# NORMATIVE GUIDELINE

# MULTI-METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK (MMF)

**Enabling Integrated, Multi-Ecosystem Crediting with Robust and Non-Overlapping Accounting Integrity under the BioCarbon Standard**

BIOCARBON CERT®

VERSION 1.0| July 3, 2026

BIOCARBON CERT

www.biocarbonstandard.com

BIOCARBON CERT®. 2026. Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF). v1.0. July 3, 2026. BioCarbon Cert. 42 p. Available at: www.biocarbonstandard.com

BIOCARBON CERT

www.biocarbonstandard.com

# Table of contents

# 1 Introduction

The BioCarbon Standard (BCS) GHG includes methodologies across sectoral scopes such as AFOLU, energy, industry, waste, and other sectors designated by BioCarbon Cert. In some cases, a project within a single BCS sector may involve two distinct GHG mitigation mechanisms that are operationally connected, separately quantifiable, and suitable for documentation within a single Project Document.

Within this context, the combined application of methodologies is permitted only where both methodologies belong to the same BCS sectoral scope and where each methodology addresses a distinct accounting unit, baseline scenario, causal mechanism, and quantified GHG outcome. The framework is intended to support same-sector multi-methodology projects, not cross-program or cross-sector crediting configurations.

However, the combined application of methodologies introduces technical and accounting challenges. These include the risk of overlapping quantification, double counting of outcomes, inconsistencies in baseline definitions, double claiming by different entities, and lack of clear attribution of results to specific activities or processes. These risks may arise in AFOLU systems through interconnected carbon pools and biophysical processes, and in energy, industry, and waste systems through shared emission sources, fuel streams, waste streams, treatment processes, industrial processes, and operational chains.

The BioCarbon Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF) addresses these challenges by establishing a normative structure for the combined application of two BCS methodologies within the same BCS sectoral scope. The framework requires GHG outcomes to be quantified in a consistent, non-overlapping, and fully traceable manner, while preserving environmental integrity, conservativeness, and the robustness of accounting.

# 2 Document status and applicability

This document constitutes the BioCarbon Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF) under the BioCarbon Standard (BCS).

The provisions set forth in this framework are normative and mandatory for BCS projects applying two BCS methodologies within the same sectoral scope under a single Project Document.

This framework applies exclusively to methodologies under the BioCarbon Standard (BCS). It does not apply to the Biodiversity BioCarbon Standard (BBS), the BioCarbon

Water Standard (BWS), or any cross-program combination of methodologies or accounting approaches.

The combined application of methodologies under this framework is limited to methodologies belonging to the same sectoral scope under BCS. Cross-sector methodological combinations are not permitted unless expressly authorized by BioCarbon Cert through a specific normative provision or sectoral classification.

# 3 Objective

The objective of the Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF) is to establish a coherent and normative structure for the combined application of two BCS methodologies within the same sectoral scope under the BioCarbon Standard (BCS).

The framework aims to ensure that GHG emission reductions, removals, or other quantified GHG outcomes generated within a single BCS project are quantified and attributed in a consistent, non-overlapping, and fully traceable manner.

In particular, the MMF seeks to ensure that:

(a) the application of two methodologies within the same BCS sectoral scope does not result in double counting or double claiming of GHG outcomes;
(b) accounting boundaries remain clearly defined across the two methodologies;
(c) baseline scenarios and quantification approaches remain methodologically consistent; and
(d) environmental integrity, conservativeness, and transparency are preserved across all credited GHG outcomes.

By establishing a unified structure for same-sector methodological interaction, the MMF enables the development of robust multi-methodology projects within BCS while maintaining the credibility of the BioCarbon system as a whole.

# 4 Core principles

Projects applying two BCS methodologies within the same sectoral scope shall comply with the following principles.

These principles ensure that the combined application of methodologies preserves environmental integrity, maintains robust accounting, and enables consistent attribution of GHG outcomes within the applicable BCS sectoral scope.

**Environmental integrity**

The combined application of methodologies shall not result in overestimation, duplication, or misrepresentation of GHG outcomes.

All credited outcomes shall reflect real, measurable, and verifiable changes attributable to project activities.

**Conservativeness**

Where uncertainty exists, assumptions and approaches shall be conservative to ensure that GHG outcomes are not overestimated.

**Transparency**

All methodological choices, interactions, and assumptions shall be clearly documented to enable independent assessment.

**Traceability**

GHG outcomes shall be traceable from project activities through quantification to credited results.

**Uniqueness of attribution**

Each GHG outcome shall be uniquely attributable to a single accounting unit and corresponding methodology.

**Consistency**

Accounting approaches, assumptions, and attribution rules shall be applied consistently across the two methodologies, time periods, and the applicable BCS sectoral scope.

# 5 Scope of application

The application of this framework is mandatory for projects under the BioCarbon Standard (BCS) where two methodologies are used within the same Project Document.

The framework applies only to BCS methodologies and only where the methodologies belong to the same BCS sectoral scope.

Projects shall apply no more than two (2) methodologies within a single Project Document. This limitation is established to ensure auditability, manage methodological

interaction risks, and preserve the integrity of attribution and accounting across methodologies.

The MMF is designed to address methodological interaction risks that arise when two methodologies are applied within the same project boundary and sectoral scope, including overlapping accounting, inconsistencies in baseline definitions, double claiming, and challenges in the attribution of GHG outcomes.

The concept of accounting unit is applied as a sector-neutral GHG accounting concept to enable consistent attribution across different BCS sectoral scopes and methodology types.

Its application is relevant in any BCS sector where multiple accounting units may be interconnected or affected by the same project activities or operational chains, including AFOLU, energy, industry, waste, and any other sectoral scope designated by BioCarbon Cert.

For avoidance of doubt, the framework does not authorize cross-sector combinations. A methodology that involves an end-use or operational interface in another sector may be combined with another methodology only where BioCarbon Cert classifies both methodologies under the same BCS sectoral scope.

# 6 Version

This document constitutes Version 1.0 of the BioCarbon Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF).

This version becomes effective upon its official publication on the BioCarbon Cert website.

From the date of entry into force, all Project Documents applying more than one methodology shall comply with the requirements set forth in this framework.

BioCarbon Cert may revise this document periodically to reflect methodological developments, programmatic updates, or evolving best practices. Subsequent versions shall supersede previous versions from their effective date, unless otherwise specified.

## 6.1 Transitional provisions

Projects that have initiated validation or have submitted a Project Document prior to the entry into force of this framework may continue under the previously applicable rules, provided that:

(a) no issuance has yet occurred; and
(b) the project demonstrates that no material risk of overlapping accounting or double attribution exists.

BioCarbon Cert may require such projects to align with specific provisions of this framework where necessary to ensure environmental integrity.

Projects undergoing validation may be required to update their documentation to demonstrate consistency with the principles of this framework prior to registration.

All new Project Documents submitted after the effective date shall comply fully with this framework.

Projects that have already completed validation and verification and have issued credits under previously applicable rules shall remain valid under those rules.

Such projects shall not be subject to retroactive application of this framework with respect to issued units.

However, for subsequent monitoring periods, verifications, and issuance of new credits, these projects shall demonstrate alignment with the principles and requirements of this framework, particularly with respect to:

(a) non-overlapping accounting;
(b) unique attribution of GHG outcomes; and
(c) consistency of accounting boundaries.

Where material inconsistencies are identified, BioCarbon Cert may require corrective adjustments to future crediting.

BioCarbon Cert may require the submission of a methodological interaction assessment for subsequent quantification periods.

# 7 Definitions

For the purposes of this framework, the following definitions shall apply:

**Accounting boundary/boundaries**

The defined spatial, operational, and temporal extent within which accounting units, emission sources, sinks, and project activities are quantified and attributed under a specific BCS methodology, as established in the Project Document.

**Accounting unit**

A discrete and non-overlapping element, source, sink, reservoir, physical stream, activity component, or quantified process used for the quantification and attribution of GHG outcomes under a specific BCS methodology.

Accounting units may take different forms depending on the applicable BCS sectoral scope and methodology. They may include, as applicable:

(a) carbon pools, carbon stocks, sinks, or reservoirs;
(b) emission sources, emission sinks, or emission processes;
(c) fuel streams, material streams, waste streams, or product streams;
(d) treatment, destruction, capture, storage, combustion, or industrial process units; and
(e) other quantified GHG accounting elements defined by the applicable methodology.

These elements are not necessarily equivalent in their biophysical, operational, or accounting nature but are treated as accounting units for the purpose of ensuring non-overlapping attribution and consistent accounting within BCS.

Accounting units shall be mutually exclusive within each methodology and shall not result in overlapping attribution across the two methodologies applied in the same Project Document.

**Attribution of GHG outcomes**

The assignment of quantified emission reductions, removals, or other GHG outcomes to a specific methodology based on defined sources, sinks, streams, reservoirs, or processes.

**BCS sectoral scope**

A sectoral category under the BioCarbon Standard (BCS), such as AFOLU, energy, industry, waste, or another sector designated by BioCarbon Cert for the classification and application of BCS methodologies.

**Carbon pool**

A reservoir of carbon within a defined system, including but not limited to aboveground biomass (AGB), belowground biomass (BGB), soil organic carbon (SOC), deadwood, and litter.

**Causal mechanism**

The direct process through which a project activity results in an emission reduction, removal, or GHG outcome.

**Common operational chain**

A physical or operational sequence of activities, facilities, processes, or material flows that may support more than one methodological component. A common operational chain may be used under this framework only where each methodology quantifies a distinct GHG outcome and no emission reduction or removal is counted more than once.

**Conformity Assessment Body**

An entity that performs conformity assessment activities, including the validation and verification of GHG projects, and that may be the object of accreditation, consistent with the definition adopted under the BCR Standard.

**Double claiming**

The use of the same emission reduction or GHG outcome by more than one entity, program, or claim.

**Double counting**

The occurrence of overlapping accounting resulting in the same emission reduction or GHG outcome being counted more than once.

**Environmental component**

A biophysical, physical, operational, or process-based element within the project boundary that is subject to measurement, monitoring, and crediting under a BCS methodology, including carbon pools, emission sources, sinks, reservoirs, fuel streams, waste streams, material streams, treatment processes, or industrial processes. Environmental components may constitute the basis for defining accounting units where applicable.

Environmental components, physical streams, and process units provide the basis for defining accounting units, as applicable to the methodology.

**Methodological independence**

The condition under which each methodology defines its baseline, quantification approach, and accounting boundaries without relying on, replicating, or duplicating those of the other methodology applied in the same Project Document.

**Methodological interaction**

The relationship between two methodologies applied within the same project boundary and BCS sectoral scope, where project activities, emission sources, sinks, reservoirs, carbon pools, fuel streams, waste streams, material streams, treatment processes, industrial processes, or operational chains may influence each other.

**Overlapping accounting**

The situation in which the same emission reduction, removal, or GHG outcome is quantified or claimed under more than one methodology.

**Primary attribution rule**

A predefined rule used to assign emission reductions, removals, or other GHG outcomes to a single methodology in cases where a process, stream, activity, or operational chain may affect multiple accounting units.

**Project length**

The total number of years, from the project start date, during which project activities shall be maintained. The project length is composed of one or more quantification periods and shall meet the minimum duration established under the BCR Standard for the applicable activity type.

**Quantification period**

The period, fixed or renewable, during which the project holder quantifies the GHG emission reductions or removals achieved by the project relative to its baseline scenario, in accordance with the BCR Standard. The quantification period shall not exceed the applicable project length and shall be determined according to the type of activity and the corresponding BCS sectoral scope.

# 8 Activity separation and causal attribution

Projects applying two BCS methodologies within the same sectoral scope shall ensure that project activities are clearly separated and that GHG outcomes are attributed to distinct causal mechanisms.

Each methodology shall correspond to a defined set of project activities that are:

(a) operationally distinguishable; and
(b) linked to specific accounting units, emission sources, sinks, streams, reservoirs, or processes.

Project activities shall not be simultaneously credited under more than one methodology for the same GHG outcome.

## 8.1 Activity separation

The Project Document shall clearly identify and describe the activities associated with each methodology.

Such activities shall:

(a) be defined in a manner that allows independent assessment;
(b) correspond to distinct intervention types; and
(c) avoid functional overlap in the generation of GHG outcomes.

Where activities interact within the same project area, facility, physical stream, or operational chain, the project shall demonstrate that such interactions do not result in overlapping accounting.

## 8.2 Causal attribution

Emission reductions, removals, or other GHG outcomes shall be attributed to a single methodology based on the causal mechanism through which they are generated.

Each GHG outcome shall be linked to one and only one causal mechanism and corresponding methodology.

Attribution shall be based on:

(a) the direct effect of the activity;
(b) the primary emission source or sink affected; and
(c) the specific accounting unit, emission source, sink, stream, reservoir, or process impacted.

### 8.3 Prohibition of dual attribution

Where a single activity, event, stream, process, or operational chain may affect multiple accounting units, including carbon pools, emission sources, sinks, reservoirs, fuel streams, waste streams, treatment processes, or industrial processes:

(a) the resulting GHG outcomes shall be clearly attributable to a single methodology.
(b) Projects shall define a clear attribution approach that prevents dual attribution under all circumstances.

A common physical stream, waste stream, fuel stream, material stream, facility, treatment process, industrial process, or operational chain may support more than one methodological component only where each methodology quantifies a distinct emission source, distinct baseline scenario, and distinct causal mechanism. The same emission reduction, removal, or GHG outcome shall not be credited under more than one methodology.

### 8.4 Primary attribution rule

Projects shall establish and apply a primary attribution rule for cases where a single process, disturbance, stream, facility, or operational chain affects multiple accounting units.

This rule shall:

(a) assign the outcome to a single methodology;
(b) be applied consistently throughout the quantification period; and
(c) follow a conservative approach.

The justification for the selected attribution shall be clearly documented.

Demonstration of compliance with the requirements of this framework shall be based on documented evidence provided in the Project Document and supporting materials, subject to validation and verification.

In cases where more than one methodology demonstrates comparable causal influence over the same GHG outcome and no clear primary driver can be established; the project shall apply a hierarchical decision approach to assign attribution.

The attribution shall be determined based on the following order of precedence:

(a) the methodology that directly addresses the primary emission source or sink affected;

(b) the methodology with the most direct causal linkage between the activity and the quantified outcome;
(c) the methodology with the more conservative attribution outcome; and
(d) where ambiguity persists, the outcome shall be attributed to a single methodology and any residual uncertainty shall be conservatively excluded from crediting.

The application of this hierarchy shall be documented and justified.

### 8.5 Same-sector and common-chain interactions

Where two BCS methodologies interact through a common operational chain, shared facility, physical stream, or related set of activities, the Project Document shall demonstrate that both methodologies belong to the same BCS sectoral scope and that each methodology quantifies a distinct GHG outcome.

A common operational chain shall not be used to justify attribution of the same GHG outcome to more than one methodology or to combine methodologies from different BCS sectoral scopes. Where a methodology involves an end-use or operational interface in another sector, the Project Document shall justify the sectoral classification assigned by BioCarbon Cert.

### 8.6 Interaction consistency

The Project Document shall demonstrate that:

(a) activities assigned to each methodology are consistent with their respective scope;
(b) interactions between activities do not result in overlapping accounting; and
(c) attribution of outcomes remains stable under different scenarios.

### 8.7 Requirement for explicit documentation

Projects applying multiple methodologies shall include a dedicated section titled: “Methodological Interaction Framework”

This section shall demonstrate that:

(a) activities are clearly separated;
(b) causal mechanisms are defined; and
(c) GHG outcomes are attributed without overlap.

### 8.8 Project length and quantification periods

Projects applying two BCS methodologies shall comply with the quantification period requirements established for each methodology under the applicable BCS provisions.

Where a project applies two methodologies, the project length applicable to the combined project shall correspond to the longer of the two project lengths established for the individual activities.

This requirement ensures that:

(a) the methodology with the longer-term causal mechanism or monitoring requirement is not constrained by a shorter project length; and
(b) GHG outcomes generated throughout the full duration of both activities remain subject to consistent monitoring, verification, and crediting.

For example, in a project combining a REDD+ methodology with a savanna (grassland) methodology, where the REDD+ methodology requires a minimum project length of 40 years (achieved through renewable quantification periods of up to 10 years each), the project shall apply a minimum project length of 40 years, corresponding to the longer of the two applicable periods. Individual quantification periods within that project length shall be defined and renewed in accordance with the requirements applicable to each methodology.

The selected project length shall be clearly documented in the Project Document, and the applicable quantification periods within it shall remain consistent throughout the crediting period, subject to validation and verification.

# 9 Attribution of GHG outcomes

GHG outcomes shall be attributed in accordance with the activity separation and causal attribution rules established in Section 8. This section further defines the accounting conditions required to ensure that such attribution remains consistent, non-overlapping, and fully traceable across the two methodologies.

GHG outcomes shall be quantified, reported, and credited in a manner that ensures:

(a) unique attribution;
(b) non-overlapping accounting; and
(c) full traceability to the corresponding methodology.

### 9.1 Attribution consistency

Each GHG outcome shall be attributed to a single methodology based on the causal mechanism defined in Section 7.

No emission reduction, removal, or other GHG outcome shall be attributed to more than one methodology.

Attribution shall remain consistent throughout the quantification period and across all monitoring and reporting cycles.

### 9.2 Accounting boundaries

Projects shall define clear accounting boundaries for each methodology, including:

(a) emission sources and sinks;
(b) accounting units, as defined in Section 7; and
(c) associated project activities.

These boundaries shall be mutually exclusive and collectively representative of the project scope.

### 9.3 Quantification separation

Quantification of GHG outcomes shall be performed separately for each methodology.

Each methodology shall:

(a) apply its own quantification procedures;
(b) use distinct input data where required; and
(c) produce independently verifiable results.

Aggregation of results shall only occur after individual quantification has been completed and validated.

### 9.4 Prohibition of overlapping accounting

Projects shall ensure that no GHG outcome is:

(a) quantified more than once;
(b) included in more than one calculation; or
(c) reported under more than one methodology.

Overlapping accounting is strictly prohibited.

### 9.5 Traceability of credited GHG outcomes

All credited GHG outcomes shall be traceable to:

(a) a specific methodology;
(b) a defined set of activities; and
(c) a clearly identified accounting boundary.

The Project Document shall demonstrate full traceability from:

(a) Activity
(b) Causal mechanism
(c) Quantification
(d) Credited outcome.

### 9.6 Consistency with BCS sectoral accounting

Attribution and accounting shall be consistent with the requirements of the BioCarbon Standard (BCS), including:

(a) the applicable BCS sectoral scope;
(b) the two applicable BCS methodologies;
(c) the BioCarbon Standard rules, tools, and procedures; and
(d) applicable external accounting requirements, where relevant.

Where external accounting systems or other certification systems are relevant, the project shall demonstrate that credited GHG outcomes are not double counted or double claimed outside BCS.

## 10 High-risk interaction zones

Projects applying two BCS methodologies shall identify, assess, and manage high-risk interaction zones where a single process, disturbance, intervention, physical stream, facility, or operational chain may affect multiple accounting units simultaneously.

Such zones represent a heightened risk of overlapping accounting, double claiming, and incorrect attribution of GHG outcomes.

### 10.1 Identification of high-risk processes

Projects shall identify processes that may generate cross-methodological effects, including but not limited to:

(a) drainage and rewetting

(b) fire and biomass combustion
(c) degradation and land-use change
(d) hydrological alterations
(e) ecosystem restoration activities affecting multiple components;
(f) waste diversion, sorting, preprocessing, treatment, or transformation affecting more than one GHG outcome;
(g) fuel substitution, alternative fuel production, storage, transport, or combustion;
(h) industrial process changes affecting more than one emission source; and
(i) capture, storage, destruction, or removal processes with shared material or energy balances.

These processes shall be explicitly described in the Project Document.

### 10.2 Risk of cross-impact

Where a single process, stream, facility, or operational chain affects more than one accounting unit, the project shall demonstrate that:

(a) the effects are clearly understood;
(b) the interaction between methodologies is properly characterized; and
(c) accounting boundaries are not compromised.

### 10.3 Attribution in high-risk scenarios

In cases where a single process generates impacts across multiple accounting units, GHG outcomes shall be managed to prevent overlapping accounting.

Projects shall apply a predefined attribution approach consistent with the primary attribution rule established under Section 8.4.

This approach shall:

(a) prevent dual attribution;
(b) ensure conservative allocation; and
(c) be consistently applied throughout the project.

### 10.4 Conservative treatment

Where uncertainty exists regarding the attribution of GHG outcomes, the most conservative approach shall be applied.

This may include:

(a) assigning outcomes to a single methodology with reduced crediting; or
(b) excluding uncertain outcomes from crediting.

### 10.5 Dominant driver rule

Where a biophysical, chemical, operational, hydrological, technological, or market-related process constitutes the primary driver of GHG outcomes within the project boundary, the project shall explicitly identify and document that process as the dominant interaction factor.

This requirement applies, in particular, to systems where one driver may affect more than one accounting unit, including hydrology-dominated AFOLU systems, waste diversion and treatment systems, waste-derived fuel chains, industrial thermal processes, fuel-switching systems, and other BCS sectoral contexts with shared physical or operational drivers.

The determination of a dominant driver shall be supported by appropriate evidence, which may include:

(a) biophysical, chemical, operational, or process characterization of the system;
(b) scientific literature, technical standards, empirical studies, or engineering data relevant to the sectoral context;
(c) site-specific data, mass balances, energy balances, monitoring records, or operational data demonstrating the influence of the dominant driver on GHG outcomes; and
(d) consistency with the causal mechanisms defined for each methodology.

The justification shall be sufficiently robust to allow independent assessment by the Conformity Assessment Body (CAB).

Where uncertainty exists in determining the dominant driver, a conservative attribution approach shall be applied.

Where a dominant driver is identified, the project shall demonstrate that:

(a) the dominant process, stream, facility, or operational chain is explicitly characterized within the Project Document;
(b) the influence of the dominant driver on each accounting unit is clearly described;
(c) GHG outcomes arising from the dominant driver are attributed to one methodology only; and
(d) the same effect is not used to support overlapping claims across methodologies, entities, certification systems, or other claims.

Where a single intervention, stream, or operational chain affects multiple accounting units simultaneously, the project shall apply a conservative primary attribution rule to ensure that resulting GHG outcomes are credited only once.

Failure to define and apply a clear attribution approach for outcomes affected by a dominant driver shall render the combined application of methodologies non-eligible.

Any same-sector system with strong coupling between accounting units, physical streams, process units, baselines, or causal mechanisms shall be considered a high-risk interaction zone. Projects applying two methodologies in such systems shall apply enhanced attribution rules and conservative accounting.

### 10.6 Prohibition of split attribution

Projects shall not split the same GHG impact of a single process across multiple methodologies for the purpose of crediting.

Partial attribution of the same outcome to more than one methodology is not permitted.

### 10.7 Documentation requirements

The Project Document shall include:

(a) identification of high-risk interaction zones;
(b) description of affected processes;
(c) justification of attribution decisions; and
(d) demonstration of conservative treatment.

## 11 Double counting safeguards

Building on the attribution and accounting rules defined in Sections 8 and 9, projects shall implement safeguards to prevent any form of double counting or double claiming of GHG outcomes.

These safeguards shall ensure that all credited GHG outcomes are uniquely identified, consistently accounted for, and not duplicated under any circumstance.

### 11.1 Intra-project safeguards

Projects shall prevent double counting within the same Project Document by ensuring that:

(a) emission reductions, removals, or GHG outcomes are not attributed to more than one methodology;
(b) accounting boundaries remain clearly defined and non-overlapping; and
(c) interactions between methodologies do not result in duplicated quantification.

Double counting within a project is strictly prohibited.

### 11.2 External double claiming safeguards

Where a project activity, accounting unit, physical stream, facility, or GHG outcome is subject to claims, rights, or accounting under another certification system, registry, national accounting system, contractual arrangement, or entity-level claim, the project shall ensure that:

(a) the same GHG outcome is not counted, issued, transferred, retired, or claimed more than once;
(b) each credited GHG outcome is assigned to a single BCS methodology and traceable unit; and
(c) claiming rights and accounting approaches remain documented, consistent, and non-overlapping.

