

## QUALITY REPORT

# Safe Water Programme – Nigeria - VPA 94

GS-4319 · Gold Standard · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-1178D41D · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

# 5.4

Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.2
■ Transparency (25%)	5.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	4.3

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

## Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a quantified leakage deduction, and a recent baseline reassessment. However, documentation quality is weakened by low extraction confidence and several contradictions across documents, especially on monitoring method, benefit sharing, and the crediting period. Overall, this looks like a moderate-quality Gold Standard project with meaningful evidence gaps and some reliability concerns.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4319
Sector	industrial
Country	Nigeria
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC 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

- Low extraction confidence and multiple contradictions reduce confidence in the record.
- The monitoring method, benefit-sharing description, and crediting period differ across documents.
- No verified emission reduction totals were available in the extracted record.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which supports the project case.

- The baseline is project-specific rather than a more robust standardized or jurisdictional baseline, and no buffer pool was found.

The validation report from 2022 confirms additionality through a combined test, which is a meaningful positive. The baseline method is project-based and was last reassessed in 2021, but no buffer pool was found and no reversal events were reported in the extracted record. Leakage was quantified at 5%, which helps, although the overall permanence picture is limited by missing buffer information.

### Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring report set out an annual survey approach and the project has a named VVB, Earthood Services Private Limited.

- Verified and claimed emission reduction totals were not found, and the record contains contradictions on the monitoring method and crediting period.

The project is documented under Gold Standard with Earthood Services Private Limited as VVB, and the monitoring approach references annual surveys. However, verified and claimed emission reduction totals were not found in the extracted record, which limits public traceability of performance. The low extraction confidence also weighs on transparency because at least one key document was poorly readable.

### Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ Leakage was addressed with a quantified deduction of 5%, which is better than an unquantified treatment.

- The usage rate was assumed at 90% while the verified usage rate was not found, leaving some over-crediting risk.

Claim safety is helped by the quantified leakage deduction and the VVB-confirmed additionality. Still, the assumed usage rate of 90% is not matched by a verified usage rate in the extracted record, so over-crediting risk cannot be ruled out. The project is not shown to have CORSIA or CCP status in the available data, so dual-claim risk is not clearly resolved.

### Documentation — 4.3 / 10

+ Multiple evidence documents were used, including a validation report, stakeholder consultation material, and an appendix.

- Extraction confidence was low, and key fields such as benefit sharing and the crediting period conflict across documents.

Documentation breadth is moderate: the extracted record cites 11 documents and includes a validation report, stakeholder consultation material, and an appendix. That said, extraction confidence is low, which materially weakens confidence in the record. There are also contradictions on the monitoring method, benefit sharing, and crediting period, suggesting the documentation set is not fully consistent.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed additionality
● <b>Permanence</b>	No buffer pool stated
● <b>Leakage</b>	Quantified 5% deduction
● <b>Baseline</b>	Project baseline, reassessed in 2021
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clean, reconciled monitoring package with verified and claimed emission reduction totals and a single authoritative crediting period.

→ Provide a verified usage-rate study and clarify the benefit-sharing arrangement, with document-level consistency across all reports.

## Documents Reviewed

- GS11189 VPA 74-104(GS12390-12420) Nigeria WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v3.0 09042024(20).xlsx
- GS.VAL.23.53\_VPA 74 to 104 Inclusion Report\_CL(51).pdf
- GS VPA-DD 12410 Nigeria VPA-94\_ver5.0\_09042024(1).docx
- 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 PoA 11189 PoA-DD v5.0 25052022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4319
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4319
- 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-1178D41D · 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)