

QUALITY REPORT

Bandai Hills Bamboo Reforestation Project, Ghana

VCS-2929 · VCS · Ghana

Report ID: CM-D2EF5333 · Generated: 2026-04-23 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

5.3Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	6.1
■ Transparency (25%)	5.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.5
■ Documentation (15%)	5.5

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

Assessment Summary

The project has a validated additionality test (barrier) and a 10% buffer which support integrity, but several gaps and contradictions in key areas (leakage treatment, baseline reassessment, and reversal handling) reduce confidence. Documentation includes a recent validation report (2024) and a named VVB, but missing quantified MRV outputs and some contradictory PDD entries lower transparency and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-2929
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Ghana
Vintage	Recent
Project Methodology	AR-ACM0003 2.0.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2041
VVB	TÜV NORD CERT GmbH
Monitoring Period	2022 — 2042
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	11 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-23

Red Flags

- Contradictory records on leakage treatment: validation report states leakage deemed negligible with 0% deduction but PDD suggests leakage not addressed.
- Reversal risk noted (uncontrolled fires) but the field for reversal events is listed as not addressed in extracted record.
- Key MRV figures (total emissions reductions claimed/verified) are not present in available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.1 / 10

+ Additionality confirmed by the VVB in the validation report (barrier test, TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, validation report 2024-02-27).

- Leakage deduction of 0% and 'reversal events' flagged as not addressed in some documents; fire risk is described (validation report) indicating unresolved permanence risk.

Additionality is supported by a barrier test and confirmed by the VVB in the validation report (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH, validation report 2024-02-27). The project uses VCS AR-ACM0003 and holds a 10% buffer pool, which is positive for permanence. However, reversal risk from uncontrolled fires is explicitly described in the validation report, while the extracted reversal_events field indicates reversals are 'not addressed' — a material gap. Leakage is assigned a 0% deduction and described as 'deemed negligible' in the validation report but is inconsistent with the PDD, which undermines reliability of leakage treatment.

Transparency — 5.0 / 10

+ VVB named (TÜV NORD CERT GmbH) and recent validation report dated 2024-02-27 available.

- Core MRV numbers are missing from extracted records (total emissions reductions claimed/verified not found), and there are contradictions between PDD and validation report on multiple fields.

A named VVB and a recent validation report increase transparency; monitoring and crediting periods are provided. Nonetheless, essential MRV outputs such as total emissions reductions claimed and verified are not found in the extracted record. The merged record contains contradictions across documents (see overall) and a medium extraction confidence, reducing certainty about what is publicly documented.

Claim Safety — 4.5 / 10

+ Project uses an approved VCS AR methodology (AR-ACM0003 version 2.0.0) and includes a 10% buffer pool.

- Project-specific baseline with no recorded reassessment and contradictory leakage justification raise over-crediting risk (PDD vs validation report).

Use of an approved methodology and a buffer pool lower greenwashing risk, but a project-specific baseline without evidence of reassessment and contradictory leakage treatment raise over-crediting concerns. CORSIA/CCP status is not stated, so double-claim risk cannot be excluded. The contradictions in FPIC/grievance and safeguards timing also weaken confidence in safe claims.

Documentation — 5.5 / 10

+ Recent validation report (2024-02-27) and multiple documents listed (PDD, validation report, unknown document), n_docs_used = 9.

~ Extraction confidence is medium, and several key fields are null or not stated (ERR figures, grid EF, reassessment), reducing documentation quality.

Documentation includes a recent validation report (2024-02-27) and multiple source documents (PDD, validation report, plus unknown). Nine documents were used in extraction, but extraction confidence is medium. Several fields are null or not stated (total ERR claimed/verified, grid emission factor, baseline reassessment), and there are outstanding contradictions that suggest documents were updated at different times.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed barrier test
● Permanence	buffer present but fire reversal risk
● Leakage	0% deduction but contradictory documentation
● Baseline	project-specific baseline; reassessment unclear
● Safeguards	FPIC and grievance documented (validation report)
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

Documents Reviewed

- Bandai Hills Reforestation Project Boundary.kml
- Registration Representation
- BandaiHills_Project_Area.kml
- Non-permanence risk report
- Registration Review Report
- Draft Project Description
- Listing Representation
- Project Description
- Validation Representation
- Validation Report

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-D2EF5333 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-23 · Generated: 2026-04-23

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