

QUALITY REPORT

Afforestation on the Big Island of Hawaii: Restoring native hardwood forests and enhancing multiple ecosystem services

GS-1333 · GS · United States

Report ID: CM-7665561A · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0



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

Assessment Summary

This is a forestry afforestation project with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings in the verification report, which supports a moderate-to-strong integrity profile. However, several key risk controls are not stated in the extracted record, especially leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and reversal handling, which limits confidence in permanence and over-crediting risk.

Project Details

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Registry | Gold Standard |
| Registry ID | GS-1333 |
| Sector | arr |
| Country | United States |
| Vintage | Aging |
| Project Methodology | Gold Standard Afforestation/Reforestation (A/R) GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Methodology GS A/R requirements V0.9 (Road Test) |
| Crediting Period | 2010 — 2059 |
| VVB | Pangolin Associates |
| Monitoring Period | 2022 — 2022 |
| Confidence | High |
| Documents Reviewed | 8 documents reviewed |
| Scored | 2026-04-13 |

Red Flags

- Leakage treatment is not stated, and no leakage deduction is reported in the extracted record.
- Permanence controls are incomplete in the extracted record because buffer pool coverage and reversal-event handling are not stated.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.6 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, and the verification report reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- Leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and reversal-event detail are not stated in the available documents.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and says the VVB found no material findings or required corrective actions. That supports the project's core integrity case. Still, leakage treatment is not stated, buffer pool coverage is not found in the extracted record, and reversal handling is marked as not addressed, which weakens permanence and leakage confidence.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

- + The project has a named verifier, Pangolin Associates, and a defined monitoring period for 2022.
- Key MRV details such as total credits claimed versus verified, leakage treatment, and usage monitoring are not stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is moderate because the verifier is named as Pangolin Associates and the monitoring period is clearly stated as 2022. However, the extracted record does not state total credits claimed versus verified, usage monitoring method, or leakage treatment, so the public MRV picture is incomplete. The documentation is readable and multi-sourced, but key quantitative fields are missing.

Claim Safety — 5.0 / 10

- + The project uses a Gold Standard afforestation/reforestation methodology and the baseline was last reassessed in 2012.
- No quantified leakage deduction, FNRB value, or usage-rate evidence is available, leaving over-crediting risk only partially assessed.

Claim safety is middling. The project uses a Gold Standard afforestation/reforestation methodology and the baseline was last reassessed in 2012, which is helpful, but the baseline is project-based rather than clearly standardized or jurisdictional. Because leakage deduction, FNRB, and usage-rate evidence are not stated, the risk of over-crediting cannot be tightly bounded.

Documentation — 6.4 / 10

- + Six documents were used, including the PDD and verification report, and extraction confidence is high.
- The record still lacks several important fields, including buffer pool, leakage, and CORSIA/CCP status.

Documentation quality is fair to good: six documents were used, including the PDD, verification report, and appendix, and extraction confidence is high. The crediting period is long and the monitoring period is recent, which helps, but several important fields remain absent from the extracted record. No corrective actions were required, which is a positive sign, but the evidence set is still incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| ● Additionality | VVB-confirmed additionality |
| ● Permanence | buffer and reversal controls unclear |
| ● Leakage | leakage not stated |
| ● Baseline | project baseline with reassessment date |
| ● Safeguards | grievance and benefit-sharing present, FPIC not stated |
| ● Double-claim | CORSIA/CCP status not stated |

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide quantified leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and reversal monitoring details in the public documentation.

→ Disclose verified issuance figures, usage monitoring assumptions, and explicit CORSIA/CCP status to reduce double-claim and over-crediting uncertainty.

Documents Reviewed

- GS3260_GS3260 Annual Report 2022.pdf
- GS3260_GS4GG Transition Annex_Revised_June2021.docx
- GS3260_Project Map_Revised Feb15.pdf
- GS3260_3.2_LSC_Revised Feb15_Changes saved.pdf
- GS3260_PDD_Aug2021(1).docx
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1333
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1333
- HLC_Verification_Report_Final_09Dec2020(1).pdf

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-7665561A · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy