

QUALITY REPORT

Safe Water Programme – Nigeria - VPA 95

GS-4318 · Gold Standard · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-F51DC62D · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.6
■ Documentation (15%)	4.6

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals: additionality was confirmed by the VVB, the baseline was reassessed in 2021, and no unresolved material findings are shown in the validation report. However, transparency and claim safety are weakened by missing verification figures, self-reported usage monitoring, no stated leakage treatment, and low extraction confidence across the source set.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4318
Sector	industrial
Country	Nigeria
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC Version 3.1
Crediting Period	2024 — 2029
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2021-11-01 — null
Confidence	Low
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted record, with no quantified deduction or justification shown.
- The crediting period is inconsistent across documents, which reduces confidence in the record and the timing of claims.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ The validation report from Earthood Services Private Limited confirms additionality through a combined test, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2021.

- Leakage treatment is not stated, and no buffer pool or reversal protection is shown in the extracted record.

The validation report from Earthood Services Private Limited confirms additionality using a combined test, which supports the project's core integrity case. The baseline method is project-based and was last reassessed in 2021, but leakage treatment is not addressed in the extracted record and no buffer pool or reversal information is available. No unresolved material findings are shown, although the closed CLs and CAR indicate the validation process did require follow-up.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The validation report identifies the VVB and shows a defined monitoring period beginning on 2021-11-01, with safeguards and grievance mechanisms documented.

- The extracted record does not provide verified emission totals, and usage monitoring is based on self-reporting rather than direct measurement.

Transparency is moderate because the validation report identifies the verifier and the monitoring period, and the record also shows FPIC, grievance mechanisms, and benefit-sharing documentation. However, the extracted facts do not include verified emission totals, and usage monitoring is self-reported, which is weaker than direct metering or third-party verification. The low extraction confidence further limits trust in the completeness of the public record.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project uses the TPDDTEC methodology under Gold Standard, which is generally more structured than an ad hoc baseline approach.

- No leakage deduction is stated, and the record does not show verified usage rates or any clear CORSIA/CCP status.

Claim safety is only moderate because the project sits on a structured Gold Standard methodology, but the record does not show quantified leakage treatment or verified usage rates. The absence of CORSIA and CCP status in the extracted facts leaves dual-claim risk unresolved rather than clearly excluded. Because the baseline is project-specific rather than jurisdictional, the over-crediting risk is not negligible.

Documentation — 4.6 / 10

+ The record draws on multiple document types, including a validation report, stakeholder consultation material, and an appendix, with 11 documents used.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the crediting period is contradictory across documents, which weakens document reliability.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence and missing key quantitative fields, including verified emissions totals, usage rates, and leakage deductions. The record does show multiple document types and 11 documents used, which is a positive sign, but the contradictory crediting period values reduce reliability. I privileged the later crediting-period value from the 2024-04-12 source over the 2023-06-29 value because it is more recent, but the contradiction itself still warrants a downward adjustment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal evidence
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessed in 2021
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish verified monitoring results, including total emissions reductions, usage rates, and the exact leakage treatment applied.

→ Resolve the crediting-period discrepancy and provide clear registry status on CORSIA eligibility and any CCP-related claims.

Documents Reviewed

- GS VPA-DD 12411 Nigeria VPA-95_ver5.0_09042024(1).docx
- GS11189 VPA 74-104(GS12390-12420) Nigeria WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v3.0 09042024(21).xlsx
- DEV_387.pdf
- DEV_703.pdf
- GS 11189 Design Consultation Report V1.1 22052022.pdf
- GS 11189-Stakeholder-Consultation-Report Final with Annex.pdf
- GS.VAL.23.53_VPA 74 to 104 Inclusion Report_CL(52).pdf
- GS PoA 11189 PoA-DD v5.0 25052022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4318
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4318
- 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-F51DC62D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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