

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:	5.1 Overall program governance
Carbon crediting program:	ACR
Assessment based on carbon crediting program documents valid as of:	15 May 2022
Date of final assessment:	08 November 2022
Score:	4.38

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

Indicator 5.1.1

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program has a Secretariat comprised of paid and fully employed staff that is responsible for the administration of the program.”

Information sources considered

- 1 Program website: Our team (<https://americancarbonregistry.org/about-us/team>), last accessed on 3 June 2022.

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

-

Assessment outcome

Yes (2 Points).

Justification of assessment

There is no officially designated secretariat or governance documents related to the program’s function. The "Our Team" section on the program website defines staff and functions related to the administration of the program such as standard development, client services, quality assurance, and other matters.

Indicator 5.1.2

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program provides contact details for the Secretariat on the program’s website.”

Information sources considered

- 1 Project website: Contact Us (<https://americancarbonregistry.org/resources/contact-us>), last accessed on 3 June 2022

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

-

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Points).

Justification of assessment

The American Carbon Registry provides contact details on the website and therefore fulfils the indicator.

Indicator 5.1.3

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program defines who is responsible for the administration of the program and has established formally defined procedures for the decision-making process on key programmatic functions, such as the approval of the normative program documents, the registration of projects, and the issuance, transfer and cancellation of carbon credits.”

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>
- 2 Program website: Our team (<https://americancarbonregistry.org/about-us/team>), last accessed on 3 June 2022.
- 3 Program website: Governance (<https://americancarbonregistry.org/about-us/Governance>), last accessed on 9 June 2022.
- 4 American Carbon Registry Operating Procedures. Document issued in April 2022. Online available at: https://americancarbonregistry.org/how-it-works/membership/acr-operating-procedures_april-2012.pdf/view
- 5 Process for Registering Offset Projects Using ACR-Approved Methodologies. Document issued in August 2022. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/guidance-tools-templates>
- 6 Process For Registering Compliance Offset Projects On ACR For The California Cap And Trade Program. Document issued in August 2022. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/guidance-tools-templates>
- 7 American Carbon Registry – Terms of Use. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/how-it-works/membership/acr-website-terms-of-use.pdf/view>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

- Provision 1 Source 1, Introduction, page 9: “ACR Governance. The ACR program is built on principles of accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and participatory processes. As an enterprise of Winrock, ACR benefits from the support and guidance of an established, reputable, global nonprofit organization. Winrock’s management, executive team, and board of directors provide direct oversight of all ACR operations.”
- Provision 2 Source 2: “We understand the complex technical, market and regulatory issues involved in developing offset projects and work with carbon asset owners to navigate the project registration and verification process through to issuance of carbon credits.

As a wholly-owned nonprofit subsidiary of Winrock International, ACR is governed by the Board of the Environmental Resources Trust (ERT).”

Provision 3 Source 1, 1.J Adoption of and Revisions to ACR Standards, page 15: “All ACR Standards will be posted for public comment for at least 60 days prior to adoption. ACR will prepare responses to all submitted comments and post the comments and responses along with the new version of the standard. ACR will review and revise the ACR Standard, as necessary, at a minimum of every 3 years. Such updates occur when significant changes to GHG accounting best practices or the legislative and/or regulatory context justify an update; when new provisions or requirements originating in methodologies make ACR aware of higher-level requirements or clarifications that should be made at the ACR Standard; upon an update to ACR’s internal policy and/or process requirements; or for other reasons.

Provision 4 Source, 7.B ACR’s Internal Review, Public Consultation, And Scientific Peer Review Process, page 45: “The following process is applied to new methodologies developed internally by Winrock/ACR, methodologies drafted by external authors, and certain methodology modifications, per Section A.2 of this chapter. In such cases, ACR coordinates a process of internal review, public stakeholder consultation, and a blind scientific peer review. ACR administers this process, with fees charged to the methodology author. [...]”

Provision 5 Source 4, section 1.2, page 3: “Purpose of these Operating Procedures

This document is intended to provide administrative detail and practical steps for Account Holders to facilitate their use of the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY. This document does not have the force of law; does not establish new mandatory requirements for carbon offset projects; and, in no way supplants, replaces, or amends any of the requirements of the ACR Standard, ARB regulations, or ICAO requirements. Conversely, an omission or truncation of regulatory requirements in this document does not relieve entities of their respective obligations to fully meet all ACR, ARB, and/or ICAO requirements.”

Provision 6 Source 4, section 1.3, page 3-4: “Overview of the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY

The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY serves as the book of record for tracking offset project listing; independent verification; and the issuance, transfer, retirement, and/or cancelation of Offset Credits for verified emissions reductions or removals. Offset Credits are either Emission Reduction Tons (ERTs), when verified against an ACR methodology and the ACR Standard, or Registry Offset Credits (ROCs), when verified against an ARB protocol and meeting the ARB regulatory requirements. ACR has engaged APX, Inc. as its technology provider with respect to the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY.

The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY Administrator will issue one serialized Offset Credit for each metric ton of CO₂e emissions reductions or removals from verified projects. The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY will only issue and track Offset Credits originating from verified offset projects that have been validated and verified by a Verifier/Validator recognized by ACR or approved by ARB. Offset Credits are issued as inactive. Upon activation, Account Holders can transfer Offset Credits to their default active account, active sub-accounts, or to other Account Holders; retire

Offset Credits in their own account (including on behalf of third parties); or cancel ROCs for conversion to ARB Offset Credits (ARBOCs).

Any entity choosing to participate in the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY must establish an AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY account. The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY provides the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY Administrator, Account Holders, and the public with reports on activity within the system. Public reports are accessible to everyone via the public homepage on the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY: <https://acr2.apx.com>.”

Provision 7 Source 4, section 5.4, page 11: “For each reporting period, the Project Proponent will enter issuance data into the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY, referred to as an Emissions Record. Required issuance data includes the methodology/protocol version, the reporting period (also referred to as the vintage assignment period) start and end dates, the quantity of credits to be issued (split between emission reductions and removals, if applicable) and, for projects with a buffer contribution, the quantity of credits required for the buffer account and the quantity of current reporting period credits to be deposited into the buffer account. For offset projects seeking ERTs, the Emissions Record also collects information on whether the units are CORSIA qualified and eligible. The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY Administrator will review the issuance data and compare it to the project and verification documents before Offset Credits are issued.”

Provision 8 “Source 4, section 5.6, page 12: “The Project Setup screen and Manage Projects module within the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY have been designed to facilitate and track project registration and issuance. The screen and module display the project’s status and registration next steps, so **the Project Proponent, VVB/VB, and AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY Administrator know who is responsible for taking the next action in the registration and issuance process.** Additionally, there are command buttons that appear at different stages in the registration and issuance process, which are used to advance a project. To help guide Account Holders through the project registration and issuance process, the Project Proponent and VVB/VB will only be able to select buttons that are appropriate at that time. A complete list of the valid status and next steps is listed in the table below, along with explanatory comments.”

Provision 9 Source 5, page 8- 16

“Steps to List ACR Offset Projects

1.The Project Proponent opens an account on ACR following instructions found at [https://americancarbonregistry.org/how it works/membership](https://americancarbonregistry.org/how-it-works/membership) and establishes desired login sand sub accounts following the steps in the Operating Procedures, found on the same website.

2.Every project submitted for listing must use an active, ACR approved methodology found at [https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon accounting/standards methodologies](https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies)

3.Project Proponent submits a new project on the Registry, including the upload of an Offset Project Listing Form using the template found at

<https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon> accounting/guidance tools templates and pays the invoice for the project listing fee.

4. ACR reviews the Offset Project Listing Form for completeness, and alignment with the ACR Standard.

5. ACR review of the Offset Project Listing Form results in:

a) Project Listing with approval to proceed to Validation/Verification Body (VVB) selection,

b) Requests for clarifications or corrections, or

c) Rejection because the project is ineligible or does not meet requirements of the ACR Standard.

A project is considered listed once the Offset Project Listing Form is approved. The project listing information and form will then be made public on the Registry.

6. Having received listing approval, the Project Proponent develops the GHG Project Plan. A template for the GHG Project Plan can be found at <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbonaccounting/guidance> tools templates .

[...]

Steps for Offset Credit Issuance

1. Upon acceptance of the submitted reporting and verification documents, ACR serializes and issues to the Project Proponent's account Emission Reduction Tons (ERTs) for the relevant reporting period, in the amount listed in the verification opinion.

In the case of a terrestrial or geologic sequestration project, the appropriate number of ERTs are deposited into the ACR Buffer Pool or Reserve Account, if this is the approved risk management option the Project Proponent has chosen.

2. ERTs are issued as inactive and the Project Proponent, at their discretion, can activate the credits. Initiating activation generates an invoice and activation occurs upon receipt of payment.

3. **Active ERTs can be transacted or retired in accordance with the ACR Terms of Use, Operating Procedures, and Fee Schedule**, all found at https://americancarbonregistry.org/how_itworks/membership"

Provision 10 Source 6, page 6- 11:

"Who Can List Compliance Offset Projects

An Offset Project Operator (OPO) is the entity with legal authority to implement an offset project

• Per §95974, the Offset Project Operator may also designate an entity as an Authorized Project Designee (APD) at the time of offset project listing or any time after offset project listing

- An Offset Project Operator may modify or change an Authorized Project Designee once within each calendar year after the offset project has been listed

Steps to List Compliance Offset Projects

1 Per §95975, before an offset project can be listed by an OPR, the Offset Project Operator and, if applicable, its Authorized Project Designee must register with ARB pursuant to §95830

2 The project developer must also open an account on ACR: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/how-it-works/membership>

3 OPO/APD enters project information and uploads required Compliance Offset Project Listing Form and optional Authorized Project Designee (APD) Form on to the Registry

4 OPO/APD submits project for listing and pays project listing fee

5 ACR will determine the eligibility of the project within 30 calendar days of receiving complete and accurate listing information. If approved, the listing information will be made public and the status will be “Proposed Project”

Steps for Registry Offset Credit Issuance

1. Once the project is listed, OPO/APD uploads the Offset Project Data Report (OPDR) on to the Registry (this can be done before or after Verification Body selection), making sure to meet regulatory reporting deadlines (§95976(d) and §95976(d)(8))

2. OPO/APD selects an ARB-approved Verification Body in the Registry

3. Pursuant to §95979, before providing any offset verification services, the Verification Body must submit a self-evaluation of any potential conflict of interest (COI) between the Verification Body and the entity for which it will perform offset verification

4. ACR will review the Verification Body’s COI evaluation & make a conflict of interest determination within 30 calendar days

5. Pursuant to §95977.1, the Verification Body must submit a Notice of Offset Verification Services (NOVS) to ACR 10 calendar days before offset verification services begin

6. Verification Body conducts verification per ARB requirements

7. Once verification is complete, Verification Body uploads the Verification Statement and Verification Report pursuant to §95977.1

8. OPO/APD then enters a new emission record into the Registry including the vintage, reporting period dates, and quantity of credits and submits verification documentation ACR to determine if ROCs will be issued

9. ACR reviews the Verification Statement and Report and determines if requirements are met within 45 calendar days of receipt of complete verification documentation

10. If the GHG emissions reductions or removal enhancements were issued a Positive Offset or Qualified Positive Offset Verification Statement, and the submitted information meets the requirements of the regulation, ACR will issue serialized ROCs, and the status of the project will change to “Active Registry Project”

Steps for ARB Offset Credit Issuance

Once issued, ROCs are available to be “activated” for cancellation for issuance as ARB Offset Credits

in the Compliance Instrument Tracking System Service (CITSS)

For issuance of ARBOCs:

1. ACR provides required information and documentation to ARB
2. OPO/APD submits Request for Issuance of ARBOCs to ARB
3. ARB will determine whether the GHG emission reductions/GHG removal enhancements meet the requirements of the regulation and applicable Compliance Offset Protocol within 45 calendar days of receiving complete and accurate information
4. ARB will issue ARBOCs within 15 calendar days of determining that requirements are met
5. ARB will provide notice of issuance within 5 working days of issuance and approve ACR to cancel corresponding ROCs
6. OPO/APD activates credits (if not yet done) and initiates ROC cancellation request on ACR Registry (can be requested simultaneously)
7. OPO/APD pays the associated ACR fees
8. ACR Administrator completes cancellation of ROCs, and the offset project status changes to “Active ARB”

Provision 11: Source 4, section 7.2, page 16: “Transfer of Offset Credits Between Accounts Account Holders may transfer active Offset Credits between their own accounts or to other AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY Account Holders at any time. Offset Credits are specified by their serial numbers and other characteristics, such as project type and location. Account Holders can initiate a transfer by logging in with their credentials and following these steps:

1. Click on the credit quantity listed in the View/Transfer Credits column for the account found under Open Accounts in the View, Transfer, Retire and Cancel Credits section on the main home screen.
2. In the new screen, users can view Offset Credit details for all batches of credits held within that account.
3. Click “Transact” in the Action column of the Offset Credit batch to be transferred.
4. Enter the quantity of Offset Credits to be transferred.

5. Select the type of transfer (i.e., send to another Account Holder or another sub-account).
6. Pick from the available active accounts in the dropdown list to deposit the active credits into.
7. If desired, enter the email addresses to be notified of the transaction.
8. Click Submit.”

Provision 12: Source 4, section 7.3, page 16: “Transfer of Offset Credits Between Account Holders

After the transfer has been initiated, the Offset Credits pending transfer will be marked as “transfer pending”. This will have the effect of “freezing” the Offset Credits so that they cannot be moved to another sub-account or another Account Holder.

The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY system will then generate an automatic electronic notification of the request to transfer Offset Credits to the proposed recipient. The Offset Credit transfer recipient must confirm the transfer before the Offset Credits are moved into their account.

The transferring Account Holder may withdraw any transfer before such transfer has been confirmed by the recipient by withdrawing the transfer in a designated screen on the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY. The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY system will notify the recipient that the transfer was canceled.

The transfer of any Offset Credit or block of Offset Credits shall only be completed in the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY upon the electronic confirmation by both the transferring Account Holder and the recipient.

Upon completion of the transfer, the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY system will send an electronic confirmation to both Account Holders confirming that the transfer has been completed. A transfer fee will be assessed in accordance with the ACR Fee Schedule.”

Provision 13: Source 4, section 7.4, page 16: Cancellation of Offset Credits

Cancellation of Offset Credits primarily occurs for the purpose of converting Registry Offset Credits to ARB Offset Credits.

Account Holders can initiate a cancellation of active Offset Credits by logging in with their credentials and following these steps:

1. Click on the credit quantity listed in the View/Transfer Credits column for the Account found under Open Accounts in the View, Transfer, Retire and Cancel Credits section on the main home screen.
2. In the new screen, users can view Offset Credit details for all batches of credits held within that account.
3. Click “Transact” in the Action column of the Offset Credit batch to be canceled.
4. Enter the quantity of Offset Credits to be canceled.

5. Select Cancel Credits and select Convert to ARB Offset Credits from the dropdown menu.
6. If desired, enter the email addresses to be notified of the transaction.
7. Click Submit.

After the cancelation has been initiated, the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY Administrator is notified of the cancelation request and will proceed to confirm the cancelation and submit a cancelation report to ARB. A cancelation fee will be assessed in accordance with the ACR Fee Schedule.

Account Holders can choose to activate and cancel Offset Credits simultaneously. Account Holders can initiate activation and cancelation by following these steps:

1. Click on the credit quantity listed in the View/Transfer Credits column for the Inactive row under Account Balances in the View, Transfer, Retire and Cancel Credits section on the main home screen.
2. In the Inactive tab, tick the box on the lefthand column of the batch of Offset Credits to be activated and canceled.
3. If seeking to activate less than the entire quantity of Offset Credits in that batch, type the desired quantity in the Transaction Quantity column.
4. Repeat steps 2 and 3 if seeking to activate and cancel Offset Credits from more than one batch.
5. Click “Activate” in the top left corner of the screen (the quantity shown is the sum of all Offset Credits to be activated and canceled).
6. In the new screen, select Activate and Cancel and select Convert to ARB Offset Credits from the dropdown menu.
7. Click Confirm.

Upon request of Offset Credit activation and cancelation by the Account Holder, one-time fees for activation and cancelation will be charged in accordance with the ACR Fee Schedule. Upon receipt of payment, the AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY

Administrator is notified of the cancelation request and will proceed to confirm the cancelation and submit a cancelation report to ARB.

The AMERICAN CARBON REGISTRY Administrator will also cancel Offset Credits to compensate for reversals as necessary, per the terms of a Risk Mitigation Agreement”

Provision 14 Source 7, page 1: “The following are the Terms of Use for the American Carbon Registry (the “Registry”), operated and administered by Environmental Resources Trust (ERT), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Winrock International, doing business as American Carbon Registry, an Arkansas non-profit corporation (“ACR” or “Administrator”). “American Carbon Registry”, “American Carbon Registry Standard” (the “ACR Standard”) and ACR’s system for GHG reduction and removal projects and credits, are owned by and constitute the valuable intellectual property of ACR.

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

The "Our Team" section on the program website defines staff and functions related to the administration of the program such as development and oversight of operational processes, standard development, client services, quality assurance, and other matters. The Process for Registering Offset Projects Using ACR-Approved Methodologies and the Process for Registering Compliance Offset Projects On ACR For The California Cap And Trade Program (both documents issued in August 2022) define procedures for the registration of projects, and issuance, transfer, and cancellation of emission allowances. The program has procedures in place for development of new methodologies (Provision 4). The indicator is therefore fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.4

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

"The program is overseen by a Board of Directors or Trustees."

Information sources considered

- 1 Program website: Our team (<https://americancarbonregistry.org/about-us/team>), last accessed on 3 June 2022.

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1: "We understand the complex technical, market and regulatory issues involved in developing offset projects and work with carbon asset owners to navigate the project registration and verification process through to issuance of carbon credits. As a wholly-owned nonprofit subsidiary of Winrock International, ACR is governed by the Board of the Environmental Resources Trust (ERT)."

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

The above documentation specifies that the indicator is fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.5

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

"All non-staff individuals serving in a professional capacity to support the administration of the program (e.g., members of the Board, advisory groups or expert committees) are subject to conflict-of-interest provisions to address any financial or other conflicts that may arise in their role supporting

the administration of the program (e.g., in providing expert opinions or reviewing quantification methodologies).”

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>
- 2 Winrock Code of Conduct. Document issued in May 2021. Online available at: <https://code.winrock.org/code/>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, section 1.K, page 15: “As a nonprofit organization that values its reputation for integrity, ACR requires that all management and staff adhere to its Code of Professional Conduct, which includes a strict and comprehensive policy against engaging in activities that present a conflict of interest. Accordingly, each director, officer, and staff member are required to regularly affirm that they are in compliance with this policy, that they avoid all conflicts of interest and take reasonable action to avoid circumstances that create the appearance of a conflict of interest. ACR staff are required to notify management immediately if any conflict-of-interest situations arise or come to their attention so the conflict can be appropriately mitigated.

In addition to its internal conflict of interest policy, ACR requires that its third-party registry service provider maintain and adhere to a strict conflict of interest policy and that all ACR-approved Validation and Verification Bodies (VVBs) execute an Attestation of Validation/Verification Body, which defines the VVB role and responsibilities and ensures technical capabilities of all staff and no conflicts of interest. ACR-approved VVBs must also execute and have approved by ACR a project-specific conflict of interest form for each project validation and/or reporting period verification for which they have been selected.”

Provision 2 Source 2, page 4: “At Winrock we follow the laws of every country where we work. We also follow this Code of Conduct. Upholding Winrock’s Code of Conduct is a responsibility shared by all involved in contributing to project results, providing solutions, and delivering on Winrock’s mission. The Code is mandatory and applies to each employee, Board member, volunteer, intern and fellow, and consultant (also known as our “workforce”).

In addition to the Code, we also have Operational Policies and Procedures, which are issued by operational groups (such as Finance, Human Resources or Operations) that apply to specific activities or roles. These Operational Policies and Procedures implement business practices to achieve consistent results and efficiencies, and to minimize legal risks. Compliance with the Operational Policies and Procedures also is a mandatory condition of employment.”

Assessment outcome

No (0 Points).

Justification of assessment

According to the program provisions, all management and staff must comply to the program's code of professional conduct and directors, officers (Board members), and staff members are required to adhere to the program's conflict-of-interest provisions. The program provisions do not explicitly specify that non-staff experts that contribute to the program without remuneration (such as advisory groups or expert committees) are subject to conflict-of-interest provisions. The indicator is therefore not fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.6

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

"The program has established a code of conduct (or similar document) that identifies the provisions by which program staff and registry administrators must conduct themselves, including conflict of interest provisions to address any conflicts that may arise in the administration of the program (e.g., in registering projects or issuing carbon credits)."

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, section 1.K, page 15: "As a nonprofit organization that values its reputation for integrity, ACR requires that all management and staff adhere to its Code of Professional Conduct, which includes a strict and comprehensive policy against engaging in activities that present a conflict of interest. Accordingly, each director, officer, and staff member are required to regularly affirm that they are in compliance with this policy, that they avoid all conflicts of interest and take reasonable action to avoid circumstances that create the appearance of a conflict of interest. ACR staff are required to notify management immediately if any conflict-of-interest situations arise or come to their attention so the conflict can be appropriately mitigated.

In addition to its internal conflict of interest policy, ACR requires that its third-party registry service provider maintain and adhere to a strict conflict of interest policy and that all ACR-approved Validation and Verification Bodies (VVBs) execute an Attestation of Validation/Verification Body, which defines the VVB role and responsibilities and ensures technical capabilities of all staff and no conflicts of interest. ACR-approved VVBs must also execute and have approved by ACR a project-specific conflict of interest form for each project validation and/or reporting period verification for which they have been selected."

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

The above documentation specifies that the indicator is fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.7

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program's normative program documents are developed and updated in accordance with formally defined procedures.”

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, Definitions, page 69: “A methodology revision is a fundamental change in an existing approved methodology due to a change in conditions, circumstances, or general developments in knowledge. ACR approval of methodology deviations and modifications is determined by the relevant ACR Technical Committee. Approval of revisions requires public consultation and peer review.

Provision 2 Source 1, 7.A.2, page 45: “New methodologies proposed to ACR for approval always require internal screening, public consultation, and blind scientific peer review as described in section B.”

