

QUALITY REPORT

Orlivske LLC

TC-2053 · Hemp Carbon Standard

Report ID: CM-92FF232E · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

2.0

Overall Score
out of 10

■ Integrity (35%)	2.4
■ Transparency (25%)	1.1
■ Claim Safety (25%)	2.0
■ Documentation (15%)	2.8

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

Assessment Summary

The available verification record is too thin to support a strong quality assessment. It confirms a monitoring period and an independent verifier, but key elements such as additionality, baseline design, leakage treatment, and permanence safeguards are not stated in the extracted documents. This creates a high evidence-gap risk for both integrity and claim safety.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	TC-2053
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 information are all not found in the extracted documents.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 2.4 / 10

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

- Key integrity inputs are missing: no additionality test, no baseline method, no leakage deduction, and no buffer pool or reversal information are stated in the available documents.

The verification report from Control Union Malaysia covers the 2024 monitoring period, which is a positive sign for independent review. However, the extracted record does not state any additionality test, baseline method, leakage deduction, buffer pool, or reversal history, so the core integrity case is largely unsubstantiated. No material findings or corrective actions were reported, but that does not offset the missing methodological evidence.

Transparency — 1.1 / 10

+ A specific monitoring period is stated, and the project has at least two source documents listed in the extracted record.

- The extracted record does not state total credits claimed or verified, usage monitoring, or any registry completeness details, limiting public MRV transparency.

Transparency is limited because the extracted record does not provide total credits claimed or verified, usage monitoring details, or registry completeness information. The monitoring period is clearly stated, and two documents are referenced, but the public-facing MRV picture remains incomplete. With no quantified issuance or verification figures available, it is difficult to assess whether reporting is comprehensive.

Claim Safety — 2.0 / 10

- The project's baseline approach is not stated, so over-crediting risk cannot be checked against a defined counterfactual.

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

Claim safety is weak because the baseline approach is not stated, leaving the counterfactual and over-crediting risk unclear. Leakage treatment is also absent, and there is no evidence in the extracted record for usage-rate verification or assumptions. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so dual-claim exposure cannot be excluded from the available documents.

Documentation — 2.8 / 10

+ The record identifies a named verifier and a dated verification report, which supports some documentation traceability.

- Extraction confidence is only medium, and the key supporting fields are largely absent rather than quantified, indicating a weak documentation package.

The documentation set includes a dated verification report and a named VVB, which supports some traceability. Still, the extracted record shows many key fields as not found in available documents, and extraction confidence is only medium. The absence of quantified methodological details suggests the documentation package is incomplete rather than merely concise.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	No additionality evidence found
● Permanence	Reversal safeguards not stated
● Leakage	Leakage treatment not stated
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	No safeguards evidence found
● Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full validation and verification package showing the additionality test, baseline methodology, leakage assessment, and any buffer or reversal provisions.

→ Disclose quantified issuance and verification figures, plus explicit statements on CORSIA eligibility, CCP status, and social safeguards such as FPIC and grievance mechanisms.

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-92FF232E · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

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