

QUALITY REPORT

Star Rock Farms

TC-2049 · Hemp Carbon Standard

Report ID: CM-CB904FFC · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.1

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	1.8
■ Transparency (25%)	2.2
■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.5
■ Documentation (15%)	3.4

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

Assessment Summary

The project's documentation is too thin to support a strong quality assessment. 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. This creates a high risk of weak claim support and possible over-crediting.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	TC-2049
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 record.
- Baseline method, leakage treatment, buffer pool, and reversal history are not stated in the extracted documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

+ The verification report is from Control Union Malaysia and covers the 2024 monitoring period, which provides some independent oversight.

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

The verification report dated 2025-05-16 names Control Union Malaysia and covers monitoring from 2024-01-01 to 2024-12-31, which supports some independent review. However, the extracted record does not state any additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool percentage, or reversal events, so the core integrity evidence is very weak. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but that does not compensate for the missing methodological detail.

Transparency — 2.2 / 10

+ A named verifier and a defined monitoring period are present in the verification report.

- Claimed versus verified issuance totals are not found, and the extracted record lacks baseline, leakage, and usage-monitoring details.

Transparency is limited because the record does not include claimed versus verified issuance totals, baseline details, leakage treatment, or usage-monitoring method. The presence of a named VVB and a specific monitoring period is positive, but the documentation remains incomplete for public scrutiny. The medium extraction confidence also suggests some uncertainty in the source capture.

Claim Safety — 1.5 / 10

- The record does not state any baseline method, leakage justification, or additionality test, which raises over-crediting risk.

~ CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-market claim risk cannot be ruled out from the extracted evidence.

Claim safety is poor because the extracted documents do not state how the baseline was set, whether leakage was deducted, or whether additionality was tested. Without those elements, the risk of over-crediting is elevated, especially for a removal project where methodological rigor matters. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim risk cannot be excluded from the available evidence.

Documentation — 3.4 / 10

+ Two document types were used, including a verification report and supporting issuance/validation material.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and many key fields are not stated in the available record.

Documentation quality is only modest because two document types were used, but the extracted record still leaves many critical fields blank. The monitoring period is current, yet the crediting period is not stated and the extraction confidence is only medium, indicating at least one source was not fully readable. No corrective actions were required, but the absence of findings is less informative than complete methodological disclosure.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish the full methodology and verification evidence for additionality, baseline setting, leakage treatment, and permanence safeguards.

→ Disclose verified issuance totals, registry status, and any CORSIA or CCP eligibility determinations with supporting documents.

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-CB904FFC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

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