### 11.3 Prevention of double claiming

Projects shall ensure that GHG outcomes are not:

(a) claimed by more than one entity;
(b) used simultaneously under different certification systems; or
(c) attributed to more than one purpose in a manner that compromises accounting integrity.

Double claiming is strictly prohibited.

### 11.4 Unique identification and tracking

All credited outcomes shall be:

(a) uniquely identified;
(b) traceable to a specific methodology and BCS sectoral scope; and
(c) recorded in a manner that allows reconciliation across the project lifecycle.

### 11.5 Reconciliation procedures

Projects shall establish procedures to:

(a) reconcile results across methodologies;
(b) verify the absence of duplication; and
(c) ensure consistency between quantification, reporting, and issuance.

These procedures shall be documented and subject to validation and verification.

### 11.6 Alignment with external accounting frameworks

Projects shall ensure that safeguards against double counting and double claiming are consistent with applicable international requirements, including those related to:

(a) national accounting systems;
(b) corresponding adjustments, where applicable; and
(c) other relevant accounting frameworks.

## 12 MRV integration

Projects applying two BCS methodologies within the same sectoral scope shall establish an integrated Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) system that ensures methodological separation while maintaining overall coherence and consistency of project-level accounting.

Compliance with these requirements shall be demonstrated through the application of the relevant methodologies, standardized templates, and MRV tools under the BioCarbon Standard.

The MRV system shall enable the accurate monitoring, quantification, and reporting of GHG outcomes associated with each methodology without overlap.

### 12.1 Methodology-specific monitoring

Projects shall maintain distinct monitoring parameters for each methodology.

Monitoring shall:

(a) be aligned with the requirements of each applicable methodology;
(b) reflect the specific activities, accounting units, emission sources, streams, reservoirs, and processes associated with each methodology; and
(c) ensure that data collected is sufficient to support independent quantification.

### 12.2 Data separation and management

Projects shall ensure that data used for quantification:

(a) is clearly attributable to a specific methodology;
(b) is not duplicated across methodologies; and
(c) is managed in a manner that preserves traceability.

Where shared data sources are used, the project shall demonstrate that such use does not result in overlapping accounting.

### 12.3 Integrated reporting

Projects shall consolidate results from multiple methodologies into a single, coherent reporting structure.

Reporting shall:

(a) clearly distinguish outcomes by methodology;
(b) maintain consistency across reporting periods; and
(c) provide a transparent linkage between activities, data, and credited outcomes.

### 12.4 Traceability and auditability

The MRV system shall ensure full traceability of GHG outcomes from:

(a) Activity
(b) Monitoring data
(c) Quantification
(d) Reported results
(e) Credited units.

All data and calculations shall be auditable and verifiable by the Conformity Assessment Body (CAB).

### 12.5 Consistency over time

Projects shall ensure that monitoring and reporting approaches remain consistent throughout the quantification period.

Changes in data collection, methodologies, or assumptions shall:

(a) be justified;
(b) be transparently documented; and
(c) not affect the integrity of attribution or accounting.

### 12.6 Sectoral consistency within BCS

Where two methodologies are applied within the same BCS sectoral scope, the MRV system shall ensure that:

(a) data and reporting are coherent across the two methodologies;
(b) GHG outcomes remain clearly separated; and
(c) no duplication occurs across monitoring parameters, datasets, calculations, or issued units.

# 13 Limits and restrictions

Projects applying two BCS methodologies under the BioCarbon Cert framework shall comply with the limits and restrictions established in this section.

These limits are intended to ensure auditability, prevent methodological interaction risks, and maintain the integrity of GHG outcome accounting.

## 13.1 Maximum number of methodologies

Projects shall apply no more than two (2) methodologies within a single Project Document.

The application of more than two methodologies is not permitted.

## 13.2 Same-sector limitation and prohibition of incompatible combinations

Projects shall not combine methodologies where:

(a) the methodologies belong to different BCS sectoral scopes;
(b) they target the same accounting unit, carbon pool, emission source, sink, reservoir, fuel stream, waste stream, material stream, or process unit;
(c) they quantify the same emission source, sink, reservoir, emission reduction, or removal; or
(d) their interaction cannot be resolved in a conservative and non-overlapping manner.

Methodological combinations that result in cross-sector application or overlapping accounting are not permitted, unless BioCarbon Cert has expressly classified both methodologies within the same BCS sectoral scope through a specific normative provision.

## 13.3 Requirement for demonstrable compatibility

Projects shall demonstrate that the selected methodologies are compatible and belong to the same BCS sectoral scope.

Compatibility shall be assessed based on:

(a) same BCS sectoral scope;
(b) separation of accounting units, as defined in Section 7;
(c) independence of baseline scenarios, including the absence of shared assumptions or underlying drivers that could result in implicit double counting or double attribution of GHG outcomes;

(d) distinct causal mechanisms; and
(e) absence of overlapping quantification.

Failure to demonstrate compatibility shall result in non-eligibility of the combined application.

Demonstration of baseline independence shall include a structured assessment comparing baseline scenarios across methodologies. At a minimum, the project shall demonstrate that:

(a) baseline scenarios are based on distinct drivers of change;
(b) key assumptions are not shared in a manner that could influence both baselines simultaneously;
(c) projected trends in emissions or GHG outcomes are not derived from the same underlying datasets or models without clear separation; and
(d) the application of one baseline does not implicitly affect or constrain the outcome of another baseline.

This assessment shall be documented in a manner that allows independent verification.

### 13.4 Restrictions in high-interaction systems

In systems where accounting units, emission sources, physical streams, operational chains, or environmental components are strongly interconnected, including but not limited to peatland forests, integrated landscape systems, waste diversion systems, waste-derived fuel chains, and industrial process systems, projects shall apply additional caution.

Where interaction risks cannot be clearly resolved, the application of multiple methodologies shall not be permitted.

