

QUALITY REPORT

Redevelopment of Tana Hydro Power Station Project

XEP-d89da0 · CDM

Report ID: CM-AD8211B6 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.5Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.0
■ Transparency (25%)	0.5
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	1.0

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 performance) cannot be verified. Given the low readability flag and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high based on evidence gaps alone.

Project Details

Registry	UNFCCC CDM
Registry ID	XEP-d89da0
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 verification of additionality, baseline, leakage, and MRV details
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key document was poorly readable and increasing the risk of missing or mis-extracted critical facts

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality approach, baseline method, leakage treatment, and any findings/corrective actions were not found in the extracted record

~ Renewable energy projects can be robust under CDM, but this cannot be confirmed without the underlying PDD/monitoring/verification reports

No information on additionality testing, baseline approach, baseline reassessment timing, leakage deduction/justification, buffer or reversal provisions, or any material findings/corrective actions was found in the extracted record. With no PDD, monitoring report, or verification report available in the evidence set, integrity cannot be substantiated and is scored conservatively.

Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or claimed vs verified ER figures were found in the extracted record

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

Transparency is very limited because the extracted record contains no documents and therefore no VVB identity, monitoring period, or comparison of claimed versus verified emission reductions. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that key MRV details were captured even if they exist in source files.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and double-claim controls were not found in the extracted record

- Over-crediting risk cannot be evaluated because baseline and monitoring parameters were not found

Claim safety is weak due to the absence of baseline and monitoring parameters needed to judge over-crediting risk, and because CORSIA/CCP eligibility and double-claim safeguards were not found in the extracted record. Without documentary evidence, marketing or compliance claims would carry elevated greenwashing risk.

Documentation — 1.0 / 10

- Zero documents were used in extraction, leaving the assessment unsupported by primary sources

- Low extraction confidence suggests document quality/readability issues that undermine reliability

Documentation quality is very poor: the evidence document list is empty and zero documents were used, so there is no traceable basis for any key assertions. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating readability/extraction problems that further undermine completeness and reliability.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality assessment found
● Permanence	Reversal/buffer provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not found
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification/certification reports so additionality, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and MRV performance can be assessed

→ Provide registry extracts (issuance/retirement history) and explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility and any CCP/ICVCM status to reduce double-claim and greenwashing risk

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-AD8211B6 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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