

QUALITY REPORT

GS1247 VPA 155 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Gatsibo District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-1504 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-BAFD3FCB · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive safeguards and monitoring features, but key elements of additionality, baseline design, and permanence are not well evidenced in the extracted record. The crediting period discrepancy between the monitoring report and the PDD reduces confidence in the documentation and suggests the record is not fully consistent.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1504
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 additionality test or VVB confirmation is stated in the extracted documents.
- The crediting period differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, creating a reliability concern.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.4 / 10

- + The monitoring report reports no material findings and no corrective actions required.
- Additionality is not documented in the extracted record, and reversal risk is not addressed.

The monitoring report states no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is positive for implementation quality. However, additionality is not evidenced in the extracted record because no test type or VVB confirmation is stated, and reversal events are noted as not addressed. The absence of a buffer pool figure also weakens permanence confidence.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the report includes quantified usage monitoring through an annual survey.
- Total verified and claimed emission reductions are not stated, and the VVB name is not found in the available documents.

The monitoring period is clearly defined as 2019-02-06 to 2020-02-05, and usage monitoring is described as an annual survey. Still, the extracted record does not provide total claimed or verified emission reductions, and the VVB name is not found. That limits public traceability and makes the MRV package only moderately transparent.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report states a quantified leakage treatment and a verified usage rate of 100% against an assumed 80%.
- The baseline method is not stated, and the project is not shown to be excluded from CORSIA or CCP channels.

Claim safety is helped by the reported 100% verified usage rate and the stated quantified leakage treatment, which suggests some effort to control over-crediting. But the baseline method is not stated, and the project's CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not clearly resolved in the available record. The assumed 80% usage rate versus 100% verified usage also raises questions about how conservatively the baseline was set.

Documentation — 5.1 / 10

- + Two document types were used, and extraction confidence is high.
- The crediting period is inconsistent across documents, and the baseline last reassessment date is not stated.

The record draws on a PDD and a monitoring report, and extraction confidence is high, which supports basic documentation quality. However, the crediting period is contradictory: the monitoring report gives 2014-11-06 to 2024-02-05, while the PDD gives 2017-02-05 to 2024-02-05. I privileged the monitoring report because it is the more recent document and likely reflects the latest project status, but the inconsistency still lowers reliability. The baseline last reassessment date is also not stated.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	Leakage treatment unclear
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the baseline methodology, additionality test, and VVB validation details in a single consistent project record.

→ Resolve the crediting-period discrepancy and disclose verified versus claimed emission reductions, leakage deduction, and permanence provisions.

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-1504
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1504

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-BAFD3FCB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy