

QUALITY REPORT

Anthony and Edward Hofer Farms

TC-1983 · Hemp Carbon Standard

Report ID: CM-9E1AD135 · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.6 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	2.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	2.4
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.1
	■ Documentation (15%)	3.2

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

Assessment Summary

The project has very limited documented support for core quality claims. The verification report shows a monitoring period and an independent VVB, but key elements such as additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, and permanence safeguards are not stated in the extracted record. Overall, this creates a high uncertainty profile and weak claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	TC-1983
Sector	other
Vintage	Recent
VVB	Control Union Malaysia
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2024
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	2 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-12

Red Flags

- No additionality test or VVB-confirmed additionality is stated in the available documents.
- Baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, and reversal history are not found in the extracted record.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.8 / 10

- + The monitoring report was verified by Control Union Malaysia for the 2024 monitoring period.
- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence safeguards are not stated in available documents.

The verification report names Control Union Malaysia and covers the 2024 monitoring period, which provides some independent oversight. However, the extracted record does not state any additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, or reversal events, so the core integrity case is weak. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but that does not offset the large evidence gaps.

Transparency — 2.4 / 10

- + A named VVB and a defined monitoring period are present in the verification report dated 2025-05-16.
- Claimed versus verified issuance totals are not stated, and the extracted record lacks the monitoring and usage methods needed to assess MRV quality.

Transparency is limited because the record does identify the VVB and the monitoring period, but it does not provide the claimed versus verified issuance totals. The monitoring method, usage monitoring method, and other registry completeness details are not found in the extracted record. With only medium extraction confidence, the documentation is incomplete for a robust public claim.

Claim Safety — 2.1 / 10

- The baseline method is not found, which weakens confidence in the emissions/removal claim.
- No leakage justification, buffer pool, or CORSIA/CCP status is stated, leaving over-crediting and double-claim risk unresolved.

Claim safety is low because the baseline method is not stated and leakage treatment is absent. The record also does not state CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted documents. For a removal project, the lack of quantified permanence and leakage controls materially increases over-crediting concern.

Documentation — 3.2 / 10

- + Two source documents were used, including a verification report and issuance record.
- The extraction confidence is only medium, and many key fields are missing rather than quantified.

Documentation quality is modest at best: two documents were used, including a verification report dated 2025-05-16, but many critical fields are missing. The extraction confidence is medium, which suggests at least one source was not fully readable or complete. No corrective actions were required, but the absence of key quantified evidence keeps the documentation score low.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	No reversal data or buffer pool stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not stated
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards documented
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full validation and verification evidence for additionality, baseline setting, leakage assessment, and permanence controls, including any buffer pool or reversal monitoring.

→ Disclose registry status details, verified issuance totals, and explicit CORSIA/CCP eligibility so double-claim risk can be assessed.

Documents Reviewed

- 16 May 2025 Issuance Certificate
- 16 May 2025 2024 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-9E1AD135 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12
carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy