

QUALITY REPORT

John Butkiewicz

CM-ba57b4 · Hemp Carbon Standard · Canada

Report ID: CM-F3D05506 · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.4 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	3.2
	■ Transparency (25%)	3.8
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.4
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.0

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

Assessment Summary

The project has some positive signs, including a named VVB, a recent monitoring period, and no material findings reported in the monitoring report. However, key elements needed to judge carbon integrity are missing from the extracted record, including the baseline method, additionality test, leakage treatment, and permanence protections. The CCP-approved status helps somewhat, but the low extraction confidence and missing core documentation keep the overall assessment weak.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	CM-ba57b4
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

- Core integrity evidence is missing: no baseline method, no additionality test type, and no leakage deduction or justification were found in the extracted documents.
- The record shows low extraction confidence, which reduces trust in the completeness of the documentation.
- CCP approval is noted, but CORSIA eligibility is not stated and the extracted record does not show enough detail to rule out over-crediting risk.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

- + The monitoring report names Control Union Malaysia as the VVB and reports no material findings or corrective actions.
- The extracted record does not state the additionality test, baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer pool, or any reversal history.

The monitoring report dated 2024-04-06 identifies Control Union Malaysia as the VVB and says there were no material findings and no corrective actions required, which is a modest positive. But the extracted record does not state the additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, or any reversal events, so the core integrity case is incomplete and weak.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

- + The monitoring period is clearly stated as 2023-01-01 to 2023-11-30, and the record includes three source documents.
- Key public-facing MRV details are missing from the extracted record, including total ERR figures, usage monitoring, and leakage justification.

Transparency is limited because the record provides a monitoring period and the existence of three source documents, but it does not include total ERR claimed or verified, usage monitoring, or leakage justification. The low extraction confidence further reduces confidence that the available documentation is complete enough for strong public scrutiny.

Claim Safety — 3.4 / 10

- + The project is marked CCP approved, which is a positive signal for claim quality.
- The baseline approach, leakage treatment, and any quantified ERR reconciliation are not stated, leaving over-crediting risk unresolved.

Claim safety is only moderate-to-low because the project is CCP approved, but the extracted record does not show the baseline method, leakage treatment, or any reconciliation between claimed and verified emissions reductions. Without those details, it is difficult to assess over-crediting risk or whether the crediting claim is conservative.

Documentation — 3.0 / 10

- + The record draws on a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report, and the monitoring report date is recent.
- Extraction confidence is low, and several critical fields are not found in the available documents.

Documentation quality is weakened by the low extraction confidence and the fact that several key fields are not found in the available documents. The presence of a PDD, monitoring report, and validation report helps, but the record still lacks enough detail on the main methodological and safeguard elements to support a strong score.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● 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

- Provide the full validation and monitoring evidence for additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and any buffer or reversal provisions.
- Publish verified ERR figures and a clear reconciliation between claimed and verified credits, along with explicit CORSIA and safeguard status.

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-F3D05506 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy