



CCQI
Carbon Credit
Quality Initiative

Application of the CCQI 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](https://www.carboncreditquality.org) 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

Contact

carboncreditqualityinitiative@gmail.com

Criterion:	4.1: Enhancing adoption of low, zero or negative emissions technologies and practices
Project type:	Avoided deforestation (planned and unplanned)
Date of final assessment:	02 July 2024
Score:	5

Assessment

Relevant scoring methodology provisions

The scoring approach assesses the degree to which the technologies or practices applied under the project type facilitate the transition towards net zero emissions (see table 1). The main consideration is whether the project type employs negative, zero or low emissions technologies or practices. Moreover, it is considered whether the project type poses risks for locking-in technologies or practices that may result in an increase in GHG emissions in the long-term, thereby undermining the achievement of net zero emissions, or whether the project type employs innovative technologies or practices which may accelerate the transition to net zero emissions. See further details on the scoring in the methodology.

Table 1 Scoring approach for enhancing adoption of low, zero or negative emission technologies and practices

Technology type	Score
Negative emissions technologies and practices	
Description: Technologies and practices that remove CO ₂ from the atmosphere, such that more CO ₂ is sequestered in the process than greenhouse gases are emitted:	
• Direct air carbon capture and storage (capture of CO ₂ from the atmosphere and storage in long-term reservoirs) (DACCS)	5
• Bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS)	4
• Afforestation, reforestation and restoration (ARR)	5
Zero emissions technologies and practices	
Description: Technologies and practices that result in net zero GHG emissions during their operation.	
Exception: A score of 4 applies to technologies or practices that are less innovative than the best available technology. For example, this holds for biomass power generation using less efficient plants than the best available technology.	
• Cement production with renewable energy sources combined with carbon capture and storage (CCS) with high efficiency rate (e.g., >90%)	5
• Fuel switching to zero-emitting technology (e.g., fuel switch from natural gas to "green" hydrogen produced from renewable energy sources and with minimal hydrogen leakage throughout the value chain)	5
• Change in practice or components along the process or production cycle leading to change from high to zero emissions (e.g., steel production using "green" hydrogen produced from renewable energy sources and with minimal hydrogen leakage throughout the value chain)	5
• Zero emissions renewable energy generation, such as	5
○ Wind and solar power generation	
○ Hydro power generation from run-of-river plants or dams with negligible CH ₄ and CO ₂ emissions	
○ Geothermal energy use with negligible fugitive emissions	
• Use of biomass residues or other forms of sustainable/renewable biomass using best available technology	4
Avoided emissions technologies and practices	

Technology type	Score
<p>Description: Technologies and practices that generate indirect upstream or downstream emission reductions as a result of the use of technology or practice, or practices that intervene with the release of existing of terrestrial carbon stocks.</p> <p>Exceptions: A score of 4 applies to technologies or practices that have a superior alternative or do not represent the best available technology, for example, because they are less energy efficient than already available alternatives (e.g., compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) compared to light-emitting diodes (LEDs)).</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly efficient demand side technology (e.g., LED lamps) 	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient demand side technology (e.g., CFL lamps) 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Battery or pump storage enabling greater renewable electricity generation 	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recycling of waste 	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Composting of organic waste 	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation 	5
<p>Low emissions technologies and practices</p>	
<p>Description: Technologies and practices that emit comparatively lower levels of GHG emissions during their operation.</p> <p>The default score is 3, given that these technologies or practices lead to continuous GHG emissions and could thus compromise the goal of achieving net zero emissions in the future.</p> <p>A score of 4 applies to technologies or practices that use best available technology, and for which the risk of locking-in investments that lead to continuous GHG emissions is low. This holds, for example, for the use of landfill gas for energy generation from already closed landfills. In the case of closed landfills there is no risk that, as a result of the project, landfilling is continued rather than embarking on more sustainable waste handling practices, such as recycling and composting.</p> <p>A score of 2 applies to technologies or practices that do not use best available technology and for which the risk of locking in investments which lead to continuous GHG emissions is significant. This holds in particular for technologies with a long lifetime, such as fossil fuel-based power plants.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon capture and storage (CCS) from fossil fuel fired power plants <p>Rationale: While CCS can avoid any direct emissions from fossil fuel fired power plants, the continued use of fossil fuels causes unavoidable emissions from their mining, exploration, processing and transportation, such as CH₄ emissions from coal mining and oil and gas exploration. Given that power plants may operate for decades, there is a significant risk of locking-in investments that may undermine achieving net-zero emissions in the future. In addition, superior alternatives, such as renewable power generation in combination with storage systems, are already available.</p>	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel switching to a less carbon intensive fossil fuel (e.g., from coal to natural gas) 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon capture and utilization (CCU) 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of landfill gas from closed landfills for energy generation 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of landfill gas from open landfills for energy generation 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste to energy 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfill gas flaring 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfields natural gas power plants 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of "blue" hydrogen from fossil fuel sources combined with carbon capture and storage (CCS) 	3

Assessment outcome

The project types are assigned a score of 5.

Project type

The assessment refers to the following project types:

Avoided planned deforestation:

“Activities to avoid deforestation that is legally authorized and planned by an identifiable, commercial agent. In addition, forest degradation may be reduced. The activities are implemented on a dedicated project level geographical area (not at jurisdictional level). The project type reduces emissions by avoiding the loss of forest carbon stocks.”

Avoided unplanned deforestation:

“Activities to avoid deforestation that is driven by multiple, mostly local agents. The deforestation occurs as a result of socioeconomic forces, such as subsistence agriculture of local communities, encroaching roads, or illegal logging. In addition, forest degradation may be reduced. Projects usually combine different activities to reduce deforestation, such as improving agricultural practices of local communities, providing alternative livelihoods, instituting patrols or assisting with land tenure reform. The activities are implemented on a dedicated project-level geographical area (not at jurisdictional level). The project type reduces emissions by avoiding the loss of forest carbon stocks.”

Justification of assessment

According to the scoring approach for enhancing adoption of low, zero or negative emission technologies and practices as described in the methodology, technologies and practices that remove CO₂ from the atmosphere, such that more CO₂ is sequestered in the process than greenhouse gases are emitted, is considered as an activity that is highly facilitative of the transition towards net zero emissions.

As avoiding deforestation aims at maintaining carbon stocks at high levels and increase them it is considered to fall in the scope of practices defined above. The project type therefore receives a score of 5.