

QUALITY REPORT

Winfield Farms & Seed Ltd

CM-a4fec3 · Hemp Carbon Standard · Canada

Report ID: CM-4B2A72E3 · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.4
	■ Transparency (25%)	1.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	2.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signals, including a named VVB, a recent monitoring period, and no material findings reported in the monitoring report. However, the extracted record lacks the core evidence needed to judge additionality, baseline validity, leakage treatment, and permanence, and the low extraction confidence further weakens trust in the documentation. The CCP-approved status raises claim-safety concerns because other public-claim status fields are not stated, and the project is not clearly shown to be free of double-claim risk.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	CM-a4fec3
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Canada
Vintage	2023
Project Methodology	Carbon Space's Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) Methodology Carbon Space Technology Version 1.0
Crediting Period	2023 — 2023
VVB	Control Union Malaysia
Monitoring Period	2023 — 2023
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-12

Red Flags

- No baseline method, additionality test, or leakage treatment is stated in the extracted documents.
- The record is incomplete and low-confidence, with key claim-safety fields such as CORSIA eligibility and usage monitoring not stated.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.4 / 10

- + The monitoring report names Control Union Malaysia as the VVB and reports no material findings.
- Core integrity evidence is missing: no additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, or buffer pool information is stated in the available documents.

The monitoring report identifies Control Union Malaysia as the VVB and says there were no material findings or corrective actions required, which is a modest positive. But the extracted record does not state any additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool percentage, or reversal history, so the core integrity case is largely unsubstantiated in the available documents.

Transparency — 1.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2023-01-01 to 2023-11-30, and the report date is 2024-04-06.
- Transparency is weakened because total ERR claimed and verified are not stated, and the extraction confidence is low.

Transparency is only moderate because the monitoring period is clearly stated and the report date is recent. However, total ERR claimed and verified are not stated, usage monitoring is not described, and the extraction confidence is low, which suggests the documentation is incomplete or difficult to read.

Claim Safety — 3.1 / 10

- + The project is CCP-approved, which is a positive signal for market recognition.
- Claim safety is limited because CORSIA eligibility, baseline method, leakage justification, and usage-rate evidence are not stated, leaving over-crediting and dual-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is weak because the project is CCP-approved, but CORSIA eligibility is not stated and the record does not show how emissions reductions were quantified against a stated baseline. With no leakage justification, no usage-rate evidence, and no verified ERR totals, the risk of overstated claims cannot be ruled out.

Documentation — 2.2 / 10

- + Three document types were used, including a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report.
- The extraction confidence is low, and many key fields are not found in the available record, including safeguards, baseline, and additionality details.

The evidence set includes three document types, which is better than a single-source record, and the monitoring report is dated 2024-04-06. Even so, the extraction confidence is low and many critical fields are missing, so the documentation is not complete enough to support a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence stated
● Permanence	Reversal risk not documented
● Leakage	No leakage treatment stated
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards not documented
● Double-claim	CCP-approved; CORSIA status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the baseline methodology, additionality test, leakage treatment, and any buffer or reversal provisions in a readable monitoring package.

→ State verified ERR totals, CORSIA eligibility, and safeguard documentation such as grievance and community-consent procedures.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification 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-4B2A72E3 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

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