

QUALITY REPORT

# Clean Energy for the Kenyan Future

XEP-fb275b · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-B2B9A47C · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

|                                                              |                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| <div>1.4</div> <div>Overall Score</div> <div>out of 10</div> | ■ 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 MRV results) cannot be validated. With low extraction confidence and zero documents captured, the risk of over-crediting and weak substantiation is high based on evidence gaps alone.

## Project Details

|             |               |
|-------------|---------------|
| Registry    | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | XEP-fb275b    |
| Sector      | other         |
| 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 results
- Low extraction confidence indicates at least one key source was poorly readable, further reducing reliability

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 2.0 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any reversals are not stated in available documents
- ~ 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 (no evidence documents listed), so additionality testing, baseline selection, leakage treatment, and any permanence/reversal provisions cannot be evaluated. With these core integrity elements not stated in available documents, integrity must be scored conservatively.

### Transparency — 0.5 / 10

- No VVB name, monitoring period, or verified vs claimed emission reductions are available 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 verification/monitoring documentation (0 documents used) and does not provide a VVB name, monitoring period, or any claimed versus verified emission reductions. Low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the public record was successfully captured.

### Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- CORSIA/CCP status and key over-crediting risk parameters (baseline and leakage) are not stated in available documents
- ~ With no quantified ERR information, the risk of misclaiming cannot be bounded from the extracted record

Claim safety is weak because eligibility/status indicators (such as CORSIA eligibility or CCP status) and the main drivers of over-crediting risk (baseline method and leakage justification) are not stated in available documents. Without any quantified verified results, it is not possible to assess whether credits are likely to be overstated.

### Documentation — 0.8 / 10

- Zero documents were used and no evidence documents are listed in the extracted record
- Minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating poor readability/quality of at least one key source

Documentation quality is extremely poor: no evidence documents are listed and the extraction used zero documents. The minimum extraction confidence is low, indicating at least one key source was poorly readable, which materially undermines document completeness and reliability.

## Risk Indicators

|                        |                                              |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| ● <b>Additionality</b> | No additionality assessment found            |
| ● <b>Permanence</b>    | Permanence/reversal provisions not evidenced |
| ● <b>Leakage</b>       | No leakage treatment found                   |
| ● <b>Baseline</b>      | No baseline method found                     |
| ● <b>Safeguards</b>    | No safeguards evidence found                 |
| ● <b>Double-claim</b>  | CORSIA/CCP status not stated                 |

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the PDD and the latest monitoring and verification reports (including VVB opinion) so additionality, baseline, leakage, and verified ERs can be checked

→ Publish registry-relevant fields (monitoring period, issuance/retirement data, CORSIA/CCP status) and improve document legibility 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-B2B9A47C · 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)