Provision 3 Source 1, section 7.B, page 45: “The following process is applied to new methodologies developed internally by Winrock/ACR, methodologies drafted by external authors, and certain methodology modifications, per Section A.2 of this chapter. In such cases, ACR coordinates a process of internal review, public stakeholder consultation, and a blind scientific peer review. ACR administers this process, with fees charged to the methodology author.

1. The methodology developer(s) submits to ACR for review the following information:
 - 1) Brief description of the proposed project type (including but not limited to: activity, geography, quantification approach, additionality approach, leakage description);
 - 2) Market analysis demonstrating technical potential for emissions reductions of the proposed activity and ability and timing to scale impact given geographic, regulatory or other market considerations;
 - 3) Sample project using the proposed methodology including an economic analysis demonstrating that the proposed activity is viable under current market conditions; and
 - 4) Indication of intent for near-term project development. Based on review of this information, ACR will determine whether to move forward with the methodology review (Step 2).

2. The Project Proponent submits the proposed new or modified methodology to ACR. ACR has templates posted at www.americancarbonregistry.org for some proposed methodologies. Project Proponents must submit their proposed methodology using the available templates to reduce the time and cost of the approval process for both

Project Proponent and ACR. ACR screens the methodology against its requirements, communicates any corrections or clarifications that are immediately needed, and informs the methodology author of its judgment as to whether the methodology is ready for public consultation and peer review. ACR conducts this internal review at currently published fees.^{18F23} If the methodology author elects to proceed, they address any corrections and clarifications identified in the ACR review and resubmit the methodology. Based on review of draft methodology document, ACR will determine whether to move forward with the public consultation and peer review processes (Steps 4 and 5). ACR's agreement to proceed with subsequent steps in the methodology approval process does not guarantee that the methodology will be approved.

3. ACR coordinates a public consultation process. The methodology is posted publicly on the ACR website for a minimum of 30 days, and ACR sends out a public notice inviting comments. During this period, the methodology authors may also elect to conduct a webinar with ACR to present the draft methodology and solicit additional comments. At the conclusion of the public comment period, ACR compiles all comments by methodology section and forwards a compiled report to the methodology author, who then incorporates revisions and/or documents responses to each comment, which are posted on ACR's website.

4. The revised methodology is provided to a team of independent subject matter experts for a blind scientific peer review process. ACR may consult the relevant ACR Technical Committee in the selection of reviewers. The lead reviewer compiles comments and recommendations from the peer review team and prepares a summary report. ACR delivers to the methodology author a peer review report, organized by section of the methodology, to which the author must respond by incorporating revisions and/or documenting justifications for the proposed approach. Generally, several rounds of peer review are necessary. Timing and cost of peer review depends on the complexity, scope, and quality of the methodology and the availability of peer reviewers. The cost of peer review is borne by the methodology author.

5. Once all required corrections have been made to the satisfaction of the peer reviewers and ACR, ACR approves the new methodology and publishes it on its website. An approved methodology may be used by any Project Proponent, including the methodology author, in preparing GHG Project Plans and registering projects on ACR.

6. ACR posts process documentation—including all public comments and documented responses, and all peer review comments and documented responses—along with the public comment version of the methodology, and the final approved methodology.

Scientific peer review teams are selected from a pool of potential reviewers with applicable subject matter expertise. ACR actively identifies and qualifies candidates for inclusion in this pool, and publicly solicits applications from interested parties. Applications are reviewed for sector expertise, GHG quantification experience, and impartiality. Throughout and after the peer review process, the experts selected for each review team remain unknown to the methodology author and the public.”

Provision 4 Source 1, section 7.C, page 47: “ACR may periodically update (or decide to retire) its approved methodologies and tools. Such updates occur when significant changes to GHG accounting best practice or the legislative and/or regulatory context justify an update; when sufficient new data is available to revise eligibility and/or additionality requirements; when ACR becomes aware of clarifications that should be made; or for other reasons.

For methodologies that employ a performance standard for additionality assessment, ACR shall review the validity and underlying assumptions of the performance standard for all non-forestry projects every 5 years, at minimum. The period for forestry projects is every 10 years, at mini-mum.”

Provision 5 Source 1, Appendix C, page 101: “The ACR Standard is based on the foundation laid by the normative reference standards and documents listed in Table 5 below. These documents assisted ACR to articulate its own requirements and specifications for the quantification, monitoring, and reporting of GHG project-based emissions reductions and removals, verification, project registration, and issuance of project-based offsets.

In particular, the ACR Standard builds on the ISO technical specifications for GHG accounting, GHG assertions and verification, and verifier accreditation as set forth in the ISO 14064 Parts 1-3:2006 and ISO 14065:2013, Specifications. To the ISO specifications, ACR adds its own mandatory requirements as detailed in the ACR eligibility criteria, additionality determination process, sector standards, and approved methodologies and tools. In the event of conflicts between the ACR Standard and the ISO technical specifications or other normative references, the ACR Standard shall take precedence.”

Provision 6 Source 1, Appendix c, page 10:

Table 5: Normative References for the ACR Standard

AUTHORING BODY	DOCUMENT OR STANDARD	RELATIONSHIP TO ACR
International Standardization Organization (ISO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ISO 14064:2006 Parts 1-3: A set of international standards that address the quantification, reporting, and verification of GHG emissions and project reductions ● ISO 14065:2013: Verifier accreditation requirements 	ISO 14064:2006 provides a foundation for the ACR Standard with technical specifications for GHG accounting and reporting for projects and verification assertions. ISO 14065: 2007 specifies requirements for verifier accreditation.
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guidelines for National GHG Inventories ● Good Practice Guidance ● Fifth Assessment Report 	Identification of best practices and options for GHG emission inventory development; methodological guidance and primary seed document for more specific guidance materials and standards

Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project-level baseline and monitoring tools and methodologies • Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality • GHG sources and sinks significance test 	<p>The CDM additionality tool informs ACR additionality tests and may assist Project Proponents in formulating additionality arguments.</p>
--	--	---

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Points).

