

QUALITY REPORT

Eastwood Farms Ltd

CM-ae622b · Hemp Carbon Standard · Canada

Report ID: CM-6957C4E1 · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

4.6

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	5.2
■ Transparency (25%)	4.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	4.6
■ Documentation (15%)	4.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signals, including VVB-confirmed additionality and no reported material findings in the monitoring report. However, key baseline, leakage, and permanence details are not stated in the extracted record, and the low extraction confidence reduces trust in the documentation. CCP approval raises claim-safety concerns because the project is not clearly shown to be outside other crediting channels.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	CM-ae622b
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	Canada
Vintage	2023, 2024
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

- Baseline method, leakage treatment, and buffer pool coverage are not stated in the available documents.
- The record shows CCP approval but does not state CORSIA eligibility, creating residual dual-claim risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 5.2 / 10

- + Additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the project's core crediting case.
- Baseline method, leakage deduction, and reversal protection are not stated in the extracted documents.

The validation evidence supports additionality because the VVB is recorded as having confirmed it. That said, the extracted record does not state the baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool percentage, or any reversal history, so permanence and baseline robustness cannot be fully assessed from the available documents. No material findings or corrective actions were reported in the monitoring report, which is a modest positive.

Transparency — 4.1 / 10

- + The project has three source documents in the extracted set, including a monitoring report, validation report, and PDD.
- Key MRV fields such as total ERs claimed and verified, usage monitoring, and baseline reassessment are not found in the available record.

The project has three document sources in the extracted set, but the record is incomplete on several core MRV items. Total ERs claimed and verified are not found, and the usage monitoring method, baseline reassessment timing, and leakage justification are also not stated. The low extraction confidence further weakens transparency because at least one key document was poorly readable.

Claim Safety — 4.6 / 10

- + No material findings were reported in the monitoring report, which reduces immediate over-crediting concern.
- CCP approval is stated, while CORSIA eligibility is not stated, so the claim boundary is not fully clear.

Claim safety is weakened by the absence of quantified baseline and leakage information, which makes over-crediting harder to rule out. The project is marked as CCP approved, but CORSIA eligibility is not stated, so the claim boundary is not fully clear. The absence of material findings is helpful, but it does not offset the missing core quantification fields.

Documentation — 4.0 / 10

- + The extracted record includes multiple document types and a recent monitoring period ending in 2023.
- Extraction confidence is low, and several core fields are missing or not stated, limiting confidence in the evidence base.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, which is a reasonable documentary base. However, the extracted record shows low extraction confidence and many null or not-stated fields for critical parameters such as baseline, leakage, and safeguards. The monitoring period is recent, but the documentation remains incomplete for a high-confidence assessment.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal details stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not stated
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CCP approved; CORSIA status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the baseline method, leakage treatment, and any buffer or reversal protection details in a clear monitoring summary.

→ Provide complete verified and claimed issuance figures, plus explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility, safeguards, and registry/claim boundaries.

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-6957C4E1 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

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