QUALITY REPORT

Safe Water Programme – Nigeria - VPA 85

GS-4328 · Gold Standard · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-EB2072D1 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	6.1
	Transparency (25%)	5.0
	Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
	Documentation (15%)	4.2

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 material findings reported in the validation record. However, several key items are missing or only partially documented, and the extracted record contains contradictions on usage monitoring, benefit sharing, and the crediting period, which reduces confidence in the file. Overall, this looks like a moderate-quality project with meaningful evidence gaps rather than a high-confidence claim.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4328
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

- ■ Contradictory records on usage monitoring method and benefit-sharing disclosure reduce reliability of the documentation set.
- ■ Leakage is described as negligible, but no quantified deduction is provided and the supporting rationale is thin.
- ■ Key registry and claim-safety fields such as total verified issuance, CORSIA eligibility, and CCP status are not stated in the extracted documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ The validation report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB found no material findings.

- Leakage is only described as negligible, with no quantified deduction stated in the available record.

The validation report supports additionality because it says a combined additionality test was used and that Earthood Services Private Limited verified it. The same report also notes no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is positive for project robustness. On the other hand, leakage is only described as negligible, with no percentage deduction stated, so the leakage treatment is not fully transparent.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ The validation report identifies the VVB as Earthood Services Private Limited and the monitoring period is at least partially specified.

- Total claimed and verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted documents, and the monitoring period end date is missing.

Transparency is mixed because the VVB is named and the monitoring period begins on 2021-11-01, but the end date is missing in the extracted record. The record also does not state total verified or claimed emission reductions, which limits public traceability of performance. The use of stratified random sampling for usage monitoring is a positive sign, but the missing quantitative outputs keep the score moderate.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

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

- The record does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, and the contradictory usage-monitoring entries weaken confidence in the claimed savings.

Claim safety is weakened by missing registry-level claim information: CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in the available documents. The baseline method is project-based rather than jurisdictional, which is generally less conservative than a standardized baseline. The contradiction between stratified random sampling and self-report for usage monitoring also raises over-crediting risk, even though the validation report itself is more recent and therefore was given more weight.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

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

- Extraction confidence is low, and the record contains contradictions on benefit sharing, usage monitoring, and the crediting period.

The file draws on eleven documents, including a validation report, stakeholder consultation material, and an appendix, which is a reasonable base. However, extraction confidence is low, meaning at least one key document was hard to read, and that lowers confidence in the documentation set. The contradictions on benefit sharing, usage monitoring, and the crediting period further reduce documentation quality, even though the validation report is the most authoritative source for the core project assessment.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed combined test
● **Permanence**	No reversal evidence, but buffer not stated
● **Leakage**	Negligible claim without quantified deduction
● **Baseline**	Project baseline with reassessment timing known
● **Safeguards**	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● **Double-claim**	CORSIA and CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the verified and claimed emission reduction totals, along with the full monitoring period and registry issuance details.

→ Provide a quantified leakage assessment and resolve the contradictions on usage monitoring, benefit sharing, and the crediting period in a single authoritative document.

Documents Reviewed

- GS.VAL.23.53_VPA 74 to 104 Inclusion Report_CL(42).pdf
- GS VPA-DD 12401 Nigeria VPA-85_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
- GS11189 VPA 74-104(GS12390-12420) Nigeria WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v3.0 09042024(11).xlsx
- GS PoA 11189 PoA-DD v5.0 25052022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4328
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4328
- 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-EB2072D1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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