

QUALITY REPORT

Olkaria IV Geothermal Project

XEP-320d56 · CDM

Report ID: CM-FCDD30A6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------|
| 1.6 Overall Score out of 10 | ■ Integrity (35%) | 2.2 |
| | ■ Transparency (25%) | 0.8 |
| | ■ Claim Safety (25%) | 2.0 |
| | ■ Documentation (15%) | 1.2 |

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation beyond basic identifiers, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring performance) cannot be substantiated. Given the low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the project should be treated as high uncertainty and high over-crediting/greenwashing risk until primary CDM documents are reviewed.

Project Details

| | |
|-------------|------------------|
| Registry | UNFCCC CDM |
| Registry ID | XEP-320d56 |
| Sector | renewable_energy |
| Vintage | 2025 |
| Confidence | Low |
| Scored | 2026-04-02 |

Red Flags

- No project documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, or monitoring results
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

- Additionality approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any non-conformities are not found in the extracted record (no documents provided)

- Geothermal is typically a low-reversal-risk technology, but permanence and leakage provisions are not evidenced in available documents

No validation/verification, PDD, or monitoring report content is available in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any material findings/corrective actions cannot be confirmed. The minimum extraction confidence is low, which further increases the chance that key integrity-relevant details were missed or unreadable. As a result, integrity must be scored conservatively due to major evidence gaps.

Transparency — 0.8 / 10

- VVB identity, monitoring period, and any claimed vs verified ER figures are not found in the extracted record

- Registry/MRV completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured

The extracted record does not include the VVB name, monitoring period, or any quantified claimed-versus-verified emission reductions, so MRV transparency cannot be assessed. With no evidence documents listed and low extraction confidence, registry completeness and public traceability are effectively unverified. This warrants a low transparency score driven by missing primary sources.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not found in the extracted record, leaving double-claim/market-eligibility risk unresolved

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and monitoring assumptions are not available

Because baseline method, leakage justification/deductions, and any usage or grid-related parameters are not available in the extracted record, over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not found, leaving market-eligibility and double-claim signaling unresolved. Given these unknowns, claim safety is scored low to reflect elevated greenwashing risk from insufficient substantiation.

Documentation — 1.2 / 10

- No evidence documents were captured (0 documents used), indicating severe documentation gaps

- Low extraction confidence reduces reliability of any absence-of-evidence conclusions

The extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence document list, indicating that core CDM documentation (PDD, validation report, monitoring report, verification/certification report) was not captured. The minimum extraction confidence is low, suggesting at least one key source was poorly readable and undermining completeness. Documentation quality is therefore very weak.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ● Additionality | No additionality evidence found |
| ● Permanence | Low reversal risk but not evidenced |
| ● Leakage | Leakage treatment not found |
| ● Baseline | Baseline method not found |
| ● Safeguards | Safeguards not found |
| ● Double-claim | Eligibility/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract the CDM PDD, validation report, and the latest monitoring and verification/certification reports so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV performance can be evidenced

→ Add registry-linked issuance/verification data (monitoring period, ERs claimed vs verified, VVB identity, and any CARs/CLs) and clarify CORSIA eligibility/CCP status to reduce claim and double-claim uncertainty

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-FCDD30A6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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