



Plan Vivo Tool for Demonstrating Additionality

The Plan Vivo tool for demonstrating additionality is based on the “Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality in A/R CDM Project Activities” and the CO2FIX Additionality Tool.

All projects approved under the Plan Vivo Standard must demonstrate that the activities to be implemented and resulting emission reductions are additional.

Projects must demonstrate that activities are additional in that:

1. Activities are not required by enforced legislation or conducted to fulfil the official policies, regulations, or industry standards or any organisation or institution.
2. Activities are not supported by commercial interests to the extent that the activities would be commercially viable in their own right (without the availability of carbon finance).
3. **Identification of alternative land-use scenarios:** Identify realistic and credible land-use scenarios that would have occurred on the land within the proposed project boundary in the absence of the project.

Alternative scenario 1: Continuation of the pre-project land use (e.g. slash and burn agriculture) (description)
Alternative scenario 2: Afforestation/ reforestation of the land within the project boundary.... (description)
Alternative scenario 3: Other plausible and credible land-use alternatives to the project activity deemed appropriate (description)
Most likely scenario: based on the analysis of scenarios above, it can be presumed that the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of project activities is: (Description and justification)

4. **Barrier analysis:** the project should demonstrate that it is overcoming barriers that otherwise would prevent the project activities. Projects should also demonstrate how they will overcome the barriers identified. See table for guidance.

Type of barrier	Examples	How barriers will be overcome
Financial/ economic barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No money to develop project - No system of community payments for ecosystem services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding secured to develop initial project, ongoing project management and transaction costs and payments for ecosystem services
Technical barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project coordinator without staffing and skills needed to implement and manage project - Communities without awareness and skills to initiate project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment of staff and skill strengthening for the project coordinator - Training undertaken with the project coordinator staff, site



	development processes and activities.	coordinators and community field workers include mapping; biomass inventories; participatory threat assessment and derivation of baselines; carbon quantification
Institutional/political barriers	e.g. Lack of regulation of forestry and land-use or poor enforcement of such regulations.	
Ecological barriers	e.g. Widespread degraded soil, recent natural events such as floods, climatic conditions, land-pressures such as intensive grazing	
Social barriers	e.g. Poor organisation and mobilisation of local communities and groups, remoteness of communities, poor infrastructure	
Cultural barriers	e.g. Traditional knowledge, laws and customs, market conditions or practices, traditional equipment and management activities.	

It should be demonstrated how the project will overcome the barriers identified, for example through the provision of financial support, materials, training and technical/ other support.

5. Common Practice Analysis

This section should contain an analysis of the extent to which similar project activities have already been implemented or are currently under development in the geographical area of the proposed project. This step acts as a credibility check to demonstrate additionality that complements barrier analysis. Similar project activities are defined as that which are of a similar scale and take place in a comparable situation (e.g. climate, institutional, social factors).