

QUALITY REPORT

Safe Water Programme – Kenya - VPA 50

GS-4235 · Gold Standard · Kenya

Report ID: CM-0F5A8E87 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	5.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.9
	■ Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity support because additionality was confirmed by the VVB and the monitoring record shows a measured usage rate above the assumed value. However, leakage is not addressed, the baseline is project-specific rather than standardized, and the file contains several material findings, which weakens confidence in the claimed reductions. Documentation is only moderate because key values are missing or inconsistent across documents, even though multiple source types were used.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4235
Sector	industrial
Country	Kenya
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	Emission reductions from Safe Drinking Water Supply Version 1.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2025
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2023
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	16 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- Leakage is marked as not addressed, with no quantified deduction found in the extracted record.
- The file lists many material findings, including multiple CARs and CLs, which suggests significant verification issues.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the test type is described as combined in the issuance record.
- Leakage is not addressed, and no leakage deduction percentage is stated in the available documents.

The issuance record shows additionality confirmed by Earthood Services Private Limited, which is a positive sign for project robustness. At the same time, the baseline is project-based rather than a standardized or jurisdictional approach, leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed, and there are many material findings listed, including multiple CARs and CLs plus one FAR. No reversal events are reported, but buffer pool coverage is not stated, so permanence protection is only partially evidenced.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

- + The monitoring period is clearly stated, and the VVB is identified as Earthood Services Private Limited.
- Total claimed and verified emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, limiting traceability of the crediting outcome.

The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2023-01-01 to 2023-11-30, and the VVB is named, which helps traceability. However, the extracted record does not state total claimed or verified emission reductions, and the baseline was not last reassessed in the available documents. The monitoring approach is described as an annual survey, but the overall disclosure remains incomplete.

Claim Safety — 4.9 / 10

- + The verified usage rate of about 96.3% is higher than the assumed 90%, which supports the monitored parameter.
- The baseline is project-specific, leakage treatment is unclear, and the record does not state CORSIA or CCP status.

The verified usage rate of about 96.3% is above the assumed 90%, which reduces concern about one monitored parameter being overstated. Still, the project uses a project-specific baseline, leakage is not addressed, and the record does not provide CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so dual-market and over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out. The FNRB value is given as 0.9351 using a local field method, but the record does not provide a clear comparison against a national default in the extracted facts.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

- + Sixteen documents were used, including a validation report, monitoring report, stakeholder consultation, and appendix.
- Extraction confidence is only medium, and several key fields are missing or contradictory across documents.

Documentation breadth is moderate because the extracted set includes 16 documents and references validation, monitoring, stakeholder consultation, and appendix materials. Even so, the extraction confidence is only medium, and several important fields are missing, including total ERR figures, buffer pool percentage, and baseline reassessment timing. The presence of many material findings also suggests the documentation package required substantial follow-up.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality test
● Permanence	No reversals reported, but buffer not stated
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment not stated
● Safeguards	FPIC, grievance mechanism, and safeguards noted
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide a clear quantified leakage assessment and any deduction applied, with supporting methodology.
- Publish reconciled ERR figures, baseline reassessment history, and a complete resolution of all CARs and CLs.

Documents Reviewed

- Public_GS11189 VPA 31-47 and 49-61 Kenya_MP4 ER sheet ver.4.0.xlsx
- GS11189 VPA 31-47 49-61 Kenya WPS - MP4 MR v5.0_Clean.pdf
- VPA 49-73 Kenya WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v2.0 30102023.xlsx
- GS 11189 SDG Impact Tool_Not applicable.xlsx
- GS 11189_VPA 49- 73_ Stakeholder-Consultation-Report.pdf
- GS VPA-DD 12252 Kenya VPA-50_ver5.0_22112023.pdf
- DEV_387.pdf
- DEV_703.pdf
- GS.VAL.23.53_VPA 49 to 73 Inclusion Report.pdf
- GS 11189 Design Consultation Report V1.1 22052022.pdf
- GS 11189-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report Final with Annex.pdf
- GS PoA 11189 PoA-DD v5.0 25052022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4235
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4235
- GS.VER.23.60_FVR_Kenya_MP04_CL(2).pdf
- FVR_PoA Validation_11189-updated(FB_round) 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-0F5A8E87 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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