QUALITY REPORT

Regenerative Agriculture in the USA

CT-609 · Regen Standard (Regenerative Standard) · United States

Report ID: CM-A8D49EE2 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.4 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	3.2
	Transparency (25%)	3.8
	Claim Safety (25%)	3.0
	Documentation (15%)	4.2

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

Assessment Summary

This soil carbon project has major evidence gaps on core integrity items (additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and reversals), which increases over-crediting risk. While a buffer pool contribution is stated, safeguards and grievance processes are not documented in the extracted record, and key MRV/issuance figures are missing.

Project Details

Registry	Regen Standard (Regenerative Standard)
Registry ID	CT-609
Sector	soil_carbon
Country	United States
Vintage	2024, 2025
Project Methodology	VM0021 1.0
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Leakage is explicitly not addressed, and no leakage deduction is reported in the extracted record.
- Additionality approach and whether it was confirmed by an independent VVB are not found in the extracted record.
- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents.
- No monitoring period or verified removals/ERR figures are available in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 3.2 / 10

+ A 10% buffer pool contribution is stated, which can help manage reversal risk for soil carbon.

- Additionality, baseline approach, and leakage treatment are not evidenced in the extracted record (despite documents listed).

The extracted record does not provide an additionality test type or confirmation by a VVB, even though a validation report is listed, which weakens confidence that the activity is truly additional. The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in available documents, making baseline validity hard to judge. Leakage is explicitly marked as not addressed, and no leakage deduction is reported, which is a material integrity gap for soil carbon/agriculture. A 10% buffer pool contribution is stated, but reversal events and their details are not found in the extracted record, limiting permanence assessment.

Transparency — 3.8 / 10

+ The extracted record indicates multiple core document types were used (PDD, validation report, monitoring report).

- Key public-facing MRV fields (monitoring period and claimed/verified ERR) and the VVB identity are not found in the extracted record.

Although the evidence set lists a PDD, validation report, and monitoring report, the extracted record lacks the monitoring period and both claimed and verified ERR totals, which are central to MRV transparency. The VVB name is not found in the extracted record, reducing traceability of independent assurance. No material findings or corrective actions are reported, but without the underlying quantified results, it is difficult to interpret the significance of a clean findings list.

Claim Safety — 3.0 / 10

- Leakage is not addressed, increasing over-crediting risk for an agriculture/soil carbon activity.

~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so eligibility/label-claim risk cannot be screened.

Over-crediting risk is elevated because the baseline method is not stated and leakage is not addressed, with no quantified leakage deduction reported. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so downstream claim constraints and double-claim/labeling risk cannot be confidently assessed. With no claimed or verified ERR totals in the extracted record, buyers cannot readily reconcile what was issued versus what was measured.

Documentation — 4.2 / 10

+ Three document types are referenced (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and extraction confidence is medium.

- Many critical fields that should be in those documents (VVB name, monitoring period, baseline and additionality details) are missing from the extracted record.

The extracted record references three key document types (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) and indicates medium extraction confidence, suggesting some usable source material. However, many expected core data points (VVB identity, monitoring period, baseline and additionality specifics, and quantified results) are not found in the extracted record, indicating incomplete extraction or incomplete documentation. Safeguards-related elements (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are recorded as absent, which further weakens the documentation picture for social risk management.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	Additionality not evidenced
Permanence	Buffer pool stated; reversals not evidenced
Leakage	Leakage not addressed
Baseline	Baseline method not stated
Safeguards	Safeguards/FPIC/grievance not documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish or extract the validation/verification details showing the additionality test applied, the baseline approach, and the named VVB responsible for assurance.

→ Provide the monitoring period and quantified claimed vs verified ERR totals, plus an explicit leakage assessment (with a justified deduction if applicable) and reversal monitoring outcomes.

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report

Report ID: CM-A8D49EE2 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

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