

## QUALITY REPORT

# GS1247 VPA 110 Improved Kitchen Regimes: Kayonza District Borehole Project, Rwanda

GS-973 · GS · Rwanda

Report ID: CM-AB34C4E0 · Generated: 2026-04-14 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**5.2**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>5.2</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>5.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>5.0</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>5.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive safeguards and monitoring elements, but key robustness items are missing or only partially documented. The biggest concerns are the lack of a clearly stated additionality test, no buffer pool information, and contradictions between documents on usage rates, claimed ERs, reversal reporting, and crediting period dates.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-973
Sector	industrial
Country	Rwanda
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC v.1
Crediting Period	2015 — 2023
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2020
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-14

## Red Flags

- No additionality test type or VVB confirmation is stated in the extracted record.
- Contradictions exist on usage rates, claimed emission reductions, reversal reporting, and crediting period dates across documents.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 5.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report states a quantified leakage treatment with a 0% deduction and no reversal events reported in the latest document.

- Additionality is not evidenced in the extracted record, and no buffer pool percentage is stated; the report also includes a forward action request to monitor borehole operating status and non-available days.

The monitoring report shows a quantified leakage deduction of 0% and says no reversal events were reported, which supports some integrity. However, additionality is not documented in the extracted record, the buffer pool percentage is not stated, and the report includes a forward action request to monitor borehole operating status and non-available days, which weakens confidence in permanence and monitoring robustness.

### Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ The project has a named monitoring period and a documented annual survey approach for usage monitoring, with the Gold Standard registry identified.

- The VVB name and verified ER total are not found in the available documents, and the record contains contradictions on usage rates and claimed ERs between monitoring documents.

Transparency is moderate because the project documents identify the Gold Standard registry, the monitoring period, and an annual survey for usage monitoring. That said, the VVB name is not found in the extracted record, the verified ER total is not available, and the record contains contradictions on usage rates and claimed ERs across monitoring documents, which reduces clarity and auditability.

### Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

+ Usage was verified at 90% in the later monitoring report, and leakage was explicitly quantified at 0%.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a clearly standardized or recently reassessed baseline, and the project is not shown to be CCP-approved or explicitly outside CORSIA eligibility.

Claim safety is mixed. The later monitoring report verifies a 90% usage rate and reports a 0% leakage deduction, but the baseline is project-specific and not shown to be recently reassessed, and the project is not clearly shown to be CCP-approved or excluded from CORSIA-related claims. The contradictions on usage assumptions and ER totals increase over-crediting risk.

### Documentation — 5.1 / 10

+ Two official document types were used, and the extraction confidence is high.

- The documentation is incomplete on several core items, including the VVB name, buffer pool, and verified ER total, and the crediting period differs between the PDD and monitoring report.

Documentation quality is fair but incomplete. Two official document types were used and extraction confidence is high, yet several important fields are missing, including the VVB name, buffer pool, and verified ER total. The crediting period also differs between the PDD and the monitoring report, which suggests the documentation set is not fully consistent.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality evidence found
● <b>Permanence</b>	No reversals reported, but buffer pool missing
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage quantified at 0%
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear additionality assessment and, if applicable, VVB confirmation of the test used.

→ Disclose the buffer pool arrangement, verified ER totals, and a reconciliation of the contradictory usage, reversal, and crediting-period figures.

## Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report\_1st monitoring period\_16.08.2016 to 30.09.2017\_v1.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_4th monitoring period\_01.10.2019 to 30.09.2020\_v5.pdf
- Monitoring Report\_3rd monitoring period\_01.10.2019 to 30.09.2019\_v6.pdf
- PDD\_17.09.2018\_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-973
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-973

### 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-AB34C4E0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-14 · Generated: 2026-04-14  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy