

BIOCARBON GUIDELINES

Baseline and Additionality

GHG Projects generate Verified Carbon Credits (VCC) that represent emissions reductions, avoidance, or removals that are additional.

Version 1.2 September 27, 2023



© 2023 BIOCARBON REGISTRY®. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without the express permission of BIOCARBON REGISTRY.

BIOCARBON REGISTRY®. 2023. BIOCARBON GUIDELINES. BASELINE AND ADDITIONALITY. BCR projects generate verified carbon credits (VCC) that represent emissions reductions, avoidance, or removals that are additional.

Version 1.2 September 27, 2023. 22 p. <http://www.biocarbonregistry.com>

Table of contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Objectives	2
3	Version	2
4	General terms.....	2
5	Scope	2
6	Baseline or reference scenario.....	3
7	Additionality	4
8	Identification of the baseline scenario and additionality for AFOLU projects.....	5
8.1	Baseline scenario	5
8.2	Additionality.....	5
9	Other sectors	16
10	Methodological documents	16
	19	

1 Introduction

BCR STANDARD define that the issuance of VCC shall be based on a realistic and credible baseline. In addition, the rule related with the VCC quantification includes the demonstration that the project holder applies a reasonable, justifiable, and conservative baseline estimation of emissions.

In consequence, GHG project holders shall establish a baseline or reference scenario, meaning the situation representing the GHG emissions that would occur in the absence of a GHG project, fulfilling with the methodology applicable to the GHG emission reductions or removal activities.

The baseline is the scenario for the GHG mitigation project that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the GHG mitigation project activity¹. The baseline shall be described assuming a conservative “business as usual” emissions level.

The additionality is the effect of the GHG project activity to reduce anthropogenic GHG emissions below the level that would have occurred in the absence of the GHG project activity. Considerations of additionality and details on the demonstration of additionality are in BCR methodological documents.

On the other hand, GHG project holders shall demonstrate that emission reductions (or removals) do not correspond to emission reductions attributable to the implementation of legally required actions.



¹ Adapted from Glossary CDM terms. Version 10.0

2 Objectives

The objectives of these guidelines are:

- a) establish the requirements applicable to the GHG projects, to baseline identification;
- b) provide the requirements to demonstrate additionality of the mitigation activities and results;
- c) require the necessary conditions to ensure quality in the quantification of the GHG emission reductions;
- d) support projects conformity within the rules and application procedures for the demonstrate additionality of the GHG projects.

3 Version

This document constitutes Version 1.2. September 27, 2023.

This version of the document may be adjusted periodically. Intended users should ensure that they are using the updated version.

4 General terms

The following general terms apply:

- a) "Shall" is used to indicate that the requirement shall be met;
- b) "Should" is used to suggest that, among several possibilities, a course of action recommended as particularly appropriate;
- c) "May" is used to indicate that it is permitted.

5 Scope

This document provides the set of requirements necessary for the baseline identification and demonstration of additionality of GHG projects, ensuring that they comply with the conditions established in the BCR STANDARD.

In this sense, additionality signifies that the verified carbon credits represent GHG emissions reductions or carbon sequestration or removals that exceed any GHG reduction or removals: (a) required by law, regulation, or legally binding mandate, and (b) that exceed any GHG reductions or removals that would then occur in a conservative manner in the absence of the project activities.

The scope of these guidelines is limited to:

- a) GHG projects using a methodology developed or accepted by BIOCARBON REGISTRY, applicable to GHG emissions reductions or GHG emissions removals; and,
- b) GHG projects using a methodology developed or accepted by BIOCARBON REGISTRY, applicable to activities in the AFOLU, energy, transportation, and waste handling and disposal sectors.

These guidelines set out the requirements for establishing baseline and demonstrating additionality of projects that aim to reduce GHG emissions and/or increase removals under the BCR STANDARD.

These guidelines contain only additional or also referred information. The project holder shall apply the rules and protocols that constitute the methodologies² for the quantification of GHG emission reductions and removals, defined by sector and/or type of project (See section 8 of BCR STANDARD).

6 Baseline or reference scenario

GHG project holders shall establish a baseline or reference scenario, meaning the situation representing the GHG emissions that would occur in the absence of a GHG project, and they comply with the methodology applicable to the GHG emission reductions or removal activities.

Definition of the reference scenario shall follow the provisions contained in the BIOCARBON REGISTRY methodological documents and the other methodologies applicable to projects, in their most recent version and:

- a) transparently regarding assumptions, methods, parameters, data sources, and factors;
- b) considering uncertainty and using prudential assumptions;
- c) specifically, for each GHG project activity;
- d) considering relevant national as also when applicable to sectoral policies and circumstances;
- e) maintaining consistency with the emission factors, activity data, projection variables of GHG emissions, and the other parameters used for the construction of the reference scenario;

² Methodological documents or guidance

- f) implementing procedures to ensure data quality under ISO 14064-2 and the requirements of the selected methodology;
- g) in such a way that no GHG reductions or removals can obtain, due to decreases in an activity outside the project business;
- h) covering emissions and removals of all gases, defined in the applied methodologies, included in the project boundary under consideration.

7 Additionality

The project holders shall clearly demonstrate that the project consider procedures to demonstrate additionality. The criteria for the additionality demonstration are publicly disclosed and conservative. BCR STANDARD does not include activities that are automatically additional. That mean, in BCR STANDARD are not considered “positive list” of eligible project types.

The basis, data, assumptions, and information related for demonstrate additionality and baseline setting shall be assessed by an accredited and independent third-party verification entity (Conformity Assessment Body) and reviewed by the technical committee of BioCarbon Registry, including the criterion that requires procedures for ensuring legal additionality.

BIOCARBON REGISTRY requires the application of the CDM Tool, which provide a reasonable assurance that the emissions reductions would not have occurred in the absence of the project activities. For AFOLU projects, BCR STANDARD provide an adapted application of the Tool in the methodological documents. In consequence, for the activities for which BIOCARBON REGISTRY has prepared methodological documents, the description in these documents shall be applied. For projects in the energy, transport and waste sectors, the use of the Clean Development Mechanism Tool is required.



8 Identification of the baseline scenario and additionality for AFOLU projects

8.1 Baseline scenario

The Project holders shall identify the baseline scenario to demonstrate that the Project is additional.

When selecting the Methodology to determine the baseline scenario of a project in the AFOLU sector, the project holder shall select the most appropriate among the criteria listed below, justifying this choice's convenience.

- a) Existing or historical changes, as appropriate, in carbon stocks at project boundaries;
- b) Changes in carbon stocks, within the project boundary, due to land use that represents an attractive course of action considering barriers to investment;
- c) Changes in carbon stocks within the project boundaries, identifying the most likely land use at the beginning of the Project.

For the methodology's application, it is recommended to use what is stated in literal (c) above. However, the project's holder may select (a) or (b) approaches if he or she presents appropriate explanation and justification.

The project holder shall reliably demonstrate that all the assumptions, justifications, and documentation considered are adequate to identify the baseline scenario.

8.2 Additionality

The project holder shall demonstrate the project additionality through the following steps³:

STEP 0. Preliminary screening based on the starting date of the A/R project activity

The start date of GHG projects is when effective GHG emission reductions begin.

The project holder shall determine the project start date, describe that choice, and present evidence that proves its date. That evidence shall

³ Adapted of "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" (Report EB35, Annex 19).

demonstrate that the start date is defined within the five (5) years before project validation starts.

STEP 1. Identification of alternative scenarios

This step serves to identify alternative land use scenarios to the project activity that could be the baseline scenario, through the following sub-steps:

Sub-step 1a. Identify credible alternative land use scenarios to the proposed project activity

Identify realistic and credible land-use scenarios that would have occurred on the land within the proposed project boundary in the absence of the afforestation or reforestation project activity.

The scenarios should be feasible for the project participants or similar project developers taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies⁴ and circumstances, such as historical land uses, practices and economic trends.

The identified land use scenarios shall at least include:

- Continuation of the pre-project land use;
- Forestation of the land within the project boundary performed without being registered as the A/R project activity;
- If applicable, forestation of at least a part of the land within the project boundary of the proposed A/R project at a rate resulting from⁵:
 - o Legal requirements; or
 - o Extrapolation of observed forestation activities in the geographical area with similar socio-economic and ecological conditions to the proposed A/R project activity.

For identifying the realistic and credible land-use scenarios; land use records, field surveys, data and feedback from stakeholders, and information from other appropriate sources, including Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) may be used as appropriate. If the baseline approach

⁴ The Annex 3 to the report of the EB at its twenty-second meeting and the Annex 19 to the report of the EB at its twenty-third meeting clarify how the relevant national and/or sectoral policies shall be taken into account during identification of a baseline scenario. See: <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/Guidclarif>.

⁵ In this case, the project participants will assess the baseline rate of forestation and shall provide justification that the project will lead to an increased rate of afforestation/reforestation that would not occur in the absence of the project activity and that this results from direct intervention by the project participants. If the proposed A/R CDM project activity does not increase the rate of afforestation/reforestation, the proposed project activity is not additional.

selected is 22b or c, then the project shall perform a survey of local experts or land owners/users on their plans for land management/investments during the period to the project start.

All identified land use scenarios must be credible. All land uses within the boundary of the proposed A/R project activity that are currently existing or that existed at some time, may be deemed realistic and credible.

For all other land use scenarios, credibility shall be justified⁶. The justification shall include elements of spatial planning information (if applicable) or legal requirements and may include assessment of economical feasibility of the proposed alternative land use scenario.

Outcome of Sub-step 1a: List of credible alternative land use scenarios that would have occurred on the land within the project boundary of the A/R CDM project activity.

Sub-step 1b. Consistency of credible alternative land use scenarios with enforced mandatory applicable laws and regulations

(This sub-step does not consider national and local policies that do not have legally-binding status and local policies that have been implemented since the adoption of the modalities and procedures for the CDM [decision 17/CP.7, 11 November 2001])

Apply the following procedure:

Demonstrate that all land use scenarios identified in the sub-step 1a: are in compliance with all mandatory applicable legal and regulatory requirements;

- If an alternative does not comply with all mandatory applicable legislation and regulations then show that, based on an examination of current practice in the region in which the mandatory law or regulation applies, those applicable mandatory legal or regulatory requirements are systematically not enforced and that non-compliance with those requirements is widespread, i.e. prevalent on at least 30% of area of the smallest administrative unit that encompasses the project area;
- Remove from the land use scenarios identified in the sub-step 1a, any land use scenarios which are not in compliance with applicable mandatory laws and regulations unless it can be shown these land use scenarios result from systematic lack of enforcement of applicable laws and regulations.

⁶ e.g. construction of an airport is usually not a credible land use scenario in a rural region with low density population and weak road infrastructure

Outcome of Sub-step 1b: List of plausible alternative land use scenarios to the A/R project activity that are in compliance with mandatory legislation and regulations taking into account their enforcement in the region or country and EB decisions on national and/or sectoral policies and regulations.

If the list resulting from the Sub-step 1b is empty or contains only one land use scenario, then the proposed A/R project activity is not additional.

→ Proceed to Step 2 (Barrier analysis)

STEP 2. Barrier analysis

This step serves to identify barriers and to assess which of the land use scenarios identified in the sub-step 1b are not prevented by these barriers.

Sub-step 2a. Identification of barriers that would prevent the implementation of at least one alternative land use scenarios

Identify realistic and credible barriers that prevent realization of the land use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1b.

The barriers should not be specific for the project participants, but should apply to the proposed A/R project activity as such, even if similar project developers would have developed the project activity.

Such barriers may include, among others:

- Investment barriers, other than insufficient financial returns as analyzed in Step 3, inter alia:
 - Similar activities have only been implemented with grants or other non-commercial finance terms. In this context similar activities are defined as activities of a similar scale that take place in a comparable environment with respect to regulatory framework and are undertaken in the relevant geographical area;
 - No private capital is available from domestic or international capital markets due to real or perceived risks associated with investments in the country where the A/R project activity is to be implemented, as demonstrated by the credit rating of the country or other country investment reports of reputed origin;
 - Debt funding is not available for the land-use scenarios;
 - Lack of access to credit.
- Institutional barriers, inter alia:
 - Risk related to changes in government policies or laws;
 - Lack of enforcement of land-use-related legislation.
- Technological barriers, inter alia:

- Lack of access to necessary materials, for example planting materials;
- Lack of infrastructure for implementation of the technology.
- Barriers related to local tradition, inter alia:
 - Traditional knowledge or lack thereof, laws and customs, market conditions and practices;
 - Traditional equipment and technology.
- Barriers due to prevailing practice, inter alia:
 - The land use scenario is the “first of its kind”: No activity of this type is currently operational in the host country or region.
- Barriers due to local ecological conditions, inter alia:
 - Degraded soil (e.g. water/wind erosion, salination, etc.);
 - Catastrophic natural and / or human-induced events (e.g. land slides, fire, etc);
 - Unfavourable meteorological conditions (e.g. early/late frost, drought);
 - Pervasive opportunistic species preventing land use (e.g. grasses, weeds);
 - Unfavourable course of ecological succession;
 - Biotic pressure in terms of grazing, fodder collection, etc.
- Barriers due to social conditions, inter alia:
 - Demographic pressure on the land (e.g. increased demand on land due to population growth);
 - Social conflict among interest groups in the region where the project takes place;
 - Widespread illegal practices (e.g. illegal grazing, non-timber product extraction and tree felling); -
- Lack of skilled and/or properly trained labour force;
- Lack of organization of local communities.
- Barriers relating to land tenure, ownership, inheritance, and property rights, inter alia:
 - Communal land ownership with a hierarchy of rights for different stakeholders limits the incentives to undertake the land-use scenarios;
 - Lack of suitable land tenure legislation and regulation to support the security of tenure;

- Absence of clearly defined and regulated property rights in relation to natural resource products and services;
- Formal and informal tenure systems that increase the risks of fragmentation of land holdings;
- Possibilities of large price risk due to the fluctuations in the prices of products over the project period in the absence of efficient markets and insurance mechanisms;
- Barriers relating to markets, transport and storage;
- Unregulated and informal markets for products and services prevent the transmission of effective information to project participants;
- Remoteness of land area and undeveloped road and infrastructure incur large transportation expenditures, thus eroding the competitiveness and profitability of products from the land use;
- Possibilities of large price risk due to the fluctuations in the prices products over the project period in the absence of efficient markets and insurance mechanisms;
- Absence of facilities to convert, store and add value to products resulting from land use limits the possibilities to capture rents from the land use scenario.

Outcome of Step 2a: List of barriers that may prevent one or more land use scenarios identified in the Step 1b.

Sub-step 2b. Elimination of land use scenarios that are prevented by the identified barriers

Determine which land use scenarios identified in the Sub-step 1b are prevented by at least one of the barriers listed in sub-step 2a. Substantiate, that the barrier identified as preventing realization of a land use scenario is valid and conclusive in the context of the land use scenario in question. The assessment of a barrier may take into account the level of access to and availability of information, technologies and skilled labour in the region where the planned A/R project activity is located. Eliminate these scenarios from further consideration.

If the land within the boundary of the proposed of the A/R project activity was at least partially forested, and the land is not a forest at the project start, identify reasons/actions/incentives that allowed for the past forestation and demonstrate that the current legal/financial or other applicable regulations or socio-economical or ecological or other local conditions have changed to the extent that allows for conclusion that repetition of the forestation performed without being registered as the A/R project activity is not possible.

Include all land use scenarios that were identified in the Sub-step 1b and were not eliminated in the Sub-step 2b into the list of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier.

