

QUALITY REPORT

GS5047 VPA82 African Improved Cookstoves and Clean Water Programme: Gishwati – Mukura Forest Conservation Project X

GS-2977 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-3AB62BF0 · Generated: 2026-04-17 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.0 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and no reported material findings. However, key evidence is incomplete or inconsistent, especially around leakage, usage verification, and the FNRB value, which weakens confidence in the claimed climate benefits.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-2977
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption Version 3.1 3.1
Crediting Period	2022 — 2043
VVB	SustainCERT
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-17

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents, with one source saying it was deemed negligible and the validation report saying it was quantified, but no deduction percentage is available.
- The FNRB figure is contradictory across documents, and the extracted record does not show a verified usage rate or claimed versus verified emission reductions.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the validation report reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Leakage treatment is not fully transparent in the extracted record, and reversal risk is marked as not addressed rather than clearly managed.

The validation report from SustainCERT confirms additionality and reports no material findings or corrective actions, which supports the project's core integrity. At the same time, leakage handling is not fully clear in the extracted record, and reversal risk is listed as not addressed, so permanence and emissions accounting confidence are only moderate. The project uses a project baseline, but the baseline was not shown to have been recently reassessed.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The validation report identifies SustainCERT and the project documents include safeguards, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism.
- The monitoring period, verified emission reductions, and usage verification are not stated in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

Transparency is weakened by missing core MRV details: the monitoring period, total verified emission reductions, and verified usage rate are not stated in the extracted record. The validation report does identify the verifier and the project documentation includes safeguards, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism, which helps. Still, the low extraction confidence and incomplete quantitative reporting reduce overall transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline and a quantified leakage approach is indicated in the validation report.
- The contradictory FNRB values and missing verified usage data increase over-crediting risk and reduce confidence in the claim.

Claim safety is mixed because the project appears to have a quantified leakage approach and a project baseline, but the evidence is incomplete. The extracted record shows a contradiction in the FNRB value, with one source indicating 77 and another indicating 0.98, and the higher-priority validation report value was privileged because it is the more recent and formal validation document. Missing verified usage data and absent claimed-versus-verified reduction figures further increase over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + Multiple evidence documents were used, including a validation report, and the extraction captured several safeguard-related fields.
- Extraction confidence is low, and several core fields are missing or not stated, including monitoring period, buffer pool, and verified reductions.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and several missing or unstated fields, including buffer pool coverage, monitoring period, and verified reductions. The record does include multiple documents and a validation report dated 2020-10-13, which is reasonably recent relative to the 2022-2043 crediting period. However, the incompleteness of the extracted evidence prevents a stronger documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	leakage quantified but deduction missing
● Baseline	project baseline without reassessment date
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the monitoring report with verified emission reductions, usage rate verification, and the exact leakage deduction applied.

→ Clarify the FNRB calculation, buffer pool treatment, and reversal management in a single consistent document set.

Documents Reviewed

- (1)ER and SDG Calculations GS5047 VPA90 v.3 211012.xlsx
- GS5047 Transition Annex.docx
- Annex_AK_PoA_GS5047_Design_Consultation_Report.doc
- (1)POA-DD_GS5047_v.4_180316_clean.docx
- (1)T-PreReview_V1.1-VPA-DD_Gishwati v.7 VPA76_211012_clean.docx
- T-PreReview_V1.1-VPA-DD_Gishwati v.7 VPA90_211012_clean.docx
- Memo Design Change PoA3 201002.docx
- (1)ER and SDG Calculations GS5047 VPA76 v.3 211012.xlsx
- 101.1-OR-POA-T-GS4GG_PoA-DD_ver1 GS5047 v.5 190211 mark-up 200818.doc
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-2977
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-2977
- T-DesCert_V1.2-Microscale-Validation-Appraisal-Report_Gishwati VPA47-49, 76-87, 89-93_211102.docx

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-3AB62BF0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-17 · Generated: 2026-04-17

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy