QUALITY REPORT

WithOneSeed Community Forest Programme, Timor-Leste

GS-1805 · Gold Standard

Report ID: CM-8897A82B · Generated: 2026-04-10 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.0 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	2.9
	Transparency (25%)	4.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
	Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

This is a removal project with some positive integrity signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality, a 20% buffer pool, and documented safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism. However, reversal risk is explicitly noted, leakage treatment is not addressed, and the record contains a material crediting-period contradiction that weakens confidence in the documentation and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Gold Standard
Registry ID	GS-1805
Sector	redd
Vintage	2022
Project Methodology	Gold Standard A/R GHG Emissions Reduction and Sequestration Methodology V.1.0
Crediting Period	2010 — 2039
VVB	Pangolin Associates
Monitoring Period	2021 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	19 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-10

Red Flags

- Reversal risk is explicitly described in the verification report, and the project is not reversal-free.
- Leakage is not addressed, with no quantified deduction or clear justification in the extracted record.
- The crediting period differs between the monitoring report and the PDD, indicating a documentation inconsistency.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.9 / 10

+ Additionality was confirmed by the VVB using a combined test in the verification report.

- The verification report says the main risk is reversion to slash-and-burn agriculture, and reversal events are reported.

The verification report confirms additionality through a combined test and shows a 20% buffer pool, which supports some integrity strength. But the same report explicitly identifies reversion to traditional slash-and-burn agriculture as the main risk, and reversal events are reported, so permanence is only moderate. Leakage is not quantified and is marked as not addressed, which further weakens the integrity score.

Transparency — 4.8 / 10

+ The project has a named VVB, Pangolin Associates, and the monitoring period is stated in the extracted record.

- Total verified ERs and total claimed ERs are not found in the extracted record, and the extraction confidence is low.

Transparency is mixed because the project has a named VVB, a stated monitoring period, and a Gold Standard registry record. However, the extracted record does not provide total claimed or verified ER figures, usage monitoring details, or a clear leakage treatment. The low extraction confidence also reduces confidence in the completeness of the public documentation picture.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

+ The project uses a project baseline and is a Gold Standard removal project with a 20% buffer pool.

- Leakage is marked as not addressed, and the project is listed as CORSIA-eligible while CCP status is not stated.

Claim safety is constrained by the project-specific baseline and the absence of a clear leakage deduction or justification. The project is marked CORSIA-eligible, but CCP status is not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record. The buffer pool helps, but the crediting-period inconsistency adds uncertainty around the reliability of the claim basis.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

+ The record includes multiple document types, with 17 documents used and safeguards such as FPIC and a grievance mechanism described.

- Extraction confidence is low, several key fields are not found, and nine corrective actions were required in the verification report.

Documentation is only moderate because 17 documents were used and the record includes safeguards, FPIC, and a grievance mechanism. Still, the extraction confidence is low, several key quantitative fields are missing, and the verification report required nine corrective actions. The contradiction on crediting period between the monitoring report and the PDD further reduces documentation quality.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed combined test
Permanence	buffer pool present but reversal risk reported
Leakage	leakage not addressed
Baseline	project baseline, reassessment timing missing
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear leakage assessment with either a quantified deduction or a documented justification for why leakage is negligible.

→ Resolve the crediting-period discrepancy and provide a complete, readable monitoring package with verified and claimed ER totals.

Documents Reviewed

- 201-LUF-T-AR-Additionality March 2019(1).pdf
- GS4210_Final-Monitoring-Report 07 May 2024.pdf
- GS Monitoring Plan Performance Certification.pdf
- GS_LSC_Final English_2016.doc
- GS Annual Report 22.03.2017.pdf
- WithOneSeed_2021_GSF_PerformCert_Report_v1.3_20211006(1).pdf
- GS4210 WOS Baguia CO2 Certificate Calculations_June 2021 v4.0.xlsx
- 3_4_SustainabilityMonitoringPlan.pdf
- 2.1 - Template - Key Project Information PFA Review.pdf
- 401.13-AR-T-Applicability March 2019(1).pdf
- GS_LSC_Final English_2016(1).doc
- 2.1 - Template - Key Project Information Performance Cerification.pdf
- WithOneSeed GS initial cert 30March16.pdf
- CCIPL 1481(A) _Final Performance Certification Report -CC.pdf
- GS4210 T-PreReview_V2-Project-Design-Document_HMI 2021(1).pdf
- Letter to GS 8 Oct 2025.pdf
- Gold Standard Assurance Platform — GS-1805
- Gold Standard Registry — GS-1805
- WithOneTree_Verification_Report_June_2019.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-8897A82B · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-10 · Generated: 2026-04-10

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