Outcome of Sub-step 2b: List of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier

In applying sub-steps 2a and 2b, provide transparent and documented evidence, and offer conservative interpretations of this documented evidence, as to how it demonstrates the existence and significance of the identified barriers. Anecdotal evidence can be included, but this alone is not sufficient proof of barriers.

The type of evidence to be provided may include:

- Relevant legislation, regulatory information or environmental/natural resource management norms, acts or rules;
- Relevant (sectoral) studies or surveys (e.g. market surveys, technology studies, etc) undertaken by universities, research institutions, associations, companies, bilateral/multilateral institutions, etc;
- Relevant statistical data from national or international statistics;
- Documentation of relevant market data (e.g. market prices, tariffs, rules);
- Written documentation from the company or institution developing or implementing the A/R project activity or the A/R project developer, such as minutes from Board meetings, correspondence, feasibility studies, financial or budgetary information, etc;
- Documents prepared by the project developer, contractors or project partners in the context of the proposed project activity or similar previous project implementations;
- Written documentation of independent expert judgements from agriculture, forestry and other landuse related Government / Non-Government bodies or individual experts, educational institutions (e.g. universities, technical schools, training centres), professional associations and others.

Sub-step 2c. Determination of baseline scenario (if allowed by the barrier analysis)

Apply the following decision tree to the outcome of sub-step 2b:

Is forestation without being registered as an A/R project activity included in the list of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier?

→ If yes, then:

Does the list contain only one land use scenario?

- If yes, then the proposed A/R project activity is not additional.
 - If no, then continue with Step 3: Investment analysis.
- If no, then: Does the list contain only one land use scenario?
- If yes, then the remaining land use is the baseline scenario. Continue with Step 4: Common practice test
 - If no, then through qualitative analysis, assess the removals by sinks for each scenario and select one of the following options:
- Option 1: Baseline scenario is the land use scenario that allows for the highest baseline GHG removals by sinks. Continue with Step 4: Common practice test.
- Option 2: Continue with Step 3: Investment analysis.

STEP 3. Investment analysis (if needed)

This step serves the project holder to determine the investment analysis of the possible land-use alternatives identified in the sub-step 1b.

The holder shall determine whether the project activity, without the revenues derived from Verified Carbon Credits (VCC) sale, is economically or finance less attractive than other alternatives. The investment analysis may be carried out like an independent additionality analysis or ensemble with the barrier analysis (Step 3). To perform investment analysis, use the following sub-steps:

Sub-step 3a. Determine the appropriate analysis method

Determine whether to apply simple cost analysis, investment comparison analysis, or benchmark analysis (Sub-step 3b).

If the project activity and the alternatives identified in Step 1 generate no financial or economic benefits other than carbon credits sale-related income, apply the simple cost analysis (Option I). Otherwise, use the investment comparison analysis (Option II) or the benchmark analysis (Option III). Please note those options I, II, and III are mutually exclusive. Therefore, only one of them shall apply.

Sub-step 3b. – Option I. Apply simple cost analysis

Document the costs associated with the project activities and show that the Project does not produce financial benefits other than CCV sale income.

If the conclusion is that the Project does not produce any financial benefit, go to Step 4 (Impact of project registration).

Sub-step 3b. – Option II. Investment comparison analysis

Identify the financial indicator most suitable for the project type and decision-making contexts, such as IRR, NPV, payback period, or cost-benefit ratio.

Sub-step 3b – Option III. Benchmark analysis

Identify the financial indicator most suitable for the project type and decision context, such as IRR, NPV, payback period, cost-benefit ratio, or other. For example, the required return rate (RRR) is a suitable indicator for agriculture or forestry investments. Another example is the bank deposit interest rate corrected by the Project's inherent risk or opportunity costs of land, like any expected income from land speculation.

