

Application of the Oeko-Institut/WWF-US/ EDF methodology for assessing the quality of carbon credits

This document presents results from the application of version 3.0 of a methodology, developed by Oeko-Institut, World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US) and Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), for assessing the quality of carbon credits. The methodology is applied by Oeko-Institut with support by Carbon Limits, Greenhouse Gas Management Institute (GHGMI), INFRAS, Stockholm Environment Institute, and individual carbon market experts. This document evaluates one specific criterion or sub-criterion with respect to a specific carbon crediting program, project type, quantification methodology and/or host country, as specified in the below table. Please note that the CCQI website [Site terms and Privacy Policy](#) apply with respect to any use of the information provided in this document. Further information on the project and the methodology can be found here: www.carboncreditquality.org

Sub-criterion:	1.3.2 Robustness of the quantification methodologies applied to determine emission reductions or removals
Project type:	Landfill gas utilization
Quantification methodology:	Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) AMS-III.G, Versions 10
Assessment based on carbon crediting program documents valid as of:	30 June 2021
Date of final assessment:	20 May 2022
Score:	2

Contact

info@oeko.de
www.oeko.de

Head Office Freiburg

P. O. Box 17 71
 79017 Freiburg

Street address

Merzhauser Straße 173
 79100 Freiburg
 Phone +49 761 45295-0

Office Berlin

Borkumstraße 2
 13189 Berlin
 Phone +49 30 405085-0

Office Darmstadt

Rheinstraße 95
 64295 Darmstadt
 Phone +49 6151 8191-0

Assessment

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

The methodology assesses the robustness of the quantification methodologies applied by the carbon crediting program to determine emission reductions or removals. The assessment of the quantification methodologies considers the degree of conservativeness in the light of the uncertainty of the emission reductions or removals. The assessment is based on the likelihood that the emission reductions or removals are under-estimated, estimated accurately, or over-estimated, as follows (see further details in the methodology):

Assessment outcome	Score
It is very likely (i.e., a probability of more than 90%) that the emission reductions or removals are underestimated, taking into account the uncertainty in quantifying the emission reductions or removals	5
It is likely (i.e., a probability of more than 66%) that the emission reductions or removals are underestimated, taking into account the uncertainty in quantifying the emission reductions or removals	4
OR The emission reductions or removals are likely to be estimated accurately (i.e., there is about the same probability that they are underestimated or overestimated) and uncertainty in the estimates of the emission reductions or removals is low (i.e., up to $\pm 10\%$)	
The emission reductions or removals are likely to be estimated accurately (i.e., there is about the same probability that they are underestimated or overestimated) but there is medium to high uncertainty (i.e., $\pm 10-50\%$) in the estimates of the emission reductions or removals	3
OR It is likely (i.e., a probability of more than 66%) or very likely (i.e., a probability of more than 90%) that the emission reductions or removals are overestimated, taking into account the uncertainty in quantifying the emission reductions or removals, but the degree of overestimation is likely to be low (i.e., up to $\pm 10\%$)	
The emission reductions or removals are likely to be estimated accurately (i.e., there is about the same probability that they are underestimated or overestimated) but there is very high uncertainty (i.e., larger than $\pm 50\%$) in the estimates of the emission reductions or removals	2
OR It is likely (i.e., a probability of more than 66%) or very likely (i.e., a probability of more than 90%) that the emission reductions or removals are overestimated, taking into account the uncertainty in quantifying the emission reductions or removals, and the degree of overestimation is likely to be medium ($\pm 10-30\%$)	
It is likely (i.e., a probability of more than 66%) or very likely (i.e., a probability of more than 90%) that the emission reductions or removals are overestimated, taking into account the uncertainty in quantifying the emission reductions or removals, and the degree of overestimation is likely to be large (i.e., larger than $\pm 30\%$)	1

Information sources considered

- 1 CDM methodology AMS-III.G, version 10.0
- 2 CDM TOOL: none

Further relevant information sources are listed in the evaluation of CDM methodology ACM0001.

Assessment outcome

The quantification methodology is assigned a score of 2.

Justification of assessment

The small-scale methodology basically uses the same approaches as large-scale methodology ACM0001. For example,

- the oxidation factor has the same value and
- to determine methane that is destroyed in the baseline (due to requirements to destroy methane or due to existing LFG capture and destruction system) the method simply refers to ACM0001.

Therefore, based on the assessment of ACM0001, the assigned score is 2 as well.

Remark: AMS-III.G sets $GWP_{CH_4}=21$, whereas ACM0001 sets $GWP_{CH_4}=25$. However, the GWP values are set CDM-wide according to fixed rules. Those CDM-wide values overwrite the values given in the specific methodologies. Therefore, de-facto both methodologies are using the same GWP values.