

QUALITY REPORT

Benson Farms

TC-1988 · Hemp Carbon Standard

Report ID: CM-91D7A5BB · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.8
■ Transparency (25%)	1.4
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.9
■ Documentation (15%)	2.8

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

Assessment Summary

The project’s verification report is too sparse to support a strong quality assessment. Key elements such as additionality, baseline design, leakage treatment, and permanence safeguards are not stated in the extracted record, which creates substantial uncertainty and weakens confidence in the claimed removals.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	TC-1988
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 extracted verification record.
- Baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer pool, and reversal information are all not found in the available documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

- Additionality is not demonstrated in the extracted verification report; no test type or VVB confirmation is stated.
- Baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, and reversal history are not found in the available record.

The verification report names Control Union Malaysia and covers the 2024 monitoring period, but it does not state any additionality test, VVB-confirmed additionality, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, or reversal events. With no material findings reported, there is no direct evidence of non-compliance, but the absence of core methodological details makes the integrity case weak.

Transparency — 1.4 / 10

- The extracted record does not provide claimed versus verified ERR totals, so over-crediting cannot be checked.
- ~ The monitoring period is stated for 2024 and the VVB is named as Control Union Malaysia, but the underlying MRV details are largely missing.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not include claimed versus verified emission removal totals, usage monitoring details, or any quantified leakage or baseline parameters. The report does identify the monitoring period and the verifier, which helps somewhat, but the MRV picture remains incomplete.

Claim Safety — 1.9 / 10

- Without a stated baseline method or leakage justification, the risk of overstated climate claims remains high.
- ~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted record.

Claim safety is poor because the record does not state how the baseline was set, whether leakage was addressed, or whether any permanence safeguards exist. Since CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are also not stated, the project’s public climate claims cannot be assessed with confidence from the available documents.

Documentation — 2.8 / 10

- Only two document sources were used, and the extracted record is missing many core fields needed for a robust review.
- ~ Extraction confidence is medium, which is better than low, but the documentation still lacks key quantitative and methodological details.

Documentation quality is weak to moderate: two document sources were used, the monitoring period is current, and the verifier is named, but most of the key fields are missing from the extracted record. Extraction confidence is medium rather than low, yet the absence of core quantitative and methodological information still leaves major evidence gaps.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	No buffer or reversal data 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

→ Publish the full verification and validation evidence for additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and permanence safeguards, including any buffer pool or reversal provisions.

→ Disclose verified versus claimed removal totals, registry status, and any CORSIA or CCP eligibility information so over-crediting and double-claim risk can be checked.

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-91D7A5BB · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

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