Identify the relevant benchmark value, such as the required rate of return (RRR) on equity. The benchmark represents standard returns in the market, considering the specific risk of the project type, but not linked to the subjective profitability expectation or risk profile of a particular project developer. Benchmarks can be derived from:

- Government bond rates, increased by a suitable risk premium to reflect the private investment or the project type, as substantiated by an independent (financial) expert;
- Estimates of the cost of financing and required return on capital (e.g., commercial lending rates and guarantees required for the country and the type of project activity concerned), based on banker views and private equity investors or funds' required return on comparable projects;
- A company internal benchmark that means a weighted average capital cost of the company is only one potential project developer. E.g., a single entity, physical person, or a company, who is also the project developer, owns or controls the proposed project land. The project developers shall demonstrate that this benchmark has been consistently used in the past, i.e., that project activities under similar conditions developed by the same company used the same benchmark.
- Beta rates of forestry or agricultural industry adjusted with the EMBI (Emerging Markets Bonds Index) of the country in which the Project is developed.

Sub-step 3c. Calculation and comparison of financial indicators (only applicable to options II and III)

Calculate the suitable financial indicator for the project activity, without the financial benefits from the sale of VCC and, in the case of Option II above, for the other alternatives. Include all relevant costs, for example, investment cost, operations and maintenance costs, and all revenues, excluding VCC revenues but including subsidies or fiscal incentives where applicable. In the case of public investors and as appropriate, also include non-market costs and benefits.

Present the investment analysis transparently and provide all the relevant assumptions. Present also the critical economic parameters and assumptions, such as capital costs, lifetimes, discount rate, or capital cost. Justify assumptions in a manner that the VVB can validate them. In calculating the financial indicator, the Project's risks can be included through the cash flow pattern, subject to project-specific expectations and assumptions, e.g., project holders may use insurance premiums to calculate and reflect specific risk equivalents.

Assumptions and input data for the investment analysis shall not differ across the project activity and its alternatives unless differences can be well substantiated.

Present a precise comparison of financial metric for the Project, without the financial benefits from VCC.

Option II (investment comparison analysis): if one of the other alternatives has the best indicator (for example, a higher IRR), the Project cannot be considered financially attractive.

Option III (benchmark analysis): if the project activity has a less favorable indicator, for example, a lower IRR than the reference, then the Project cannot be considered financially attractive.

If the investment analysis concludes that the Project is not financially attractive without the financial benefits derived from Verified Carbon Credits' sale, proceed to sub-step 3d (Sensitivity Analysis).

Sub-step 3d. Sensitivity analysis

Include a sensitivity analysis to assess whether the initial conclusion regarding the baseline scenario's financial attractiveness is robust to reasonable variations in the critical assumptions. The investment analysis only provides a valid argument in identifying the baseline scenario and demonstrating additionality if it consistently supports (for a realistic range of assumptions) the initial conclusion that the Project, without the financial benefits from the sale of VCC, is financially attractive.

If, after sensitivity analysis, the Project is unlikely to produce an economic benefit (Option I) or be financially attractive (Option II and Option III), then proceed directly to Step 4 (Common practice analysis).

STEP 4. Common practice analysis

The previous steps shall be complemented with an analysis of the extent to which forestation activity has already diffused in the geographical area of the proposed A/R project activity. This test is a credibility check to demonstrate additionality which complements the barrier analysis (Step 2) and, where applicable, the investment analysis (Step 3).

Provide an analysis to which extent similar forestation activities to the one proposed as the A/R project activity have been implemented previously or are currently underway.

Similar forestation activities are defined as that which are of similar scale, take place in a comparable environment, inter alia, with respect to the regulatory framework and are undertaken in the relevant geographical area, subject to further guidance by the underlying methodology.

Other registered A/R project activities shall not be included in this analysis. Provide documented evidence and, where relevant, quantitative information.

If forestation activities similar to the proposed A/R project activity are identified, then compare the proposed project activity to the other similar forestation activities and assess whether there are essential distinctions between them. Essential distinctions may include a fundamental and verifiable change in circumstances under which the proposed A/R project activity will be implemented when compared to circumstances under which similar forestations were carried out. For example, barriers may exist, or promotional policies may have ended. If certain benefits rendered the similar forestation activities financially attractive (e.g., subsidies or other financial flows) explain, why the proposed A/R CDM project activity cannot use the benefits. If applicable, explain why the similar forestation activities did not face barriers to which the proposed A/R CDM project activity is subject.