### 13.5 Limitations on methodological scope expansion

Projects shall not expand the scope or alter the sectoral classification of a methodology beyond its intended application in order to justify the use of two methodologies.

Each methodology shall be applied strictly within its defined methodological scope and BCS sectoral classification.

### 13.6 Authority of BioCarbon Cert

BioCarbon Cert may define restricted or prohibited methodological combinations, assign or clarify sectoral classifications, issue additional guidance, or reject project applications where methodological interaction risks are not adequately addressed.

Such determinations shall be based on:

(a) the risk of overlapping accounting;
(b) the inability to establish clear attribution of GHG outcomes;
(c) insufficient separation of accounting units, as defined in Section 7;
(d) inconsistency of baseline scenarios; or
(e) lack of demonstrable methodological independence or same-sector eligibility.

All determinations shall follow a conservative approach and shall be documented.

# 14 Validation and verification requirements

Projects applying two BCS methodologies within the same sectoral scope shall be subject to validation and verification procedures that assess both the individual application of each methodology and their combined interaction.

Validation and verification shall ensure that the requirements of this framework are fully met and that GHG outcomes are accounted for in a consistent, non-overlapping, and traceable manner.

## 14.1 Scope of assessment

CABs shall assess whether the project has adequately demonstrated compliance with the attribution, separation, and non-overlapping accounting requirements defined in this framework, based on the evidence provided in the Project Document, applicable methodologies, and standardized templates.

Validation and verification shall include:

(a) the independent assessment of each methodology; and
(b) the assessment of methodological interaction within the project.

CABs shall confirm that:

(a) methodologies are applied correctly;
(b) interactions are properly managed; and
(c) accounting integrity is preserved.

## 14.2 Multi-Method Consistency Assessment

CABs shall perform a dedicated assessment of methodological interaction, referred to as the: Multi-Method Consistency Assessment

This assessment shall evaluate:

(a) same-sector eligibility under BCS;
(b) separation of activities;
(c) attribution of GHG outcomes;
(d) definition of accounting boundaries;
(e) identification and treatment of high-risk interaction zones; and
(f) implementation of safeguards against double counting and double claiming.

The Multi-Method Consistency Assessment shall be conducted using a structured evaluation approach. At a minimum, CABs shall assess and document whether:

(a) both methodologies belong to the same BCS sectoral scope;
(b) activities are clearly separated and non-overlapping;
(c) a single causal mechanism is assigned to each GHG outcome;
(d) accounting boundaries are mutually exclusive and consistently defined;
(e) baseline scenarios are demonstrably independent;
(f) any risk of overlapping accounting or double attribution exists; and
(g) high-risk interaction zones are adequately identified and conservatively managed.

For each element, the CAB shall determine whether the requirement is:

(a) compliant;
(b) non-compliant; or
(c) requiring corrective action.

Any failure to demonstrate compliance with these elements shall result in a non-conformity.

### 14.3 Verification of attribution and accounting

CABs shall verify that:

(a) GHG outcomes are attributed to a single methodology;
(b) quantification is performed independently; and
(c) no overlapping accounting occurs.

Any evidence of dual attribution or overlapping quantification shall result in non-conformity and required corrective action.

### 14.4 Assessment of MRV system

The MRV system shall be evaluated to ensure that:

(a) monitoring is methodology-specific;

(b) data is properly separated and managed;
(c) reporting is consistent and transparent; and
(d) traceability is fully maintained.

### 14.5 Treatment of inconsistencies

Where inconsistencies are identified, including:

(a) unclear attribution;
(b) overlapping accounting; or
(c) insufficient separation of activities or data

CABs shall:

(a) raise findings in accordance with applicable procedures; and
(b) require corrective action prior to validation or verification approval.

### 14.6 Conservative resolution

Where uncertainty remains regarding attribution or interaction, a conservative approach shall be applied.

CABs may require:

(a) adjustment of credited outcomes; or
(b) exclusion of affected results from crediting.

### 14.7 Documentation requirements

The validation and verification process shall confirm that the Project Document includes a dedicated section titled: “Methodological Interaction Framework”

This section shall be assessed as part of the overall validation and verification process.

BioCarbon Cert may establish standardized templates or additional documentation requirements to support the application of this framework. Such instruments may be required as part of the validation and verification process.

# Annex I. Methodological Combination Matrix

## I.1 Objective

This annex establishes the conditions under which two BCS methodologies may be combined within a single project under the BioCarbon Standard (BCS).

It provides a structured classification of:

(a) permitted combinations;
(b) conditionally permitted combinations; and
(c) non-permitted combinations.

The provisions of this annex are normative and shall be applied in conjunction with the BioCarbon Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF). This annex applies only to BCS methodologies.

## I.2 General rule

Two BCS methodologies may only be combined where:

(a) both methodologies belong to the same BCS sectoral scope;
(b) accounting units, as defined in Section 7, are clearly separated;
(c) baseline scenarios are independent;
(d) causal mechanisms are distinct; and
(e) no overlapping accounting occurs across the two methodologies.

Failure to meet any of these conditions shall result in non-eligibility of the combination.

Note: In BCS GHG methodologies, accounting units may include carbon pools, emission sources, sinks, reservoirs, fuel streams, waste streams, material streams, treatment processes, industrial processes, or other quantified emission processes, as applicable to the methodology.

## I.3 Classification of combinations

Methodological combinations are classified as follows:

**Permitted**: combinations that present low interaction risk and can be applied directly.

**Conditionally permitted**: combinations that require additional safeguards and justification.

**Non-permitted**: combinations that inherently result in overlapping accounting or cannot be conservatively resolved.

### I.4 BCS sectoral combination logic

Methodological combinations shall be assessed based on the interaction of accounting units within the same BCS sectoral scope, including carbon pools, emission sources, sinks, reservoirs, fuel streams, waste streams, material streams, treatment processes, industrial processes, and other quantified GHG accounting elements.

Projects shall ensure that:

(a) the same GHG outcome is not credited under more than one methodology; and
(b) interactions between accounting units, activities, physical streams, or processes do not result in double counting or double claiming.

### I.5 Dominant-driver systems

In dominant-driver systems, methodological combinations shall only be permitted where the project demonstrates that the relevant dominant driver is explicitly identified, conservatively attributed, and not used as the basis for overlapping accounting. Dominant drivers may include hydrological processes, waste diversion and treatment processes, fuel substitution, industrial process changes, capture or storage processes, or other drivers relevant to the applicable BCS sectoral scope.

Where a dominant driver simultaneously affects more than one accounting unit, the project shall establish a primary attribution rule assigning the resulting GHG outcome to one methodology only.

### I.6 Combination matrix by BCS sectoral scope

The combinations included in this matrix are illustrative and non-exhaustive. All combinations are subject to the same-sector requirement under BCS.

Projects applying BCS methodological combinations not explicitly listed in this Annex shall be assessed in accordance with the general rules established under Sections 8, 9, and 10 of this framework.

In such cases, the project shall demonstrate:

(a) clear separation of accounting units, as defined in Section 7;
(b) independence of baseline scenarios;
(c) distinct causal mechanisms; and
(d) absence of overlapping accounting.

The absence of an explicit combination in this matrix shall not be interpreted as automatic eligibility. Unlisted combinations shall remain within the same BCS sectoral scope and shall be subject to the risk-based assessment in Section I.6.8.

I.6.1 AFOLU sector combinations

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| Avoided deforestation (REDD+/HFLD) + degradation avoidance | Conditionally permitted where drivers, accounting units, baselines, and credited areas are clearly separated and no forest carbon outcome is counted twice. |
| Agroforestry biomass + soil organic carbon | Conditionally permitted where biomass carbon and SOC accounting units are separate and belowground components are not double counted. |
| Soil organic carbon + livestock emission reduction | Permitted where soil carbon changes and enteric/manure-related emission sources are quantified separately and baselines are independent. |
| Peatland rewetting + methane management | Conditionally permitted where $CO_2$, $CH_4$, and SOC-related accounting units are separated and hydrological drivers are conservatively attributed to one methodology. |
| Biochar application + soil carbon methodology | Conditionally permitted where biochar carbon and SOC changes are separated and biochar carbon already credited elsewhere is excluded. |

For AFOLU methodologies, accounting units may include carbon pools, emission sources, removals, sinks, reservoirs, livestock-related emission sources, biomass components, soil carbon components, fire-related emissions, or other AFOLU-specific GHG accounting elements.

Where AFOLU accounting units are biophysically interconnected, projects shall demonstrate that accounting units remain non-overlapping and that dominant drivers are explicitly attributed to a single methodology.

I.6.2 Waste sector combinations

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| CSS/CSR/RDF waste-derived fuel + avoided landfill methane | Conditionally permitted, subject to distinct causal mechanisms, independent baselines, separate quantification, complete project emissions, fossil carbon accounting, and double-counting safeguards. |
| Composting of organic waste + landfill methane avoidance | Conditionally permitted where methane avoidance and composting-related project emissions are separated and the same biodegradable fraction is not credited twice. |
| Anaerobic digestion of organic waste + energy recovery from biogas | Conditionally permitted where methane capture/destruction and energy displacement are treated as distinct GHG outcomes within the waste-sector methodology framework and no emission reduction is duplicated. |
| Wastewater treatment improvement + methane capture/destruction | Permitted where treatment-process emissions and captured/destroyed methane are separately monitored, quantified, and reconciled. |

For the CSS/CSR/RDF + avoided landfill methane combination, the Project Document shall demonstrate that the CSS/CSR/RDF component and the landfill methane avoidance component are both classified under the BCS waste sector. The industrial thermal process shall be treated as the end-use context for the waste-derived fuel, not as a separate industry-sector methodology. Methane avoidance shall be limited to eligible biodegradable fractions. Project emissions from CSS/CSR/RDF preparation, transport, storage, and combustion, including fossil carbon in CSS/CSR/RDF, shall be included. The same emission reduction shall not be double counted or double claimed by the waste generator, CSS/CSR/RDF producer, industrial user, landfill operator, or any other system.

For waste-sector methodologies, accounting units may include waste streams, biodegradable fractions, fossil fractions, treatment processes, methane-generating potential, landfill or disposal-site emission sources, transport, preprocessing, storage, and combustion-related project emissions.

I.6.3 Energy sector combinations

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| Renewable electricity generation + energy-efficiency measures | Conditionally permitted where generation displacement and demand-side savings are based on independent baselines, separate metering, and non-overlapping grid or fuel displacement claims. |
| Fuel switching within the energy sector + energy-efficiency improvement | Conditionally permitted where displaced fuel emissions and efficiency-related reductions are quantified separately and no activity data is duplicated. |
| Waste heat recovery + energy-efficiency improvement | Conditionally permitted where recovered energy and reduced energy demand are independently measured and reconciled to prevent duplicated savings. |

For energy-sector methodologies, accounting units may include energy generation, consumption, grid emission factors, displaced fuels, energy-efficiency measures, demand-side reductions, and associated project emissions.

I.6.4 Industry sector combinations

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| Industrial process emission reduction + industrial energy-efficiency measure | Conditionally permitted where process emissions and energy-related emissions are distinct accounting units and baselines do not rely on the same reduction driver. |

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| Clinker substitution + thermal efficiency improvement | Conditionally permitted where process-related and fuel-related emission reductions are separately quantified and no production or emission factor is applied twice. |
| Industrial gas destruction + process optimization | Permitted where destruction of the target gas and process-related reductions are distinct, directly monitored, and independently verifiable. |

I.6.5 Removal and storage sector combinations

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| Biochar production + durable carbon storage accounting | Conditionally permitted where feedstock, conversion emissions, permanence assumptions, and stored carbon are not duplicated across methodologies. |
| Carbon capture and storage + process emission reduction | Conditionally permitted where captured and stored $CO_2$ is separated from process-efficiency reductions and monitoring systems reconcile mass balances. |
| Mineralization + industrial residue treatment | Conditionally permitted where mineralized carbon and avoided treatment emissions are distinct accounting units and project emissions are fully included. |

