

QUALITY REPORT

River Valley Specialty Farms

TC-2035 · Hemp Carbon Standard

Report ID: CM-A3180F74 · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.9

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.2
■ Transparency (25%)	1.0
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.1
■ Documentation (15%)	2.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project record is too sparse to support a strong quality assessment. The verification report shows a monitoring period and an independent verifier, but key elements for additionality, baseline validity, leakage, permanence, and quantified issuance are not stated in the extracted documents. This creates a high evidence-gap risk and weakens confidence in the claim.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	TC-2035
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 baseline method, additionality test, or leakage treatment is stated in the extracted verification record.
- No quantified verified or claimed emission reductions are available, and no buffer pool or reversal information is found.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.2 / 10

+ The monitoring report was verified by Control Union Malaysia for the 2024 monitoring period, which provides some independent oversight.

- Additionality, baseline method, leakage treatment, and buffer provisions are not stated in the available documents, leaving core integrity questions unresolved.

The verification report for the 2024 monitoring period names Control Union Malaysia as the VVB, which supports some independent review. However, the extracted record does not state any additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool share, or reversal history, so the core integrity case is largely unsubstantiated. Because these are central to removal-credit quality, the score remains very low.

Transparency — 1.0 / 10

+ The project has at least two source documents used, including a validation report and issuance record, and the verification report is dated 2025-05-16.

- No verified or claimed ERR totals, no monitoring methodology details, and no usage monitoring method are stated in the extracted record.

Transparency is weak because the extracted documents do not provide verified or claimed ERR totals, a monitoring methodology, or a usage monitoring approach. The record does identify the project name, methodology version 1.1, VVB, and monitoring period, but that is not enough to support robust public scrutiny. The medium extraction confidence helps slightly, but the absence of key quantified fields dominates.

Claim Safety — 2.1 / 10

+ The record does not show any explicit double-registration or reversal event evidence.

- With no baseline, leakage, or quantified issuance data, over-crediting and green-claim risk remain materially elevated.

Claim safety is limited by the lack of evidence on baseline validity, leakage handling, and issuance quantities. The record does not show CORSIA eligibility or CCP status, so there is no positive claim-quality signal from those channels. With no quantified reductions and no treatment of major accounting risks, the project carries a meaningful over-crediting risk.

Documentation — 2.4 / 10

+ The extraction confidence is medium rather than low, so the record is at least partially readable.

- Many critical fields are not stated in available documents, and the extracted record contains no corrective actions or material findings to anchor a fuller review.

Documentation quality is poor to weak because only two source documents were used and many critical fields are not stated in available documents. The verification report date is recent, but recency alone does not compensate for missing core data. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, yet that appears to reflect the limited extraction rather than a fully documented clean file.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal risk not documented
● Leakage	Leakage not addressed
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards documented
● Double-claim	Registry status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full validation, verification, and issuance documents showing the baseline method, additionality test, leakage treatment, and quantified verified reductions.

→ Disclose permanence safeguards, reversal/buffer arrangements, and registry status details including any CORSIA or CCP eligibility determinations.

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-A3180F74 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

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