Justification of assessment

The ACR uses normative references laid out by the International Standardization Organization (ISO), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the CDM. For methodologies developed by the ACR the process for development and updates of these documents is defined in the program standard. The indicator is therefore fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.8

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“Material program updates (e.g., new or updated normative program documents) are subject to public consultation and the process for doing so is clearly defined in the program’s provisions.”

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>
- 2 Program website: Carbon Accounting (<https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting>), last accessed on 17 June 2022.

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

- Provision 1 Source 1, Definitions, page 69: “A methodology revision is a fundamental change in an existing approved methodology due to a change in conditions, circumstances, or general developments in knowledge. ACR approval of methodology deviations and modifications is determined by the relevant ACR Technical Committee. Approval of revisions requires public consultation and peer review.
- Provision 2 Source 1, section 1.J, page 15: “All ACR Standards will be posted for public comment for at least 60 days prior to adoption. ACR will prepare responses to all submitted comments and post the comments and responses along with the new version of the standard.

ACR will review and revise the ACR Standard, as necessary, at a minimum of every 3 years.

Such updates occur when significant changes to GHG accounting best practices or the legislative and/or regulatory context justify an update; when new provisions or requirements originating in methodologies make ACR aware of higher-level requirements or clarifications that should be made at the ACR Standard; upon an update to ACR's internal policy and/or process requirements; or for other reasons."

Source 3 Source 1, section 7.A.1: "Current versions of methodologies published by ACR via the public consultation and peer re-view process are approved without qualification. Modifications to Existing Approved Methodologies

Methodology modifications may be submitted for review by ACR, at fees per the currently published ACR fee schedule. ACR will review the extent of the modification and determine whether the internal review, public consultation, and peer review process, as described in Section B of this chapter, must be implemented. In general, if the extent of the proposed modification(s) necessitates the process described in Section B, a new version number for the methodology will be issued (e.g., Version 3.0 to Version 4.0). Modifications to eligibility, applicability, Project Activities, and/or baseline assumptions are likely to trigger the full process stipulated in Section B; minor modifications or clarifications may not require the full public consultation and peer review processes."

Provision 4 Source 1, section 7.A.2, page 45: "New methodologies proposed to ACR for approval always require internal screening, public consultation, and blind scientific peer review as described in section B."

Provision 5 Source 1, section 7.B, page 45: "The following process is applied to new methodologies developed internally by Winrock/ACR, methodologies drafted by external authors, and certain methodology modifications, per Section A.2 of this chapter. In such cases, ACR coordinates a process of internal review, public stakeholder consultation, and a blind scientific peer review. ACR administers this process, with fees charged to the methodology author.

1. The methodology developer(s) submits to ACR for review the following information: 1) Brief description of the proposed project type (including but not limited to: activity, geography, quantification approach, additionality approach, leakage description); 2) Market analysis demonstrating technical potential for emissions reductions of the proposed activity and ability and timing to scale impact given geographic, regulatory or other market considerations; 3) Sample project using the proposed methodology including an economic analysis demonstrating that the proposed activity is viable under current market conditions; and 4) Indication of intent for near-term project development. Based on review of this information, ACR will determine whether to move forward with the methodology review (Step 2).

2. The Project Proponent submits the proposed new or modified methodology to ACR. ACR has templates posted at www.americancarbonregistry.org for some proposed methodologies. Project Proponents must submit their proposed methodology using the available templates to reduce the time and cost of the approval process for both Project Proponent and ACR. ACR screens the methodology against its requirements,

communicates any corrections or clarifications that are immediately needed, and informs the methodology author of its judgment as to whether the methodology is ready for public consultation and peer review. ACR conducts this internal review at currently published fees. If the methodology author elects to proceed, they address any corrections and clarifications identified in the ACR review and resubmit the methodology. Based on review of draft methodology document, ACR will determine whether to move forward with the public consultation and peer review processes (Steps 4 and 5). ACR's agreement to proceed with subsequent steps in the methodology approval process does not guarantee that the methodology will be approved.

3. ACR coordinates a public consultation process. The methodology is posted publicly on the ACR website for a minimum of 30 days, and ACR sends out a public notice inviting comments. During this period, the methodology authors may also elect to conduct a webinar with ACR to present the draft methodology and solicit additional comments. At the conclusion of the public comment period, ACR compiles all comments by methodology section and forwards a compiled report to the methodology author, who then incorporates revisions and/or documents responses to each comment, which are posted on ACR's website.

4. The revised methodology is provided to a team of independent subject matter experts for a blind scientific peer review process. ACR may consult the relevant ACR Technical Committee in the selection of reviewers. The lead reviewer compiles comments and recommendations from the peer review team and prepares a summary report. ACR delivers to the methodology author a peer review report, organized by section of the methodology, to which the author must respond by incorporating revisions and/or documenting justifications for the proposed approach. Generally, several rounds of peer review are necessary. Timing and cost of peer review depends on the complexity, scope, and quality of the methodology and the availability of peer reviewers. The cost of peer review is borne by the methodology author.

5. Once all required corrections have been made to the satisfaction of the peer reviewers and ACR, ACR approves the new methodology and publishes it on its website. An approved methodology may be used by any Project Proponent, including the methodology author, in preparing GHG Project Plans and registering projects on ACR.

6. ACR posts process documentation—including all public comments and documented responses, and all peer review comments and documented responses—along with the public comment version of the methodology, and the final approved methodology.