I.6.6 Conditionally permitted same-sector combinations

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| Any same-sector combination using a shared physical stream or operational chain | Conditionally permitted where the project demonstrates distinct causal mechanisms, independent baselines, separate quantification, and no double counting or double claiming. |

| Combination | Conditions |
|---|---|
| Any same-sector combination with a dominant driver affecting multiple accounting units | Conditionally permitted where the dominant driver is identified, the primary attribution rule is applied, and uncertain outcomes are conservatively excluded. |
| CSS/CSR/RDF waste-derived fuel + avoided landfill methane | Conditionally permitted under the BCS waste sector, subject to the conditions set out in Section I.6.2. |
| Any unlisted same-sector combination assessed as moderate or high risk | Conditionally permitted only after risk-based assessment and, where required, prior eligibility determination by BioCarbon Cert. |

I.6.7 Non-permitted combinations

| Combination | Reason |
|---|---|
| Methodologies from different BCS sectoral scopes | Cross-sector methodological combinations are not permitted unless BioCarbon Cert expressly classifies both methodologies within the same BCS sectoral scope through a specific normative provision. |
| Two methodologies quantifying the same emission source, sink, reservoir, or removal | Overlapping accounting. |
| Two methodologies using the same accounting unit without separation | Duplicate attribution of the same GHG outcome. |
| Same waste stream or fuel stream credited twice for the same emission reduction | Double counting or double claiming. |

| Combination | Reason |
|---|---|
| Any combination where the same baseline reduction is used in both methodologies | Baseline interdependence and implicit double counting. |
| Any combination with unresolved attribution of a dominant driver | High-risk interaction not conservatively resolved. |
| Any combination where GHG outcomes are derived from the same underlying metric without reconciliation | Overlapping accounting. |
| Any combination involving a methodology outside BCS | Out of scope of this BCS-only framework. |

This assessment shall be consistent with the compatibility requirements established under Section 13.3.

I.6.8 Combinations not listed in this matrix

Where a project applies a same-sector BCS methodological combination not explicitly listed in this Annex, eligibility shall not be assumed. The project shall demonstrate compliance with the general rules established under Sections 8, 9, and 10 of this framework through a structured risk-based assessment.

I.6.8.1 Risk factor assessment

The project shall evaluate the combination against the following interaction risk factors:

(a) dominant-driver coupling: the degree to which a biophysical, chemical, operational, hydrological, technological, or market-related driver simultaneously influences the accounting units of both methodologies;
(b) shared accounting units, physical streams, carbon pools, or process components: the extent to which both methodologies draw on the same accounting unit, stream, process, or operational chain for quantification;

(c) common drivers of change: whether the baseline scenarios of both methodologies are influenced by the same underlying drivers, such that changes in one may implicitly affect the other;
(d) cross-effect processes: the presence of processes with known multi-component effects within the project area or operational boundary, including fire, drainage, land-use change, ecosystem restoration, waste diversion, fuel substitution, treatment, destruction, capture, storage, and industrial process changes; and
(e) baseline interdependence, including potential interdependence effects: whether the projected trends or assumptions of one baseline could constrain or replicate those of the other.

For each factor, the project shall determine whether the risk is low, moderate, or high, and document the justification.

Where any factor is assessed as high risk, the combination shall be treated as conditionally permitted and shall require the safeguards established under Section 10 and the primary attribution hierarchy established under Section 8.4.

Where two or more factors are assessed as high risk and cannot be conservatively resolved, the combination shall be treated as non-permitted.

I.6.8.2 Prior eligibility determination

Where the risk factor assessment results in a moderate or high overall risk profile, or where the project cannot conclusively demonstrate that the combination meets the general rules of Section I.2, including same-sector eligibility, the project shall request a prior eligibility determination from BioCarbon Cert before advancing to validation.

The request shall include:

(a) a description of the proposed combination and the BCS sectoral context;
(b) the completed risk factor assessment under Section I.6.8.1;
(c) a demonstration of same-sector eligibility, accounting unit separation, baseline independence, and causal mechanism distinctness; and
(d) the proposed primary attribution rule and its justification.

BioCarbon Cert shall issue a determination within timelines established under BioCarbon Cert procedural rules. The determination shall be documented and made available as part of the project record.

Combinations approved through this process may be incorporated into future versions of this matrix.

I.6.8.3 Default interpretation

Where a project proceeds without a prior eligibility determination for an unlisted same-sector combination, and inconsistencies are identified during validation or verification, the most conservative interpretation shall apply in accordance with Section I.9.

CABs shall flag any unlisted combination as requiring enhanced scrutiny under the Multi-Method Consistency Assessment established in Section 14.2, including confirmation that both methodologies belong to the same BCS sectoral scope.

**I.7 High-risk combinations**

The following combinations are considered inherently high-risk and shall require enhanced scrutiny:

same-sector combinations involving shared physical waste streams, fuel streams, or material streams;
same-sector combinations involving a dominant driver that affects multiple accounting units;
AFOLU combinations involving fire, hydrology, peatlands, or strongly coupled biomass and soil carbon dynamics;
waste-sector combinations involving diversion, treatment, waste-derived fuels, landfill methane avoidance, or shared mass-flow allocation;
energy or industry combinations involving shared fuel displacement, energy balances, or process-emission baselines; and
any unlisted same-sector combination with moderate or high interaction risk.

Projects applying such combinations shall:

(a) define a primary attribution rule;
(b) demonstrate conservative accounting; and
(c) justify all allocation decisions.

**I.8 Authority of BioCarbon Cert**

BioCarbon Cert may issue binding interpretations or updates to this matrix.

Such interpretations shall be based on the general rules and principles established in this framework and shall ensure same-sector eligibility, consistency, transparency, and non-overlapping accounting.

BioCarbon Cert may:

(a) update this matrix periodically;
(b) add or restrict combinations; and
(c) issue binding interpretations where needed.

Where relevant, BioCarbon Cert may publish guidance or clarifications to ensure consistent application of such determinations.

### I.9 Interpretation rule

In case of ambiguity, the most conservative interpretation shall prevail.

*History of document*

**Type of document**

**BioCarbon Normative Guideline – Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF)**

| Version | Date | Description |
|---|---|---|
| Version 1.0 | July 3, 2026 | Initial version establishing the BCS same-sector Multi-Methodology Framework (MMF). |