

QUALITY REPORT

SAFE WATER PROJECT IN RWANDA V

GS-3091 · Gold Standard · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-F9BD9DE7 · Generated: 2026-04-11 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strengths, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, the verification report also shows unresolved findings and multiple corrective actions, while several key items are either not stated or inconsistent across documents, which weakens confidence in the claimed credits.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3091
Sector	water
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	2021
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption 3.1
Crediting Period	2021 — 2027
VVB	4K Earth Science Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-11

Red Flags

- The verification report says findings were not closed and lists several corrective actions, including inconsistencies between baseline survey forms and the SDG calculation sheet.
- There are contradictions on usage rates, leakage treatment, FNRB presentation, and the crediting period, which reduce reliability of the documentation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a quantified leakage deduction of 0% in the verification report.
- The verification report states that findings were not closed and lists multiple corrective actions, including CAR#03 and CAR#04 for inconsistencies.

The verification report confirms additionality was checked by the VVB, which supports the project's core environmental claim. Leakage is treated with a quantified deduction of 0%, but the report also says findings were not closed and lists several corrective actions, including inconsistencies between baseline survey forms and the SDG calculation sheet. The baseline method is project-specific, and reversal events are not addressed, so permanence and baseline robustness are only moderate.

Transparency — 4.6 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, and usage monitoring method are stated, and the project documents include validation, monitoring, PDD, and verification materials.
- Total ERs claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is only medium.

The record identifies the VVB, the monitoring period, and the annual survey method for usage monitoring, which helps traceability. However, total ERs claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is only medium because at least one key document was poorly readable. The documentation set is broader than a single report, but the missing quantitative issuance figures limit transparency.

Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

- + The project is an avoidance activity with a quantified leakage treatment and a high FNRB value reported under a national default method.
- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, and contradictions exist on usage rates and the crediting period.

The project is an avoidance activity with a quantified leakage treatment, which is better than an unaddressed leakage case. Still, the project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-market claim risk is not fully resolved. The contradictions on usage rates, FNRB presentation, and the crediting period also weaken confidence that the claimed reductions are fully conservative.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

- + Multiple official documents were used, including validation, monitoring, PDD, and verification reports, and safeguards are explicitly mentioned.
- Several key fields are not stated, the extraction confidence is only medium, and the verification report notes unresolved findings and corrective actions.

The evidence base includes validation, monitoring, PDD, and verification documents, and safeguards such as FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are explicitly mentioned. Even so, several key fields are not stated in available documents, and the verification report records unresolved findings and multiple corrective actions. The medium extraction confidence further suggests that the documentation package is usable but not fully robust.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	reversal risk not addressed
● Leakage	quantified leakage treatment
● Baseline	project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible, CCP status unstated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified issuance figures and reconcile all usage-rate, FNRB, leakage, and crediting-period inconsistencies across documents.

→ Close all outstanding findings and corrective actions, and provide a clearer, recent reassessment of the baseline and any reversal/permanence treatment.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring-Report-Rwanda VPAs-MP1st-20022023cl(8).pdf
- Monitoring-Report-Rwanda VPAs-MP2nd_20240409tc.docx
- 1-SDG Outcomes Calculation Form-MP1st-Ver2-20221117(4).xlsx
- GS10959 Annual Report_20221231.docx
- 16-SDG Outcomes Calculation Form-MP1st-Ver2-20221117.xlsx
- Monitoring Report
- 10959Rwanda VPA Inclusion report_clean.pdf
- 1_SDG Outcomes Calculation Form-4th MP-Ver01_ Rwanda 20260119.xlsx
- GS10959 VPA07 Safe Water Project in Bangladesh I Stakeholder Consultation Report_20211107tc.docx
- GS10959 VPA07 Safe Water Project in Bangladesh I VPA DD_20211121tc.docx
- Deviation from TPDDTEC for Calculation of Baseline Emissions without Suppressed Demand in Safe Water Supply Project_20201223_GS decision.pdf
- GS10959 VPA05 VPA DD_20220314.pdf
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3091
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3091
- Rwanda Verification Report-MP1_Iceberg clean(2).pdf
- Final Verification Report_Rwanda_Clean.pdf
- Final Verification Report_Rwanda_V3.pdf
- DVR_PoA Validation_10959.pdf
- Validation / Verification Report

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-F9BD9DE7 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-11 · Generated: 2026-04-11

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