Scientific peer review teams are selected from a pool of potential reviewers with applicable subject matter expertise. ACR actively identifies and qualifies candidates for inclusion in this pool, and publicly solicits applications from interested parties. Applications are reviewed for sector expertise, GHG quantification experience, and impartiality. Throughout and after the peer review process, the experts selected for each review team remain unknown to the methodology author and the public.”

Provision 6 Source 1, section 7.C, page 47: “ACR may periodically update (or decide to retire) its approved methodologies and tools. Such updates occur when significant changes to GHG accounting best practice or the legislative and/or regulatory context justify an update; when sufficient new data is available to revise eligibility and/or additionality requirements; when ACR becomes aware of clarifications that should be made; or for other reasons.

For methodologies that employ a performance standard for additionality assessment, ACR shall review the validity and underlying assumptions of the performance standard for all non-forestry projects every 5 years, at minimum. The period for forestry projects is every 10 years, at minimum.”

Provision 7 Source 2: “The American Carbon Registry promotes innovation to bring new offsets types to market. Project developers are welcome to submit new offset methodologies and methodology modifications for evaluation. New methodologies and methodology modifications are approved for use through ACR’s public comment and scientific peer review process. Upon approval, ACR will publish the methodology for future use.”

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

The above documentation specifies that the indicator is fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.9

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program actively performs outreach to gather public input when conducting public consultations on material program updates (e.g., through messages on their websites or messages to email listservs).”

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>
- 2 Program website: Standards & Methodologies. Open for Public Comment (<https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies/open-for-public-comment>), last accessed on 9 June 2022.

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, section 7.B, page 46: “ACR coordinates a public consultation process. The methodology is posted publicly on the ACR website for a minimum of 30 days, and ACR sends out a public notice inviting comments. During this period, the methodology authors may also elect to conduct a webinar with ACR to present the draft methodology and solicit additional comments. At the conclusion of the public

comment period, ACR compiles all comments by methodology section and forwards a compiled report to the methodology author, who then incorporates revisions and/or documents responses to each comment, which are posted on ACR's website."

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

Methodologies or papers open for public comment are published on the program website. According to the ACR standard, the program sends out public notices inviting comments, but it does not further specify how and to whom notifications are sent.

Indicator 5.1.10

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

"Material program updates (e.g., new or updated normative program documents) are developed with the participation of experts (e.g., through advisory groups or expert committees)."

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

- Provision 1 Source 1, Definitions, page 69: "A methodology revision is a fundamental change in an existing approved methodology due to a change in conditions, circumstances, or general developments in knowledge. ACR approval of methodology deviations and modifications is determined by the relevant ACR Technical Committee. Approval of revisions requires public consultation and peer review.
- Provision 2 Source 1, section 7.D, page 47: "ACR may periodically establish Technical Committees for particular sectors (e.g., AFOLU), to provide independent advice on methodology acceptance, methodology modifications and project deviations, selection of peer reviewers, and related issues. The responsibilities of the Technical Committees include the following:
- Review proposed new methodologies and tools submitted to ACR for approval; Advise ACR on the selection of appropriate peer reviewers for a proposed new methodology or methodology revision;
 - Make final determinations in the event consensus on a particular methodological issue is not reached by the peer review team or between the peer reviewers and the methodology author;
 - Advise ACR on continuous improvements to its AFOLU standards, including issuance of new versions at appropriate intervals; and

- Advise ACR on decisions to commission new methodologies and tools using internal resources.
- ACR Technical Committees are constituted via calls for applications to select the most relevant experts.

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

The above documentation specifies that the indicator is fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.11

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program has established procedures for receiving complaints and resolving disputes from any carbon crediting program stakeholders. This includes the possibility for project owners to appeal decisions by the carbon crediting program relating to their projects.”

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, section 11.A, page 60: “Complaints procedure. When a Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder objects to a decision made by ACR representatives or the application of the ACR program requirements, the following confidential complaint procedure shall be followed:

1. Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder sends a written complaint via email to ACR@winrock.org. The complaint must detail the following:
 - Description of the complaint with specific reference to ACR Standard and/or ACR Methodology requirements, as applicable;
 - Supporting documentation provided for consideration by ACR in the complaint resolution process; and
 - Complainant name, contact details, and organization.
2. ACR Senior Management shall assign an ACR representative to research and further investigate the complaint. The representative assigned to handle the complaint shall not have been involved with the issue that is the subject of the formal complaint.
3. ACR Senior Management will provide a written response, via email, to the complainant detailing ACR’s decision on the matter.”

Provision 2 Source 1, section 11.B, page 60: “Appeals procedure. In the event that a complaint remains unresolved after the conclusion of the complaints procedure, an ACR Project Proponent or stakeholder may appeal any such decision or outcome reached. The following confidential appeals procedure shall be followed:

1. Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder sends a written appeal via email to ACR@winrock.org. The appeal must detail the following:

- Description of the appeal, with specific reference to ACR Standard and/or ACR Methodology requirements, as applicable;
- Supporting documentation provided for consideration in the appeal process, including previous communication on the complaint and all relevant details of the previously implemented complaint procedure; and
- Appellant name, contact details, and organization.

2. ACR Senior Management shall forward the appeal to the appropriate Winrock Senior Director, who will convene a committee of representatives to review and discuss the matter. The committee will include a member of the Winrock Board of Directors, a member of the Winrock Senior Management team, and an ACR staff member unrelated to the complaint, all of whom will have equal votes. The committee may also include a technical and/or subject matter expert or experts as necessary, who will not be able to vote. The committee members selected will depend on the subject matter and nature of the appeal.

3. The decision reached by the committee shall be communicated, via written response, to the ACR Project Proponent or stakeholder. Any decision reached by the committee shall be final.”

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

The above documentation specifies that the indicator is fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.12

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“Potential issues with the program’s provisions as identified through public consultation or complaints by any carbon crediting program stakeholders, are addressed and the process for doing so is clearly defined in the normative program documents.”

