

QUALITY REPORT

Safe Water Programme – Nigeria - VPA 75

GS-4338 · Gold Standard · Nigeria

Report ID: CM-F1CDE4A8 · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.8

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.8
■ Transparency (25%)	5.6
■ Claim Safety (25%)	5.4
■ Documentation (15%)	4.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive integrity signals: the VVB confirmed additionality, no material findings were reported, and the monitoring period is recent. However, key crediting details are missing or weakly evidenced, including the absence of verified error totals, no stated leakage deduction percentage, and no buffer pool information. Overall, this is a moderate-quality file with meaningful evidence gaps and some reliability concerns.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-4338
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 verified total emission reduction figures are available in the extracted record, limiting confidence in the claimed issuance.
- The monitoring method is contradictory across documents, and the record has low extraction confidence, which weakens trust in the documentation.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.8 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by Earthood Services Private Limited in the validation report using a combined test.
- Leakage treatment is incomplete in the extracted record: the justification is described as quantified, but no deduction percentage is stated and buffer pool coverage is not found.

The validation report dated 2022-05-20 names Earthood Services Private Limited and says additionality was confirmed through a combined test, with no material findings or corrective actions reported. On the weaker side, the extracted record does not state a buffer pool percentage, does not provide a leakage deduction percentage, and does not show verified emission reduction totals, so permanence and quantification confidence are only moderate.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The project has a named VVB and a defined recent monitoring period from 2024-12-01 to 2024-12-31.
- The extracted record does not provide verified or claimed ERR totals, and the low extraction confidence suggests at least one key document was hard to read.

The file identifies the registry as Gold Standard, names the VVB, and gives a recent monitoring period from 2024-12-01 to 2024-12-31. But the extracted record does not include claimed or verified ERR totals, and the low extraction confidence indicates at least one source document was difficult to read, reducing transparency.

Claim Safety — 5.4 / 10

- + The project uses the TPDDTEC methodology and reports a local-field FNRB value of 82.3, which is at least grounded in local data.
- The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, while CCP status is not stated; combined with missing ERR totals and no leakage percentage, this leaves residual over-crediting and dual-claim risk.

The project's use of TPDDTEC and a locally derived FNRB value of 82.3 are positive signs, and the validation report supports additionality. Still, the absence of verified ERR totals, the missing leakage percentage, and the fact that CORSIA eligibility is true while CCP status is not stated leave meaningful over-crediting and dual-claim concerns.

Documentation — 4.8 / 10

- + Twelve documents were used, including a validation report and stakeholder consultation material, and the crediting period is clearly stated.
- Extraction confidence is low, and the record contains a contradiction on the usage monitoring method, with one document indicating annual survey and another indicating sampling.

Twelve documents were used, including a validation report, stakeholder consultation material, and an appendix, which supports a reasonably broad evidence base. However, the extraction confidence is low, and the record contains a contradiction on the usage monitoring method: one source says annual survey while another says sampling. The crediting period is stated, but several key quantitative fields remain unavailable in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Leakage quantified but deduction missing
● Baseline	Project baseline, reassessment timing unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish verified and claimed ERR totals for the monitoring period, with a clear reconciliation to issuance.

→ State the leakage deduction percentage, buffer pool treatment, and resolve the monitoring-method contradiction with a single authoritative source.

Documents Reviewed

- GS11189_NG_MP6_Annual-Report_1-12-24_31-12-24.pdf
- GS.VAL.23.53_VPA 74 to 104 Inclusion Report_CL(32).pdf
- GS VPA-DD 12391 Nigeria VPA-75_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(1).xlsx
- GS PoA 11189 PoA-DD v5.0 25052022.docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-4338
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-4338
- 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-F1CDE4A8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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