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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion:</th>
<th>2.3: Avoiding double use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon crediting program:</td>
<td>Gold Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment based on carbon crediting program documents valid as of:</td>
<td>30 June 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of final assessment:</td>
<td>20 May 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score:</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application of the methodology for assessing the quality of carbon credits

Assessment

Indicator 2.3.1

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“To address the risk of double use due to the cancellation of one carbon credit for more than one purpose, the registry system has functionalities to document the purposes for which carbon credits are used.”

Information sources considered

2 Gold Standard Registry, available at https://registry.goldstandard.org
3 List of retired credits, available at https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks?q=&page=1&is_retired=true

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, section 8.1: “The Account Holder may retire Units in The Gold Standard Registry in accordance with the rules set out in these Terms of Use, the Markit User Guidelines and The Gold Standard Operative Documents”.

Assessment outcome

Yes (2 Points)

Justification of assessment

In the registry, either a list of projects or a list of credits can be displayed. For each project, information is available on the number of credits issued as well as retired. For some credits, information on the purpose of the retirement is provided in a column of the registry available for “notes” (Sources 2 and 3). The indicator is considered to be fulfilled as the registry system has functionalities in place to document the purposes for which carbon credits are used.

Indicator 2.3.2

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program requires users of carbon credits (and/or their representatives) to transparently and unambiguously specify, either within the registry system or in another information system, the following information in relation to a cancellation:

a. The voluntary goal or requirement that is achieved through the cancellation of the carbon credits (e.g., “for voluntary offsetting purposes” or “CORSIA offsetting obligation”)

2
b. The beneficiary, i.e. which entity’s voluntary goals or mandatory requirements are met (e.g. "XYZ Airlines")

c. The calendar year(s) for which these voluntary goals or requirements are achieved (e.g., “2024 offsetting requirement covering the 2021-2023 compliance period under CORSIA”).

**Information sources considered**


2. List of retired credits, available at https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks?q=&page=1&is_retired=true


**Relevant carbon crediting program provisions**

Provision 1 Source 3, section 2.1: “The Gold Standard Registry’s functionality will be enhanced to ensure that it is able to securely and transparently issue, transfer and cancel credits/mitigation outcomes in the Paris era. The following functionality will likely be introduced:

- Indication of whether the offset credit has been cancelled and, if so, the following additional information related to cancellation is recorded and shared transparently:

- Purpose of the cancellation including name of entity in whose name the offset credit was cancelled

- [...]  

- Vintage of cancelled emission units

- [...]  

Some of this information is already available; the rest will be made available in due course.”

**Assessment outcome**

a. No (0 Points)

b. No (0 Points)

c. No (0 points)

**Justification of assessment**

In the registry, either a list of projects or a list of credits can be displayed. For some credits, information on the purpose of the retirement is provided in column of the registry available for “notes”
(Sources 1 and 2). However, it is not mandatory to provide information on the specific voluntary goal or requirement that is achieved through the retirement if it is not provided, information on the beneficiary is provided for some projects, or information on the calendar years for which voluntary goals or requirements are achieved. The program thus does not require users of carbon credits to provide the information requested by the indicator so that it is not fulfilled. It is noted, however, the Gold Standard is in the process of amending its requirements with respect to these issues (Provision 1).

**Indicator 2.3.3**

**Relevant scoring methodology provisions**

“The program enables the users of the carbon credits to voluntarily make the information in relation to a cancellation publicly accessible through the registry or project database system.

OR

The program requires that the information provided by the users of the carbon credits in relation to a cancellation be made publicly accessible through the registry or project database system.”

**Information sources considered**

2. List of retired credits, available at [https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks?q=&page=1&is_retired=true](https://registry.goldstandard.org/credit-blocks?q=&page=1&is_retired=true)

**Relevant carbon crediting program provisions**

- 

**Assessment outcome**

The first of the two conditions is met (1 Point).

**Justification of assessment**

In the registry, either a list of projects or a list of credits can be displayed. For each project, information is available on the number of credits issued as well as retired. For some credits, information on the purpose of the retirement is provided in column of the registry available for “notes”. It is thus possible to make information in relation to a retirement publicly available but this is not required.

**Scoring results**

The carbon crediting program receives 3 out of 8 achievable points. Applying the scoring approach of the methodology, this results in a score of 1.88.