

QUALITY REPORT

Krug und Partner Agrar GmbH

TC-2057 · Hemp Carbon Standard

Report ID: CM-5E976FE8 · Generated: 2026-04-12 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

1.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.8
	■ Transparency (25%)	0.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	1.0
	■ Documentation (15%)	1.5

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

Assessment Summary

The available issuance record is extremely sparse, with no stated baseline method, additionality test, leakage treatment, or permanence safeguards. The project cannot be assessed as robust from the extracted documents, and the absence of core MRV details creates a high risk of weak claims.

Project Details

Registry	Hemp Carbon Standard
Registry ID	TC-2057
Sector	other
Vintage	Recent
VVB	Control Union
Confidence	Medium
Documents Reviewed	1 document reviewed
Scored	2026-04-12

Red Flags

- No baseline method, additionality test, or leakage treatment is stated in the available issuance document.
- No monitoring period, verified issuance quantities, buffer pool, or reversal protection details were found.

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.8 / 10

~ The issuance record names Control Union as VVB, but it does not state any additionality test, baseline approach, or reassessment timing.

- No leakage deduction, buffer pool, or reversal-event information is found in the extracted issuance document.

The extracted issuance record identifies Control Union as the VVB, but it does not state any additionality test, baseline method, or baseline reassessment timing. Leakage treatment, buffer pool coverage, and reversal-event information are also not found in the available documents, so permanence and baseline robustness cannot be verified.

Transparency — 0.2 / 10

- The only evidence document used is an issuance record dated 2025-05-16, with no monitoring period or quantified issuance figures extracted.

~ Control Union is identified as the VVB, but the record lacks the core MRV details needed to verify public transparency.

Transparency is very weak because the only evidence document used is an issuance record dated 2025-05-16, and no monitoring period or verified issuance totals were extracted. The record names the VVB, but the core MRV details needed for public scrutiny are missing.

Claim Safety — 1.0 / 10

- No baseline method, leakage justification, or verified removal figures are available, which raises over-crediting risk.

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

Claim safety is low because there is no stated baseline method, no leakage justification, and no verified removal quantity in the extracted record. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated, so the risk of unsupported or dual-channel claims cannot be excluded.

Documentation — 1.5 / 10

- Only one document was used, and it is an issuance record rather than a fuller verification or monitoring package.

~ Extraction confidence is high, but the document set is incomplete and omits most of the fields needed for a credible assessment.

Documentation quality is poor in practical terms because only one document was used and it is an issuance record, not a complete verification and monitoring set. Extraction confidence is high, but the record still lacks most of the fields needed to evaluate the project credibly.

Risk Indicators

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

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide the full verification and monitoring package showing the baseline method, additionality test, leakage treatment, and any buffer or reversal safeguards.

→ Disclose verified issuance quantities, monitoring period, and registry/claim status details such as CCP and CORSIA eligibility.

Documents Reviewed

- 16 May 2025 Issuance Certificate

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-5E976FE8 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-12 · Generated: 2026-04-12

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