

QUALITY REPORT

Olkaria II Geothermal Expansion Project

XEP-d81e06 · CDM

Report ID: CM-47377122 · 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 documentation, so core quality elements (additionality, baseline, leakage, and monitoring results) cannot be substantiated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak claims is high due to lack of evidence rather than evidence of poor performance.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	XEP-d81e06
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, and MRV.
- 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 approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any non-conformities are not found in the extracted record (no documents available).

- No contradictions were detected, but this provides little assurance given the absence of underlying evidence.

No project design or assurance documents were captured in the extracted record, so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be verified. With no monitoring or verification content available, there is no basis to judge whether credited reductions are conservative. The score is therefore conservative and driven by evidence absence rather than identified methodological flaws.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- Monitoring period, verifier identity, and any claimed vs verified emission reductions are not found in the extracted record.

- Registry-relevant attributes (e.g., eligibility flags) are not found in the extracted record.

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no documents and does not provide basic MRV details such as the monitoring period, the VVB name, or any comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. Low extraction confidence further suggests that even if documents existed, key information may not have been reliably extracted. As a result, public traceability and auditability are effectively not demonstrated here.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- Over-crediting risk cannot be assessed because baseline and monitoring evidence are not available in the extracted record.

- Eligibility/status signals that would reduce greenwashing risk are not found in the extracted record.

Claim safety is weak because the extracted record provides no baseline method, no leakage justification, and no verified performance figures, all of which are needed to assess over-crediting and greenwashing risk. Eligibility indicators that could clarify downstream claim constraints (e.g., CORSIA/CCP status) are also not found in the extracted record. The score reflects high uncertainty and inability to substantiate claims.

Documentation — 0.8 / 10

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

- Low extraction confidence suggests document readability/ingestion issues, reducing reliability.

Documentation quality is very poor: the extracted record shows zero documents used and an empty evidence list. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which undermines reliability even further. This combination warrants a very low documentation score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Permanence/reversal provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	No leakage treatment found
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards evidence not found
● Double-claim	Eligibility/status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide and extract core CDM documents (PDD, validation report, monitoring report(s), and verification/certification report(s)) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV can be assessed.

→ Improve document readability/extraction (higher OCR quality) and include registry/issuance data (monitoring periods, verified ERs, VVB identity, and any eligibility/status flags).

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-47377122 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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