

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:	2.2.2 Avoiding indirect overlaps between projects
Carbon crediting program:	Gold Standard
Assessment based on carbon crediting program documents valid as of:	30 June 2021
Date of final assessment:	20 May 2022
Score:	Establishment of natural forest: 5 Landfill gas utilization: 3 Efficient cookstoves: 1

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

Double issuance can occur indirectly through overlapping claims by different entities involved in mitigation projects. Indirect overlaps between projects can only occur in cases where projects, in calculating their emission reductions or removals, include emissions sources that occur at other sites than where the project is implemented. This risk is only applicable to some project types. The following table provides examples of project types with or without a risk of indirect overlaps:

Project types with potential indirect overlaps between projects	Project types without potential indirect overlaps between projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Landfill gas utilization · Renewable electricity generation · Biomass use · Composting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Landfill gas flaring · Avoidance of N₂O from nitric or adipic acid production · Energy efficiency improvements in thermal on-site applications

For project types for which this risk is not relevant, the score is 5. For other project types, the scoring depends on the carbon crediting programs' procedures to address this risk. The scoring approach for carbon crediting program procedures to avoid indirect overlaps between projects is as follows:

Program requirements	Score
The program only credits those types of projects for which overlaps between projects are very unlikely to occur	5
The program has robust provisions in place that effectively identify and avoid overlaps between projects registered within the program <i>and</i> projects registered under other programs (see principles in the methodology)	5
The program has robust provisions in place that effectively avoid overlaps between projects registered <i>within</i> the same program	3
The program does not have robust provisions in place to avoid indirect overlaps between projects	1

Information sources considered

- 1 Gold Standard SDG impact quantification methodologies, available at <https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/400-sdg-impact-quantification/>
- 2 Principles & Requirements Version 1.2 (October 2019), available at <https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/101-par-principles-requirements/>
- 3 GHG emissions reductions & sequestration product requirements, Version 2.9 (April 2021), available at <https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/501-pr-ghg-emissions-reductions-sequestration/>.

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

- Provision 1 Source 2, section 4.1.3: "A Project type is automatically eligible for Gold Standard Certification if there are Gold Standard approved Activity Requirements and/or Impact

Quantification Methodologies associated with it or it's referenced in the Gold Standard Product Requirements. These are published to the Gold Standard website and shall be followed where provided for a given Project type”.

Provision 2 Source 2, section 3.1.1.c: “In order to avoid double counting the Project shall not be included in any other voluntary or compliance standards programme unless approved by Gold Standard (for example through dual certification). Also, if the Project Area overlaps with that of another Gold Standard or other voluntary or compliance standard programme of a similar nature, the project shall demonstrate that there is no double counting of impacts at design and performance certification (for example use of similar technology or practices through which the potential arises for double counting or misestimation of impacts amongst projects)”.

Assessment outcome

Establishment of natural forest: 5

Landfill gas utilization: 3

Efficient cookstoves: 1

Justification of assessment

Among the three project types assessed, efficient cookstoves and landfill gas utilization projects include emissions sources in the calculation of emission reductions that occur at other sites than where the project is implemented. This implies a risk of indirect overlaps with other projects.

In the case of efficient cookstove projects, the owner of a cookstove project receives credits for reducing woody biomass consumption, which results in maintaining or increasing carbon stocks on the relevant land areas. An indirect overlap could, for example, happen if at the same time an owner of an improved forest management project implemented on these land areas receives credits from enhanced forest stocks achieved as a result of the cookstove project. For this reason, the scoring for efficient cookstove projects depends on the carbon crediting program's provisions to address the risk of indirect overlaps.

In the case of landfill gas utilization projects, the owner of the landfill gas project may receive carbon credits for generating electricity with the captured gas or for selling the gas, thereby displacing the use of fossil fuels at other sites. An indirect overlap could, for example, happen if the user of the electricity or the gas implements another project and claims the emission reductions from using the electricity or gas. For this reason, the scoring for landfill gas utilization projects depends on the carbon crediting program's provisions to address the risk of indirect overlaps.

In the case of projects to establish natural forest, the risk of indirect overlaps is less relevant. Any extraction of biomass that is extracted from the project area and used under other projects would imply a decline in the amount of biomass stored in the land area, and thus be deducted from future issuances (or accounted for under non-permanence provisions). Moreover, projects to establish natural forest typically do not include any significant emission sources outside the project site in the calculation of emission reductions. Any such emissions, such as from fertilization production or transportation, are relatively small. For this reason, projects establishing natural forest are assigned a score of 5.

The Gold Standard has requirements in place for preventing potential overlaps within the Gold Standard as well as with other programs (Provision 2). However, the provisions only refer to the case of an overlap of the project area in which it needs to be demonstrated and verified that no double counting occurred. There might be other ways of overlaps, such as overlaps in upstream and downstream emissions sources, which are not addressed under the Gold Standard's requirements. These provisions are therefore not deemed sufficient to meet the conditions of a score of 5.

In the case of landfill gas projects, the Gold Standard does not have own methodologies, and does not allow the use of methodologies by other carbon crediting programs, that would allow the users of electricity or gas from landfill gas utilization projects to claim the same emission reductions. Indirect overlaps are therefore effectively avoided within the program, but not with regard to projects that may potentially be registered under other carbon crediting programs. Therefore, a score of 3 is assigned for landfill gas utilization projects.

In the case of efficient cookstove projects, the Gold Standard allows claiming carbon credits from both cookstove projects and afforestation projects. Any potential indirect overlaps of cookstove projects with afforestation projects are not addressed. Therefore, a score of 1 is assigned for efficient cookstove projects.