02-2016\_v4.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_2nd monitoring period\_06-02-2016 to 05-02-2017\_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_3rd monitoring period\_06-02-2017 to 05-02-2019\_v1.pdf
- GS3430 Local Stakeholder Consultation Report Feedback\_round2.pdf
- PDD\_03-11-2015.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1501
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1501

### 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-D5212F03 · 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)