→ If Step 4 is satisfied, i.e. similar activities can be observed and essential distinctions between the proposed project activity and similar activities cannot be made, then the proposed project activity is not additional. Otherwise, the proposed A/R CDM project activity is not the baseline scenario and, hence, it is additional.

In case of the REDD+ projects, the additionality analysis may be similar to A/R projects, considering differences in the terminology and credible assessment.

9 Other sectors

Project holders in the other sectors eligible in BioCarbon Registry; that means, the energy sector, transport, and waste, shall use methodologies approved by the Executive Board of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM – UNFCCC). Specifically, the Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality (am-tool-01-v7.0.0.pdf)⁷ or the Tool Demonstration of additionality of small-scale project activities v.13.1⁸, or the document which modifies or updates it.

Available in: <https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/index.html>.

10 Methodological documents

The BIOCARBON REGISTRY projects shall comply with the methodologies developed or approved by BCR, as well as with the other relevant documents under the BCR Program, considering that the BCR Standard includes methodological documents for quantifying GHG emission reductions or removals, at the project level.

The methodological documents contain the applicability criteria and detailed steps for quantifying and monitoring results against design and implementation of GHG projects, by a given project type.

Although the methodological documents contain specific guidance for each type of GHG project, what describes these documents adheres to the general principles and requirements in this Standard.

All methodological documents developed by BIOCARBON REGISTRY and approved by the BIOCARBON REGISTRY Technical Committee are available on www.biocarbonregistry.com.

The current versions of the methodological documents are the following:

- (i) METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENT. AFOLU SECTOR. Quantification of GHG Emission Reductions. GHG REMOVAL ACTIVITIES. Version 3.0 April 13, 2022. In: <https://biocarbonregistry.com/methodologies/BCR-Methodological-Document-AFOLU-HME.pdf>
- (ii) METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENT AFOLU SECTOR. Quantification of GHG Emission Reductions. REDD+ Projects. Version 3.1. September 15, 2022. In:

⁷ Available in <https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAMethodologies/tools/am-tool-01-v7.0.0.pdf>

⁸ Available in <https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAMethodologies/tools/am-tool-21-v13.1.pdf>

https://biocarbonregistry.com/methodologies/BCR0002_Methodological-document-REDD-projects.pdf

- (iii) Methodological Document AFOLU SECTOR. BCR0003
Quantification of GHG Emissions Reduction. Activities that prevent land use change and improve management practices for peatlands and other wetlands in high mountain ecosystems. Version 3.0. August 31, 2022. In:
https://biocarbonregistry.com/methodologies/BCR_Methodological-Document-Continental-Wetlands.pdf
- (iv) METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENT SECTOR AFOLU. BCR0004.
Quantification Emission Reduction and GHG removal. Activities that avoid land use change in Continental Wetlands. Version 2.0. June 23, 2022. In:
<https://biocarbonregistry.com/methodologies/BCR-Methodological-Document-AFOLU-HME.pdf>
- (v) Methodological Document AFOLU SECTOR. Quantification of GHG Emissions Reduction. Activities that prevent land use change in natural savannas. BCR0005. Version 1.0. October 21, 2022. In:
https://biocarbonregistry.com/methodologies/BCR0005_Methodological-document-savannas.pdf



History of document

Type of document

BCR Guidelines. Baseline and Additionality

Version	Date	Nature of the document
Version 1.0	February 17, 2023	First version of the Tool.
Version 1.1	July 27, 2023	<p>Change of type of document. Tool, actualized to guideline.</p> <p>Specified reference to other sectors in section 9. Before it was considered as a text in section 7.</p> <p>Addition of Transport sector in section 5(b)</p>
Version 1.2	September 27, 2023	<p>Section 8 adjusted</p> <p>Section 9 adjusted</p> <p>Minor editorial changes</p>