Information sources considered

- 1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, section 11.A, page 60: “Complaints procedure. When a Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder objects to a decision made by ACR representatives or the application of the ACR program requirements, the following confidential complaint procedure shall be followed:

1. Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder sends a written complaint via email to ACR@winrock.org. The complaint must detail the following:

- Description of the complaint with specific reference to ACR Standard and/or ACR Methodology requirements, as applicable;
- Supporting documentation provided for consideration by ACR in the complaint resolution process; and
- Complainant name, contact details, and organization.

2. ACR Senior Management shall assign an ACR representative to research and further investigate the complaint. The representative assigned to handle the complaint shall not have been involved with the issue that is the subject of the formal complaint.

3. ACR Senior Management will provide a written response, via email, to the complainant detailing ACR’s decision on the matter.”

Provision 2 Source 1, section 11.B, page 60: “Appeals procedure. In the event that a complaint remains unresolved after the conclusion of the complaints procedure, an ACR Project Proponent or stakeholder may appeal any such decision or outcome reached. The following confidential appeals procedure shall be followed:

1. Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder sends a written appeal via email to ACR@winrock.org. The appeal must detail the following:

- Description of the appeal, with specific reference to ACR Standard and/or ACR Methodology requirements, as applicable;
- Supporting documentation provided for consideration in the appeal process, including previous communication on the complaint and all relevant details of the previously implemented complaint procedure; and
- Appellant name, contact details, and organization.

2. ACR Senior Management shall forward the appeal to the appropriate Winrock Senior Director, who will convene a committee of representatives to review and discuss the matter. The committee will include a member of the Winrock Board of Directors, a member of the Winrock Senior Management team, and an ACR staff member unrelated to the complaint, all of whom will have equal votes. The committee may also include a technical and/or subject matter expert or experts as necessary, who will not be able to vote. The committee members selected will depend on the subject matter and nature of the appeal.

3. The decision reached by the committee shall be communicated, via written response, to the ACR Project Proponent or stakeholder. Any decision reached by the committee shall be final.”

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

The ACR standard indicates that complaints are investigated and that the complainant receives a written response on the ACR’s decision. The indicator is therefore fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.13

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The procedure for handling stakeholder disputes and complaints has defined time-bound requirements for the program to respond to disputes or complaints.”

Information sources considered

1 The American Carbon Registry Standard, v7.0. Document issued in December 2020. Online available at: <https://americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards-methodologies>

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

Provision 1 Source 1, section 11.A, page 60: “Complaints procedure. When a Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder objects to a decision made by ACR representatives or the application of the ACR program requirements, the following confidential complaint procedure shall be followed:

1. Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder sends a written complaint via email to ACR@winrock.org. The complaint must detail the following:

- Description of the complaint with specific reference to ACR Standard and/or ACR Methodology requirements, as applicable;
- Supporting documentation provided for consideration by ACR in the complaint resolution process; and
- Complainant name, contact details, and organization.

2. ACR Senior Management shall assign an ACR representative to research and further investigate the complaint. The representative assigned to handle the complaint shall not have been involved with the issue that is the subject of the formal complaint.

3. ACR Senior Management will provide a written response, via email, to the complain- ant detailing ACR’s decision on the matter.”

Provision 2 Source 1, section 11.B, page 60: “Appeals procedure. In the event that a complaint remains unresolved after the conclusion of the complaints procedure, an ACR Project Proponent or stakeholder may appeal any such decision or outcome reached. The following confidential appeals procedure shall be followed:

1. Project Proponent or ACR stakeholder sends a written appeal via email to ACR@winrock.org. The appeal must detail the following:

- Description of the appeal, with specific reference to ACR Standard and/or ACR Methodology requirements, as applicable;
- Supporting documentation provided for consideration in the appeal process, including previous communication on the complaint and all relevant details of the previously implemented complaint procedure; and
- Appellant name, contact details, and organization.

2. ACR Senior Management shall forward the appeal to the appropriate Winrock Senior Director, who will convene a committee of representatives to review and discuss the matter. The committee will include a member of the Winrock Board of Directors, a member of the Winrock Senior Management team, and an ACR staff member unrelated to the complaint, all of whom will have equal votes. The committee may also include a technical and/or subject matter expert or experts as necessary, who will not be able to vote. The committee members selected will depend on the subject matter and nature of the appeal.

3. The decision reached by the committee shall be communicated, via written response, to the ACR Project Proponent or stakeholder. Any decision reached by the committee shall be final.”

Assessment outcome

No (0 Points).

Justification of assessment

The ACR complaints and appeals procedures do not set time-bound requirements for the program to respond to disputes or complaints. The indicator is therefore not fulfilled.

Indicator 5.1.14

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“There is no evidence that the current program staff have ever engaged in fraud on behalf of the program or that key personnel have been convicted of fraud. Web searches or other publicly accessible information may inform this indicator.”

Information sources considered

-

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

No relevant findings were identified.

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

Web searches or other publicly accessible information have not revealed any cases of program staff being involved in fraud.

Indicator 5.1.15

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

“The program has never been sanctioned by a regulator or other relevant authority for noncompliance with relevant laws and regulations, or for not complying with its own provisions. Web searches or other publicly accessible information may inform this indicator.”

Information sources considered

-

Relevant carbon crediting program provisions

No relevant findings were identified.

Assessment outcome

Yes (1 Point).

Justification of assessment

Web searches or other publicly accessible information have not revealed any cases of noncompliance with laws and regulations, or sanctions levied against the program.

Scoring results

According to the above assessment, the carbon crediting program receives 14 out of 16 achievable points. Applying the scoring approach in the methodology, this results in a score of 4.38.