QUALITY REPORT

GS1366 VPA 8 Kilifi Borehole Rehabilitation Project

GS-1409 · GS · Kenya

Report ID: CM-62E3F6BC · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
3.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	3.2
	Transparency (25%)	3.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.4
	Documentation (15%)	3.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some procedural safeguards in place, including FPIC and a grievance mechanism, but the core crediting case is weakly documented in the extracted record. Key elements such as additionality verification, VVB identity, and reversal treatment are not stated, and leakage is not addressed despite a zero deduction being shown. The record also contains contradictions on benefit sharing, leakage justification, and the crediting period, which reduces confidence in the file.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1409
Sector	industrial
Country	Kenya
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption v3.1
Crediting Period	2014 — 2028
Monitoring Period	2018 — 2019
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	7 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-19

Red Flags

- Additionality is not confirmed by a VVB and the test type is not stated in the available documents.
- Leakage is shown as a 0% deduction, but the justification is marked as not addressed and earlier documents conflict on whether it was deemed negligible.
- The crediting period differs across documents, creating a reliability issue for the project timeline.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

+ FPIC was conducted and a grievance mechanism is mentioned, which supports basic project safeguards.

- Additionality is not verified by a VVB, the test type is not stated, and reversal treatment is not addressed in the extracted record.

The PDD states a project baseline approach and a methodology under Gold Standard, but the additionality test type is not stated and additionality is not verified by a VVB in the extracted record. Permanence is also weakly supported because reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool is reported. Leakage is especially weak: the file shows a 0% deduction, yet the justification is marked as not addressed, which undermines confidence in the crediting integrity.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

+ The monitoring period, methodology version, and usage monitoring approach are stated in the PDD.

- No VVB name, no claimed or verified ERR totals, and no registry completeness details are available in the extracted record.

The monitoring period, methodology version, and annual survey usage monitoring approach are stated in the PDD, which helps traceability. However, the VVB name is not found, and both claimed and verified ERR totals are missing from the extracted record, limiting public auditability. The absence of registry completeness details further reduces transparency.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

+ The project uses a defined methodology and reports a high verified usage rate of 100% against an assumed 80% rate.

- Leakage is not addressed despite a zero deduction, and the project is not shown to have CCP or CORSIA status, leaving double-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is constrained by the lack of a documented additionality test and by leakage treatment that is not explained even though a zero deduction is reported. The usage rate appears favorable, with 100% verified against an assumed 80%, but that does not offset the missing leakage rationale. CCP and CORSIA status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available documents.

Documentation — 3.1 / 10

+ Five documents were used and the extraction confidence is medium rather than low.

- Several key fields are not stated, and the record contains contradictions on benefit sharing, leakage justification, and the crediting period.

The record draws on five documents, and extraction confidence is medium, so the file is usable but not robust. FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards are mentioned, but several core items remain unstated, including VVB identity, additionality verification, and reversal treatment. The contradictions on benefit sharing, leakage justification, and crediting period materially weaken documentation quality, and I privilege the later 2020 PDD for the crediting period because it is the most recent and specific source in the extracted set.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	No VVB-confirmed additionality found
● **Permanence**	No buffer pool or reversal treatment stated
● **Leakage**	Zero deduction without addressed justification
● **Baseline**	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a VVB-verified additionality assessment, including the exact test used and supporting calculations.

→ Document leakage treatment, reversal risk management, and registry status clearly, including any buffer pool or double-claim safeguards.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_13.12.2018 to 31.12.2019_v4.pdf
- GS1366 PoA Design Consulation Report_07.11.2012.pdf
- GS1366 PoA-DD_14.10.20_v1.1.pdf
- PDD_17.07.2019_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1409
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1409
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_13.12.2018 to 31.12.2019.pdf

Report ID: CM-62E3F6BC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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