

QUALITY REPORT

GS 12239 VPA-1 Amazi Meza Rwanda Water Supply Project For Schools

GS-4383 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-E99C1C85 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.6Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	5.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some strong quality signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC and grievance mechanisms, and a verified emission reduction figure. However, several corrective actions were raised, leakage treatment is only described as negligible, and key items such as buffer pool coverage and reversal handling are not stated in the available documents.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4383
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	Methodology For Emission Reductions From Safe Drinking Water Supply v1.0
Crediting Period	2023 — 2028
VVB	Applus+ Certification
Verified ERs	7,665 tCO ₂ e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	9 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

Red Flags

- Multiple corrective actions and clarification requests were raised in the verification process, which weakens confidence in the reported results.
- Leakage is described as negligible in the monitoring report, but the contradiction record shows another document treated leakage differently, creating a reliability concern.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which is a meaningful positive signal.

- The verification process recorded several corrective actions and clarification requests, and reversal events are not addressed in the available record.

The monitoring report confirms additionality through a combined test and the VVB, which supports the project's core integrity case. At the same time, the verification process recorded three corrective actions plus clarification requests, and reversal events are not addressed, so permanence and implementation robustness remain only moderately supported. Leakage is described as negligible, but the lack of quantified deduction weakens the integrity assessment.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The monitoring report provides a verified emission reduction figure and a defined monitoring period, which supports traceability.

- Total claimed emission reductions are not stated, and the monitoring approach relies on an annual survey rather than a fully transparent continuous record.

The monitoring report dated 2024-12-11 provides a verified emission reduction total and a clear monitoring period from 2023-06-26 to 2024-03-31. However, total claimed emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the annual survey approach is less transparent than more granular monitoring. The documentation is usable, but not fully complete for public scrutiny.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project uses a stated project baseline and reports a national-default FNRB value of 84.85, which is at least documented.

- Leakage is only justified as negligible, and the contradiction record shows another source treated leakage differently, increasing over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is helped by the documented project baseline and the use of a national-default FNRB value of 84.85. Still, leakage is only said to be negligible rather than quantified, and the contradiction record shows a different treatment of leakage in another document, which raises over-crediting concerns. CORSIA eligibility is not stated and CCP status is not mentioned, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ The record includes a monitoring report, stakeholder consultation material, and seven documents used in extraction, with high extraction confidence.

- Several key fields are not stated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and total claimed emission reductions.

The evidence base includes a monitoring report, stakeholder consultation material, and seven documents used in extraction, with high extraction confidence. FPIC and a grievance mechanism are both documented, which improves the completeness of the file. Even so, several important items are not stated, including buffer pool coverage, baseline reassessment timing, and total claimed emission reductions, limiting documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No reversal handling stated
● Leakage	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clearer leakage assessment with a quantified deduction or a stronger technical justification, and reconcile the contradictory leakage treatment across documents.

→ Disclose the full verification trail for corrective actions, baseline reassessment timing, buffer pool treatment, and any CORSIA/CCP status to improve claim safety and documentation quality.

Documents Reviewed

- 18_Monitoring-Report Amazi Meza Rwanda Water Supply Project for Schools VPA1 v1.5 11 Dec 2024_Clean.pdf
- GS12239_GS12240_T-PreReview_V2.0-Preliminary-review-request-form.docx
- GS12240_VPA Stakeholder-Consultation-Report_v1.0 30Nov2023.docx
- GS VPA-Design-Documents Amazi Meza Rwanda VPA1 v1.0 30 Nov 2023.docx
- 4_GS VPA-Design-Documents Amazi Meza Rwanda VPA1 v1.5 20Nov2024_Clean.pdf
- 2024_12_15d_FVaIR_VPA-1_Amazi_Meza_Rwanda_GS12240_Clean.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4383
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4383
- 2025_01_18a_FVerR_VPA-1_Amazi_Meza_Rwanda_GSID_12240_Clean.pdf

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-E99C1C85 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14

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