

## QUALITY REPORT

# Safe Water Programme – Kenya – VPA 39

GS-3318 · Gold Standard · Kenya

Report ID: CM-60F34C20 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 4.5

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	4.8
■ Transparency (25%)	4.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.2
■ Documentation (15%)	4.1

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive evidence on additionality and grievance handling, but there are material weaknesses in leakage treatment, safeguards documentation, and data consistency. The record also contains several contradictions across monitoring documents, which reduces confidence in the claimed emission reductions and the reliability of the monitoring trail.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-3318
Sector	industrial
Country	Kenya
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	Emission reductions from Safe Drinking Water Supply Version 1.0 – 03/5/2021
Crediting Period	2021 — 2025
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	20 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

## Red Flags

- Leakage is deducted at 5% but the justification is marked as not addressed in the monitoring report.
- The record contains multiple contradictions, including different values and methods for usage rate, FNRB, leakage justification, and safeguards documentation.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test.

- Leakage treatment is weak: a 5% deduction is reported, but the justification is not addressed, and reversal handling is also not addressed.

The verification record confirms additionality through a combined test and VVB review, which supports the project's core crediting logic. However, the monitoring record states a 5% leakage deduction while also marking the leakage justification as not addressed, and reversal events are likewise not addressed. No buffer pool percentage is provided, so permanence protection is not well evidenced.

### Transparency — 4.6 / 10

+ The monitoring period, VVB name, and usage monitoring approach are stated in the issuance record.

- The record shows several internal contradictions and no verified totals for claimed versus verified emission reductions.

The issuance record identifies Earthood Services Private Limited as the VVB and gives the monitoring period and monitoring approach. Still, the record does not provide verified totals for claimed versus verified emission reductions, and the documentation contains several contradictions that weaken traceability. The absence of a clear baseline reassessment date also limits transparency.

### Claim Safety — 4.2 / 10

+ The project applies a project baseline and includes a leakage deduction, which is better than an unadjusted baseline claim.

- The FNRB figure and method are inconsistent across documents, and the usage rate evidence also conflicts between monitoring records.

Claim safety is weakened by inconsistent monitoring values and methods. The record shows a contradiction in usage rate between monitoring documents, and the FNRB value and method also conflict across sources, with the privileged value being the more recent monitoring report because it is the latest issuance record. The project is not clearly shown to be CCP-approved or CORSIA-eligible, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

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

- Four material findings and two corrective actions were required, indicating unresolved documentation issues.

The file set is reasonably broad, with 20 documents used and medium extraction confidence, but the documentation is not clean. Four material findings were recorded, including two corrective actions, which suggests the evidence package needed substantive follow-up. The crediting period is stated, but the baseline was not shown to have been recently reassessed.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed test
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Deduction stated, justification weak
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Partial safeguards evidence
● <b>Double-claim</b>	Registry status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear, documented leakage rationale and reconcile the 5% deduction with the earlier negligible-leakage position.

→ Publish a reconciled monitoring annex that resolves the usage rate, FNRB, and safeguards contradictions and states whether the project is CCP-approved or CORSIA-eligible.

## Documents Reviewed

- Public\_GS11189 VPA 31-47 Kenya WPS - MP1 ER sheet v5.0 26092022.xlsx
- GS11189 VPA 31-47 49-61 Kenya WPS - MP4 MR v5.0\_Clean.pdf
- GS11189 VPA 31-47 Kenya WPS - MP3 MR v3.0\_03102023.docx
- GS11189 VPA 31-47 Kenya WPS - MP2 MR v3.0\_01032023 - Clean.pdf
- GS11189 VPA 31-47 Kenya WPS - MP1 MR v5.0 260902022.pdf
- Public\_GS11189 VPA 31-47 Kenya WPS - MP2 ER sheet ver.3.0\_01032023.xlsx
- Public\_GS11189 VPA 31-47 and 49-61 Kenya\_MP4 ER sheet ver.4.0.xlsx
- Public\_GS11189 VPA 31-47 Kenya WPS - MP3 ER sheet ver.3.0 03102023.xlsx
- GS11189-Deviation-Request-Form\_1\_Final decision.pdf
- ImpactCarbon\_Request\_Letter\_GS11189\_VPA39\_40.pdf
- GS VPA-DD 11289 Kenya VPA - 31 v 5.0 10062022.docx
- VPA 01-30 Nigeria WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v4.0 09032022.xlsx
- GS11189-Deviation-Request-Form\_2\_Final decision.pdf
- GS11189-Deviation-Request-Form\_3\_Final decision.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-3318
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-3318
- GS.VER.23.60\_FVR\_Kenya\_MP04\_CL(2).pdf
- GS.VER.21.15\_FVR\_B2 Kenya\_20221019.pdf
- GS.VER.22.47\_FVR\_Kenya\_MP03\_V2.0.pdf
- GS.VER.22.47\_FVR\_B1 Kenya\_v1.1.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-60F34C20 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)