

## QUALITY REPORT

# Optimisation of Kiambere Hydro Power Project

XEP-c0f351 · CDM

Report ID: CM-E476ED0D · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

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

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

## Assessment Summary

The extracted record contains no usable project documentation, so core integrity elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring performance) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claim support is high.

## Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	XEP-c0f351
Sector	renewable_energy
Vintage	2025
Confidence	Low
Scored	2026-04-02

## Red Flags

- No project documents were available in the extracted record (0 documents), preventing validation of additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring.
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key document was poorly readable, further reducing reliability.

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

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

~ As a hydro optimisation project, integrity could be strong if properly evidenced, but no supporting evidence is available here.

No validation/verification, monitoring, or PDD content is available in the extracted record (0 documents), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any corrective actions cannot be confirmed. With these core integrity elements not stated in available documents, the project must be scored conservatively.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed ER figures are available in the extracted record.

- Registry/public disclosure completeness cannot be assessed because no evidence documents were captured.

The extracted record does not include a VVB name, monitoring period, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions because no evidence documents were captured. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that missing items are simply absent rather than unreadable.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and monitoring details are not found in the extracted record.

- CORSIA/CCP status is not found in the extracted record, increasing uncertainty for downstream claims.

Because baseline method, grid emission factor approach, and monitoring/verification outcomes are not found in the extracted record, the risk of unsupported or overstated credit claims cannot be ruled out. Eligibility signals (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) are also not found, increasing greenwashing and double-claim uncertainty.

### Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, indicating a major evidence gap.

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/quality issues.

Documentation is extremely weak: the extracted record shows zero evidence documents and low extraction confidence. This prevents cross-checking of key parameters and indicates that even if documents exist, they were not successfully captured/read.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	No additionality evidence found
● <b>Permanence</b>	Reversal/buffer not evidenced
● <b>Leakage</b>	Leakage treatment not found
● <b>Baseline</b>	Baseline method not found
● <b>Safeguards</b>	Safeguards not evidenced
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not found

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports so additionality, baseline method, leakage, and verified ERs can be assessed.

→ Provide registry and issuance/retirement records plus VVB details (including any corrective actions) to support transparency and claim safety.

---

### 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-E476ED0D · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

[carbonmeld.com](https://carbonmeld.com) · [carbonmeld.com/methodology](https://carbonmeld.com/methodology) · [carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy](https://carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy)