QUALITY REPORT

Safe Water Programme – Nigeria - VPA 87

GS-4326 · Gold Standard · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-A65FE44C · 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 recent baseline reassessment in 2021, and no reported reversals. However, several key items are missing or only loosely documented, including buffer coverage, leakage quantification, and verified usage-rate evidence, which weakens confidence in the claimed climate benefits.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4326
Sector	industrial
Country	Nigeria
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	TPDDTEC 3.1
Crediting Period	2024 — 2029
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	12 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- No buffer pool percentage is stated, so permanence protection is not clearly evidenced.
- Leakage is described as negligible, but no deduction percentage is provided and usage-rate verification is missing.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by Earthood Services Private Limited in the validation report, using a combined test.

- Buffer pool coverage is not stated, leakage deduction is not quantified, and no reversal detail is reported in the extracted record.

The validation report by Earthood Services Private Limited confirms additionality through a combined test, which supports the project's core integrity case. The baseline was last reassessed in 2021, and no reversal events are reported, but permanence protection is weakened because no buffer pool percentage is stated. Leakage is treated as negligible, yet no quantified deduction is provided, so the evidence is incomplete.

Transparency — 5.1 / 10

+ The monitoring period is clearly stated for December 2024, and the validation report identifies the VVB.

- Total verified emissions reductions are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low.

The monitoring period for December 2024 is clearly identified, and the project has a named VVB, which helps traceability. However, the extracted record does not provide total verified emissions reductions, and the low extraction confidence suggests at least one key source was difficult to read. Usage monitoring is described as an annual survey, but the underlying verified usage rate is not stated.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

+ The baseline was reassessed in 2021, which is better than an outdated or missing baseline reference.

- Usage-rate verification is not stated, leakage is only described as negligible, and the project is not clearly marked as outside CORSIA or CCP channels.

Claim safety is moderate because the project uses a project baseline and has a recent reassessment, but the evidence base is not strong enough to rule out over-crediting concerns. The assumed usage rate is 0.9, while the verified usage rate is not found in the available documents, and leakage is only described as negligible rather than quantified. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be excluded from the extracted record.

Documentation — 4.3 / 10

+ The record includes multiple document types, including a validation report and stakeholder consultation materials.

- Extraction confidence is low, and the contradiction set shows shifting crediting-period and benefit-sharing statements across documents.

Documentation breadth is decent because the extracted record references a validation report, stakeholder consultation, and appendix material, with 12 documents used overall. Still, the extraction confidence is low, which lowers trust in completeness, and the contradiction set shows differing crediting-period dates and a change in benefit-sharing description across documents. Those inconsistencies reduce confidence in the documentary trail even though the project appears to have multiple source documents.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed combined test
● **Permanence**	No buffer pool stated
● **Leakage**	Negligible claim, no quantified deduction
● **Baseline**	Project baseline, reassessed in 2021
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified emissions reductions, usage-rate evidence, and leakage treatment with a clear quantified deduction.

→ Disclose buffer pool coverage, CORSIA/CCP status, and reconcile the conflicting crediting-period and benefit-sharing statements.

Documents Reviewed

- GS11189_NG_MP6_Annual-Report_1-12-24_31-12-24.pdf
- GS11189 VPA 74-104(GS12390-12420) Nigeria WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v3.0 09042024(13).xlsx
- GS VPA-DD 12403 Nigeria VPA-87_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.VAL.23.53_VPA 74 to 104 Inclusion Report_CL(44).pdf
- GS PoA 11189 PoA-DD v5.0 25052022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4326
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4326
- FVR_PoA Validation_11189-updated(FB_round) clean.pdf

Report ID: CM-A65FE44C · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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