

## QUALITY REPORT

# Afforestation with Hazelnut Plantations in Western Georgia

GS-1804 · GS · Georgia

Report ID: CM-8646AC70 · Generated: 2026-04-13 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

**3.9**Overall Score  
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	<b>4.2</b>
■ Transparency (25%)	<b>3.6</b>
■ Claim Safety (25%)	<b>3.8</b>
■ Documentation (15%)	<b>4.1</b>

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

## Assessment Summary

This project has some positive signs, including VVB-confirmed additionality and documented safeguards, but the evidence base is weak for a carbon credit claim. The monitoring record shows major precision problems, many corrective actions, and no verified credits envisaged, which materially weakens confidence in the issuance claim.

## Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1804
Sector	arr
Country	Georgia
Vintage	Stale
Project Methodology	CarbonFix Standard version 3.0 3.0
VVB	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Monitoring Period	2007 — 2016
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	6 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-13

## Red Flags

- The verification findings say the forest inventory had very high standard deviation and could not meet the required 20% precision level, and that no verified credits were envisaged.
- A contradiction exists on reversal events: one document says reversals were not addressed, while another later source indicates reversals were reported.
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

## Score Breakdown

### Integrity — 4.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test, which is stronger than an unverified assertion.
- The verification findings report major inventory precision problems and state that no verified credits were envisaged, which undermines confidence in the credited reductions.

The project gets partial credit for additionality because the validation report says it was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test. However, the same verification record reports a very high standard deviation in the forest inventory, failure to achieve the required 20% precision level, and that only updated ex-ante calculations were used with no verified credits envisaged. Reversal risk is also not cleanly resolved: one source says it was not addressed, while another later source says reversals were reported, so I treated the contradiction conservatively.

### Transparency — 3.6 / 10

- + The project has both monitoring and validation documentation, with TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH named as the VVB.
- Total claimed and verified emission reductions are not stated in the extracted record, and the monitoring method for usage is also not found.

Transparency is limited because several core MRV quantities are not stated in the extracted record, including total claimed and verified emission reductions and the usage monitoring method. The project does at least identify the VVB and includes both monitoring and validation documentation, but the evidence set is incomplete and the extraction confidence is only medium. That combination supports a below-average documentation trail for a crediting claim.

### Claim Safety — 3.8 / 10

- + The project is an afforestation activity under Gold Standard, and the validation report indicates a quantified leakage approach rather than ignoring leakage entirely.
- Baseline details are only described as project-based, with no reassessment date, and the record does not state CORSIA or CCP status, leaving dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is weakened by the project-based baseline approach and the absence of key quantitative checks such as verified usage rates, leakage deductions, and FNRB inputs. The record also does not state whether the project is CORSIA-eligible or CCP-approved, so dual-claim exposure cannot be ruled out. Because the verification findings say no verified credits were envisaged, the risk of overstating credit quality is material.

### Documentation — 4.1 / 10

- + Four documents were used, including monitoring and validation reports, and the project date is relatively recent in the extracted record.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, many corrective and clarification requests were raised, and key fields such as buffer pool, leakage deduction, and monitoring metrics are missing.

The file set includes four documents and names a recognized VVB, which is a positive sign for documentation quality. But the record contains a long list of corrective action and clarification requests, plus a finding that the inventory precision target was not met. With medium extraction confidence and several missing core fields, the documentation package is only moderately complete.

## Risk Indicators

● <b>Additionality</b>	VVB-confirmed combined test
● <b>Permanence</b>	reversal treatment unclear
● <b>Leakage</b>	quantified approach mentioned, deduction missing
● <b>Baseline</b>	project baseline, reassessment not stated
● <b>Safeguards</b>	FPIC and grievance mechanism present
● <b>Double-claim</b>	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

## What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a reconciled, document-backed explanation of reversal events, including whether any reversals occurred and how they were handled.

→ Publish the verified emission reduction figures, leakage deduction, usage monitoring method, and a complete response to all corrective actions and clarification requests.

## Documents Reviewed

- 2.1 - Template - Key Project Information\_20201006.pdf
- 20191208\_Certification Report \_GS\_HAP\_2017-MS\_final .pdf
- 3.5 - Template - Sustainability Monitoring Plan\_20191113.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1804
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1804
- Validation Report\_28-01-2011.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-8646AC70 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-13 · Generated: 2026-04-13  
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy