

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

Criterion:	3.1 Significance of non-permanence risks
Project type	Household biodigesters
Date of final assessment:	31 January 2023
Score:	The project type is considered to involve a material non-permanence risk in cases where emission reductions are claimed for reducing the consumption of non-renewable biomass. In other cases, the project type is considered not to involve a material non-permanence risk.

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

Criterion 3.1

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

The methodology evaluates the non-permanence risk of the project type. If the project type is deemed not to have a material non-permanence risk, then quality objective 3 is assigned a score of 5. If there is a material risk of non-permanence, the assessment depends on the outcome of criterion 3.2. The following table provides an overview for which types of mitigation activities non-permanence risks are considered material and for which not:

Mitigation activity	Non-permanence risk	Example activities
Destruction of non-CO ₂ gases	No risk: No reservoir involved. The destruction cannot be physically reversed.	HFC-23 destruction from HCFC-22 production
Avoidance of formation of non-CO ₂ gases, without effecting the amount of carbon stored in reservoirs	No risk: No reservoir involved. The process cannot be physically reversed.	Reducing CH ₄ emissions from rice cultivation, ruminant livestock or organic waste diversion
Reducing demand for fossil fuels	No material risk within time horizon relevant for avoiding dangerous climate change (except for possible lock-in effects in the case of activities that lead to a long-term increase in energy or feedstock demand). ¹	Adoption of renewable energy; energy efficiency measures
Reducing demand for non-renewable biomass (thereby reducing forest degradation)	Material risks: natural disturbance risks and anthropogenic factors.	Efficient cook stove projects
Enhancing, preserving, or slowing depletion of terrestrial carbon reservoirs	Material risks: The size of the risk depends on spatial scale, how underlying drivers are addressed, and stability of the reservoir(s) affected by the mitigation activity.	Afforestation/reforestation; improved forest management; avoided deforestation/conversion; soil carbon enhancements; peatland preservation or "rewetting"; etc.
Storing carbon in geologic reservoirs	Material risks: The size of the risks mainly depends on reservoir stability.	Carbon capture and storage (CCS BECCS, DACCS, or other)
Preventing or extinguishing accidental uncontrolled burning of fossil fuels	Material risks: The size of the risks mainly depends on reservoir stability.	Extinguishing or preventing ignition of fires at waste coal piles

¹ An example of such a lock-in effect is a project that installs new natural gas infrastructure, with a technical lifetime of 30 years, to replace an existing oil-based heating system. In the absence of the project, the existing oil-based system would be replaced after 10 years by a new heating system that comes to the market and that operates on 100% renewable energy. In this case, the emission reductions that the natural gas system achieves in the first 10 years of its operation would be reversed in the subsequent 20 years if not replaced by less GHG intensive technology. The project is thus locking in a fossil fuel based solution for the 30 years while renewable energy solution become available.

Preventing or slowing exploitation of fossil fuel reserves	Material risks: If the protection measure is discontinued, the reservoir may be depleted.	Protecting an oil field from being extracted
--	---	--

Information sources considered

-

Assessment outcome

The project type is considered to involve a material non-permanence risk in cases where emission reductions are claimed from reducing the consumption of non-renewable biomass. In other cases, the project type is considered not to involve a material non-permanence risk.

Justification of assessment

This assessment refers to the following project type:

“Generation of biogas by anaerobic digestion of livestock manure, and possibly other household waste such as kitchen waste, through household size biodigesters (e.g., with a capacity of 2 m³). The biogas is used by households for cooking. The project type may include a compost unit that utilizes the fermented sludge from the biodigester to produce organic fertilizer. The project type reduces emissions by (i) avoiding methane emissions from the uncontrolled decomposition of livestock manure and (ii) by reducing the use of firewood or fossil fuels for cooking activities. Projects are located in rural areas in developing countries.”

The avoidance of methane emissions from livestock manure is not associated with the preservation or enhancement of carbon reservoirs. In this case, there is no physical process by which the avoided formation of these emissions can be undone. Therefore, these emission reductions are permanent.

Some projects claim emission reductions from the displacement of fossil fuels. According to the scoring methodology, this does not involve any material non-permanence risk except for possible lock-in effects in the case of activities that lead to a long-term increase in energy or feedstock demand. This is not the case for this project type. The displacement of fossil fuels has thus no material non-permanence risk.

Some projects claim emission reductions from reducing the consumption of non-renewable biomass. According to the scoring methodology, this constitutes a material non-permanence risk. The emission reductions are based on enhancing forest carbon reservoirs, which are susceptible to natural disturbances such as fire, disease, drought or windstorms which may lead to natural depletion. Additionally, forests may be susceptible to different types of human-caused depletion, such as from demand for wood, or for land needed for subsistence, agricultural production, or development. The size and scale of carbon reservoirs affected by a mitigation activity is another important factor in assessing reversal risk. For activities implemented at the scale of projects, the effect of a wildfire could be catastrophic in terms of reversing prior carbon gains.

In conclusion, a material non-permanence risk only arises for projects that claim emission reductions from reducing the consumption of non-renewable biomass.