

QUALITY REPORT

Water is Life, Madagascar

GS-2110 · Gold Standard · Madagascar

Report ID: CM-0D7ECED0 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.8 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This is a Gold Standard avoidance project with VVB-confirmed additionality and a quantified leakage treatment, which supports moderate integrity. However, the record has several documentation and reliability issues, including low extraction confidence, multiple corrective actions, and contradictions across documents that reduce confidence in the reported figures.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-2110
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Madagascar
Vintage	2023
Project Methodology	Technologies and practices to displace decentralized thermal energy consumption (TPDDTEC) 3.1
Crediting Period	2018 — 2023
VVB	SustainCERT
Verified ERs	49,834 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- The verification report lists many corrective actions, including missing evidence for surveys and a formal grievance declaration.
- There are contradictions on leakage treatment, usage rate, and crediting period across documents, which weakens data reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by SustainCERT in the verification report.
- The verification report lists numerous corrective actions, including evidence gaps and calculation corrections.

The verification report from SustainCERT confirms additionality, which is a meaningful positive for integrity. The project is an avoidance activity, so permanence risk is inherently lower than for removals, but buffer pool coverage is not stated and reversal events are not found in the extracted record. Leakage is described as quantified in the verification report, although the monitoring report later characterizes it as negligible, so the leakage treatment is not fully consistent.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period, VVB name, and verified ER total are stated in the extracted record.
- Extraction confidence is low and several key fields, including claimed ERs and buffer pool coverage, are not found in the available documents.

The record identifies the monitoring period, the VVB, and the verified emissions reductions, which helps transparency. However, total claimed ERs are not found, buffer pool information is missing, and the extraction confidence is low, meaning at least one key source was poorly readable. The monitoring approach for usage is described as an annual survey, but the underlying evidence is not fully complete in the extracted record.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project uses a project baseline and reports a quantified leakage treatment in the verification report.
- Contradictions on leakage justification and usage rate create over-crediting uncertainty.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a project baseline and the verification report indicates quantified leakage treatment. Still, the contradiction on leakage justification, together with the discrepancy in usage rate between documents, raises over-crediting risk. The FNRB value is 0.72 using a national default method, which is not obviously weak, but the record does not provide enough detail to fully de-risk the claim.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

- + Twenty-three documents were used and the record includes a verification report, monitoring report, PDD, and stakeholder consultation materials.
- Low extraction confidence and multiple corrective actions indicate incomplete or difficult-to-read documentation.

Documentation is mixed: the record draws on 23 documents, including the monitoring report, PDD, verification report, and stakeholder consultation materials. At the same time, extraction confidence is low and the verification report lists many corrective actions, including missing survey evidence, date corrections, and net benefit calculation fixes. The crediting period is also contradicted by another document, which further reduces confidence in the completeness and consistency of the file.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	Avoidance project; buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment inconsistent
● Baseline	Project baseline stated, reassessment timing missing
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clean, reconciled set of monitoring and verification documents that resolves the leakage, usage rate, and crediting period contradictions.

→ Publish the missing evidence for surveys, buffer pool treatment, and the corrective action closures, with a clear audit trail from the VVB.

Documents Reviewed

- GS7566_Ex post ER calculation_ver03(1).xlsx
- Monitoring-Report_ver05 - clean(1).pdf
- GS5658-7VPAs-Project-Annual-Report_2023.pdf
- (1)Monitoring-Report_ver6_clean.pdf
- 8. GS6752_9 VPAs_Ex post ER calculation_ver02(4).xlsx
- GS5658_7VPAs_Monitoring-Report_V03.4_Clean.pdf
- Monitoring-Report_ver04(2).pdf
- Monitoring-Report_ver02(3).pdf
- GS7566_Stakeholder Consultation Report_ver02_Clean.pdf
- GS5658_Design Consultation Report.docx
- ER Calculation_7 VPAs_31082023-21092024-v5.xlsx
- GS5658_Design Change Memo.docx
- GS5658_Design Change Memo_ver03 CLEAN.pdf
- GS5658_PoA-DD ver08_11-03-2021_Clean.pdf
- GS7566_VPA-DD_ver02_Clean.pdf
- (2)PDD_05.09.2019_v6.pdf
- GS7566_VPA-DD_ver08_Clean.pdf
- GS5658_PoA-DD_v10.docx
- GS5658_PoA-DD ver07_31-12-2020_TC.doc
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-2110
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-2110
- 9VPAs(GS6752_7311_7566_7567_10567_10568_10569_10783_10784).MD.GEN.009.Verification_Report(2).pdf
- GS5658_GS6752-GS10784_ver123 - Verification Report_SC_Final.pdf
- Verification_Report(3).pdf
- GS 5658 FVR_v2.5-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-0D7ECED0 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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