QUALITY REPORT

Safe Water Programme – Nigeria - VPA 83

GS-4330 · GS · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-B4F912E3 · Generated: 2026-04-18 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	5.8
Transparency (25%)	4.9
Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
Documentation (15%)	5.6

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 documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, key uncertainty remains around leakage treatment, reversal handling, and inconsistent monitoring details across documents, which weakens confidence in the claimed emission reductions.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4330
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	Medium
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-18

Red Flags

- ■ Leakage is not addressed in the extracted validation record, despite a later document reportedly describing it as negligible.
- ■ Contradictions exist on the monitoring method and crediting period, which reduces reliability of the reported MRV trail.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.8 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the project uses a combined additionality test under the TPDDTEC methodology.

- Leakage is not addressed in the extracted validation record, and reversal events are marked as not addressed.

The validation report names Earthood Services Private Limited as the VVB and says additionality was confirmed, which supports the project’s core integrity case. The baseline method is project-based and the baseline was last reassessed in 2021, but leakage is not addressed in the extracted validation record and reversal events are also not addressed. The absence of a buffer pool percentage further limits confidence in permanence management.

Transparency — 4.9 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, a defined monitoring period, and the baseline was last reassessed in 2021.

- Total claimed versus verified emission reductions are not stated, and the monitoring approach is inconsistent across documents.

Transparency is mixed because the record identifies the registry, VVB, methodology, and monitoring period, but key quantitative MRV fields are missing. Total emission reductions claimed and verified are not stated in the extracted record, and usage-rate verification is also absent. The contradiction between annual survey and stratified random sampling for usage monitoring, plus the missing end date for the monitoring period, weakens traceability.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

+ The reported FNRB value is below the national default, which is directionally supportive of conservative accounting.

- Leakage treatment is unclear in the extracted record, and the project is not shown to be outside dual-claim channels because CORSIA and CCP status are not stated.

Claim safety is only moderate. The reported FNRB value is below the national default, which is a positive sign, but the extracted record does not provide a leakage deduction and instead leaves leakage justification as not addressed. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the available documents.

Documentation — 5.6 / 10

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

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the record contains contradictions on monitoring method and crediting period.

Documentation is reasonably broad, with nine documents used and evidence including a validation report, appendix, and stakeholder consultation material. FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are documented, which helps completeness. Still, extraction confidence is only medium, and the contradictions on monitoring method and crediting period indicate the document set is not fully consistent.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality test
Permanence	reversal handling not addressed
Leakage	leakage not addressed in extracted record
Baseline	project baseline with reassessment timing known
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear, reconciled MRV package showing the final monitoring method, crediting period, and verified emission reduction totals.

→ Provide explicit leakage treatment, reversal/buffer-pool information, and a registry statement on CORSIA eligibility and CCP status.

Documents Reviewed

- GS11189 VPA 74-104(GS12390-12420) Nigeria WPS - Ex-ante ER sheet v3.0 09042024(9).xlsx
- GS.VAL.23.53_VPA 74 to 104 Inclusion Report_CL(40).pdf
- GS VPA-DD 12399 Nigeria VPA-83_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-4330
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4330
- FVR_PoA Validation_11189-updated(FB_round) clean.pdf

Report ID: CM-B4F912E3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-18 · Generated: 2026-04-18

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