

QUALITY REPORT

Safe Water Programme – Nigeria - VPA 86

GS-4327 · Gold Standard · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-36FE8B1A · 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%)	4.7
	Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%	

Assessment Summary

The project has some integrity strengths: the VVB confirmed additionality, the baseline was reassessed in 2021, and no unresolved material findings remain. However, several key risk controls are not fully documented, including buffer pool coverage, leakage deduction details, and verified usage rates, which limits confidence in the claimed climate benefits.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4327
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

- Leakage treatment is described as quantified, but the actual deduction percentage is not stated in the extracted record.
- The crediting period differs across documents, and the record has low extraction confidence, which weakens reliability.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by Earthood Services Private Limited in the validation report, and the project uses a combined additionality test.

- Buffer pool coverage is not stated, leakage deduction is not quantified in the extracted record, and the monitoring period is incomplete.

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 permanence and leakage controls are only partially evidenced because buffer pool coverage is not stated and the leakage deduction is not quantified in the extracted record. No unresolved material findings remain, which is positive, but the missing quantitative safeguards keep the score below strong-project territory.

Transparency — 5.4 / 10

+ The validation report identifies the verifier, the methodology version, and a baseline reassessment in 2021.

- Total verified emissions reductions are not stated, usage is self-reported, and the monitoring period end date is missing.

Transparency is moderate because the validation report identifies the verifier, methodology version 3.1, and the monitoring period start date, and the project is documented under Gold Standard. However, total verified emissions reductions are not stated, the monitoring period end date is missing, and usage monitoring relies on self-reporting rather than independently verified values. These gaps reduce the ability to trace the claim end-to-end.

Claim Safety — 5.6 / 10

+ The project is marked as Gold Standard and the validation report shows no unresolved material findings after closure of CL#01, CL#02, and CAR#01.

- The project is CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated; leakage and usage assumptions cannot be checked against quantified verification values.

Claim safety is mixed. The project has a Gold Standard validation record with no unresolved material findings, which helps, but the extracted record does not provide verified emissions reduction totals, verified usage rates, or a quantified leakage deduction. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be fully ruled out from the available evidence.

Documentation — 4.7 / 10

+ Multiple document types were used, including a validation report, stakeholder consultation material, and an appendix, and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism are mentioned.

- Extraction confidence is low, several key fields are missing, and the crediting period is contradictory across documents.

Documentation quality is limited by low extraction confidence, which suggests at least one key source was poorly readable. Although 11 documents were used and the record includes a validation report, stakeholder consultation material, and an appendix, several important fields remain missing or unspecified, including buffer pool coverage and verified usage rates. Safeguards are at least partially documented through FPIC, a grievance mechanism, and benefit-sharing language, but the contradictory crediting period entries reduce reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	buffer pool not stated
● Leakage	leakage quantified but not quantified in record
● Baseline	project baseline with reassessment date
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified emissions reduction totals, leakage deduction percentage, and usage-rate verification from the monitoring report.

→ Resolve the crediting-period discrepancy in the registry record and disclose buffer pool coverage or other permanence safeguards.

Documents Reviewed

- GS.VAL.23.53_VPA 74 to 104 Inclusion Report_CL(43).pdf
- GS VPA-DD 12402 Nigeria VPA-86_ver5.0_09042024(1).docx
- DEV_387.pdf
- DEV_703.pdf
- GS11189 VPA 74-104(GS12390-12420) Nigeria WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v3.0 09042024(12).xlsx
- 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-4327
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4327
- 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-36FE8B1A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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