

QUALITY REPORT

GS1366 VPA 9 Kilifi Borehole Rehabilitation Project

GS-1410 · GS · Kenya

Report ID: CM-314BE00D · Generated: 2026-04-19 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality, FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and a quantified leakage treatment. However, key documentation gaps remain around the verifier identity, reversal handling, and registry/eligibility status, and the record contains contradictions on benefit sharing and the crediting period that reduce confidence. Overall, this looks like a moderately documented project with meaningful reliability and claim-safety concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1410
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

- The record says reversal events are not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is found, which weakens permanence assurance.
- There are contradictions on benefit sharing and the crediting period, and the project's CORSIA/CCP status is not stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.4 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project's core environmental claim.

- Reversal risk is not well managed in the extracted record: reversal events are noted as not addressed and no buffer pool share is found.

The PDD states that additionality was verified by the VVB, which is a meaningful positive signal. On the other hand, reversal events are marked as not addressed and no buffer pool percentage is available, so permanence controls are weakly evidenced. The baseline is project-based, and the record does not show a recent reassessment, which limits robustness.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

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

- The verifier name, claimed versus verified ER totals, and CORSIA/CCP status are not found in the available documents.

The monitoring period, methodology version, and annual survey usage monitoring method are clearly stated in the PDD. But the verifier name is not found, and both claimed and verified ER totals are missing from the extracted record, limiting auditability. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated, which leaves registry and market-claim transparency incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ Leakage is treated quantitatively, with a leakage deduction of 0% and a stated justification.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a recent standardized reassessment, and the usage rate assumption of 80% differs from the verified 100% usage rate.

Leakage appears better handled than many projects because the record gives a quantified leakage treatment with a 0% deduction. Still, the baseline is project-specific, and the usage rate assumption of 80% is materially lower than the verified 100% usage rate, which raises questions about how conservative the ex ante assumptions were. The absence of CORSIA/CCP status also leaves some double-claim risk unresolved.

Documentation — 4.1 / 10

+ The record shows five documents used, with no material findings and no corrective actions required.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the crediting-period contradiction suggests the underlying documentation set is not fully consistent.

The extracted record covers five documents, includes FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit sharing, and reports no material findings or corrective actions. However, extraction confidence is only medium, so at least one key document may have been difficult to read. The contradiction on the crediting period, together with the benefit-sharing discrepancy, indicates the documentation set is not fully consistent.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed
● Permanence	Reversal handling unclear
● Leakage	Quantified 0% deduction
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verifier name, claimed and verified ER totals, and the registry status needed to confirm CORSIA/CCP eligibility.

→ Provide explicit reversal management details, including buffer pool treatment, and resolve the crediting-period and benefit-sharing contradictions with source documents.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report_1st monitoring period_11.12.2018 to 31.12.2019_v4.pdf
- GS1366 PoA Design Consultation Report_07.11.2012.pdf
- GS1366 PoA-DD_14.10.20_v1.1.pdf
- PDD_22.02.2019_v2.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1410
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1410
- Verification Report_1st monitoring period_11.12.2018 to 31.12.2019.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-314BE00D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-19 · Generated: 2026-04-19

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