

QUALITY REPORT

Olkaria I Units 4&5 Geothermal Project

XEP-914c44 · CDM

Report ID: CM-59C7A3EA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	0.8

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

Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project details from official documents, so additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and MRV quality cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting or misinterpretation is high and the project cannot be quality-assessed beyond a very conservative score.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	XEP-914c44
Sector	renewable_energy
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- No official documents were captured in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring claims
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, increasing the risk of missing or incorrect facts

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any non-conformities are not found in the extracted record because no documents were available

~ Geothermal projects can be high-integrity, but this cannot be confirmed without the PDD/monitoring/verification reports

No project design or assurance documents were captured in the extracted record (no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report listed), so additionality testing, baseline methodology, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions are not stated in available documents. Because these core integrity elements cannot be checked, the score is set conservatively low. The low extraction confidence further increases the likelihood that key integrity-relevant details were missed.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB, monitoring period, or quantified ER claim/verification information is available in the extracted record

- Registry/documentation completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were provided

Transparency cannot be substantiated because the extracted record contains no evidence documents and no information on the VVB, monitoring period, or reported versus verified emission reductions. With no auditable trail to public documentation, MRV quality and registry completeness cannot be evaluated. Given the evidence gap, transparency is scored very low.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- No information is available on baseline assumptions, leakage justification, or eligibility statuses that affect over-crediting and greenwashing risk

~ CDM projects can have standardized MRV structures, but this cannot be relied upon without the underlying reports

Claim safety is weak due to the absence of any extracted information on baseline setting, leakage justification, or eligibility/quality labels (such as CORSIA or CCP status). Without verified ER figures or monitoring details, over-crediting risk cannot be bounded. The low extraction confidence adds uncertainty that would increase greenwashing risk for end users relying on this record alone.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, so the record is not auditable

- Low extraction confidence suggests missing/uncertain content even if documents exist elsewhere

Documentation is extremely incomplete: the extracted record lists zero documents used and provides no citations to official project documents. In addition, the minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and reducing reliability. This warrants a very low documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer not documented
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	Eligibility/labels not stated

What Would Improve This Score

- Provide and extract the PDD, latest monitoring report, and latest verification/certification report so additionality, baseline method, leakage, and MRV results can be assessed
- Add registry-linked metadata (VVB name, monitoring period, ER claimed vs verified, and any CORSIA/CCP status) and re-run extraction with higher-quality scans to raise extraction confidence

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-59C7A3EA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy