PLAN VIVO

PV Climate Tool

# PT#BSA

# Baseline Scenario and Additionality Assessment

*Version 1.0*

21 October 2025

**Developed by:**

Developed by the Landscapes and Livelihoods Group (TLLG) http://www.landscapesandlivelihoods.com/, and Plan Vivo https://www.planvivo.org/

**Approved by:**

Enter details of the Methodology Approval Panel (MAP) members that approved the tool

PLAN VIVO

# Contents



DRAFT

DRAFT

PLAN VIVO

# 1 Summary

This tool provides procedures for projects certified under the Plan Vivo Carbon Standard (PV Climate) to determine the most likely land use scenario in the absence of project interventions, and the additionality of the project interventions. It is applicable globally to all PV Climate project interventions. The procedures follow a stepwise process that involves identification of potential land use scenarios, barrier analysis, investment analysis and common practice analysis.

The outcome of applying the tool is identification of a baseline scenario for a specific project area or group of project areas, and justification for the additionality of a project intervention. All assumptions, justifications and supporting information provided in the application of this tool will be reviewed to validate the credibility of the baseline scenario and additionality assessment.

The tool can be referenced in Plan Vivo approved methodologies and can be used for both the initial determination of a baseline scenario and demonstration of additionality, and for periodic re-assessment of the baseline scenario and additionality, as required by the PV Climate Project Requirements.

# 2 Sources

This tool is adapted from:

***AR-TOOL02*** *Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities, Version 1.0.*

This tool can be used in conjunction with the following PV Climate methodology:

**PM001** Agriculture and Forestry Carbon Benefit Assessment Methodology

# 3 Definitions

Definitions used in this module follow the latest version of the PV Climate Glossary and definitions in **PM001**.

# 4 Applicability Conditions

This tool is applicable to all project interventions that meet the PV Climate Project Requirements.

# 5 Procedures

DRAFT

Procedures are described below for:

- Initial baseline scenario and additionality assessment (see Section 5.1), and
- Re-assessment of the baseline scenario and additionality (see Section 5.2).

## 5.1 Initial Assessment

An initial baseline scenario and additionality assessment must be completed prior to project validation following the steps below:

- STEP 0: Preliminary screening based on the start date of the project intervention;
- STEP 1: Identification of alternative land-use scenarios;
- STEP 2: Barrier analysis to identify barriers to implementing the alternative land use scenarios;
- STEP 3: Investment analysis (if needed) to determine which of alternative land-use scenarios with no barriers is the most likely; and
- STEP 4: Common practice analysis to demonstrate that the project intervention is not widely practiced in the project region under conditions similar to those in the project area(s)

All steps must be completed for each project intervention included in the project. Full justification, with supporting evidence where possible, must be provided for each step.

If a project intervention will be applied to multiple project areas that have different alternative land-use scenarios, all steps must be completed for each project intervention and baseline scenario combination.

For grouped projects, where project areas will added to the project during the project period, baseline scenario and additionality assessment must include all potential project areas, and any assumptions relating to baseline scenarios and additionality must be reflected in the eligibility conditions used to assess new project areas before they are included in the project.

### STEP 0: Preliminary Screening Based on the Start Date of the Project Intervention

If a project intervention will be or has been implemented in any project areas up to 5-years before the completion of validation, evidence must be provided that the intervention was part of the project when it was first implemented. This evidence shall be based on documentation that was shared with project participants before the start of the project intervention.

DRAFT

Project areas where project interventions are started more than 5 years before the date of completing validation are not eligible for inclusion in the project.

## STEP 1: Identification of Alternative Land-use Scenarios

### Sub-step 1a: Identify Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios to the Project Intervention

For each project area, or group of project areas with similar conditions, projects should identify realistic and credible alternative land-use scenarios that could occur in the in the absence of the project intervention. The identified land use scenarios must at least include:

- Continuation of the pre-project land use; and
- Implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project.

All identified land use scenarios must be realistic and credible. Land uses that currently exist within the project area(s), or that existed at some time in the 10-year period before the start of the project intervention, may be deemed realistic and credible. For all other land use scenarios, credibility must be justified. For the justification, land-use records, field surveys, data and feedback from stakeholders, and information from other appropriate sources including Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) may be used[1].

**Outcome of Sub-step 1a**: Identify Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios to the Project Intervention: A list of alternative land-use scenarios, with justification and supporting evidence that they are realistic and credible in the context of a specific project area or group of project areas. For grouped projects, the conditions under which the scenarios are credible and realistic must be specified and included in the eligibility conditions for new project areas.

### Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations

Projects must demonstrate that all of the land-use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1a: Identify Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios to the Project Intervention are in compliance with mandatory legal requirements. If a land-use scenario does not meet legal requirements, it should be removed from further consideration unless it can be demonstrated that those requirements are not effectively enforced and that non-compliance is widespread in the project

[1] For more information on PRA tools to support this process, see the Plan Vivo Participatory Toolkit https://www.planvivo.org/participatory-toolkit

region. This might be the case, for example, with non-existent or ineffective enforcement of forest protection measures or land management regulations.

**Outcome of Sub-step 1b**: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations: A list of realistic and credible alternative land-use scenarios that are in compliance with effectively enforced mandatory legal requirements. Evidence must be provided for each scenario that demonstrates either: i) that it is in compliance with specified laws and regulations; or ii) that it is not in compliance with specified laws and regulations, but that the laws or regulations are not effectively enforced. In all cases the relevant legislation and regulations must be identified with reference to specific clauses applicable to the land-use scenario. Evidence that laws or regulations are not effectively enforced in the project region may include:

- Published studies or surveys,
- Studies conducted in the project region by the project coordinator or project partners (including Participatory Rural Appraisal), or
- Written documentation of independent expert judgements.

If the list resulting from Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations is empty or contains only one land-use scenario, then the proposed project intervention is not additional. If the list includes more than one land-use scenario, 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 Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations are not prevented by these barriers.

### Sub-step 2a: Identify Barriers That Would Prevent the Implementation of at Least one Alternative Land-use Scenario(s)

Identify barriers that prevent the realisation of the land-use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations. Barriers to implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project should not relate to the project coordinator or other project partners, and should also apply if the project intervention was implemented as part of a different project or initiative. Such barriers may include, among others:

DRAFT

- Investment barriers, other than insufficient financial returns as analysed in Step 3, such as:
    - Similar historical initiatives/activities only able to operate based on donor or grant funding (non-commercial finance)
    - Perceived high risks associated with investment resulting in lack of access to credit or high borrowing costs
    - Debt funding not feasible
- Institutional barriers, such as:
    - Regional or national legislation
    - Institutional or political opposition
    - Poorly-recognised land tenure rights
    - Poorly-enforced legislation
- Technical barriers, such as:
    - Lack of suitable equipment to implement activities
    - Lack of expertise amongst staff and/or community members to implement project activities
- Barriers due to prevailing practise, such as:
    - No activity of this type is currently operational in the host country or region
- Ecological barriers, such as:
    - Widespread environmental degradation such as soil erosion, salination, etc.
    - Land pressures such as intensive grazing, wildfires, and deforestation
    - Unfavourable climatic conditions such as drought
- Social or cultural barriers, such as:
    - Changing demographic pressures on land
    - Conflict or tensions among local stakeholders
    - Poor organisation and mobilisation of local communities and groups
    - Resistance within society to proposed activities
- Barriers relating to land tenure, such as:
    - 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

DRAFT

**Outcome of Sub-step 2a**: Identify Barriers That Would Prevent the Implementation of at Least one Alternative Land-use Scenario(s): A list of barriers that may prevent one or more land use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations.

### Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers

Determine which of the land-use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations are prevented by at least one of the barriers listed in Sub-step 2a: Identify Barriers That Would Prevent the Implementation of at Least one Alternative Land-use Scenario(s). For each land-use scenario, evidence must be provided that the barrier or barriers identified would prevent the realisation of the land-use scenario in the context of the project area(s).

Any land-use scenarios that are prevented by one or more barriers should be removed from further consideration.

**Outcome of Sub-step 2b**: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers: i) A list of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier that includes all land use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations that are not eliminated in Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers; ii) A list of the land use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations that are prevented by one or more of the barriers identified in Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers, with details of each barriers and evidence that the barrier(s) are likely to prevent the realisation of land use scenario in the project area(s). Evidence of barriers may come from:

- Relevant legislation or regulations,
- Published studies or surveys,
- Existing statistical data,
- Studies conducted in the project region by the project coordinator or project partners (including Participatory Rural Appraisal), or
- Written documentation of independent expert judgements.

DRAFT

Anecdotal evidence can also be included, but this alone is not sufficient proof of barriers.

### Sub-step 2c: Determine the Baseline Scenario (if Allowed by the Barrier Analysis)

Apply the following decision tree to outcome i) of Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers – the list of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier.

- Is the implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project included in the list of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier not prevented by any barrier?
    - → If **Yes:** Does the list contain only one land-use scenario?
        - → If **Yes**: The project intervention is not additional.
        - → If **No**: Proceed to STEP 3: Investment Analysis
    - → If **No:** Does the list contain only one land-use scenario?
        - → If **Yes**: The remaining land use is the baseline scenario. Proceed to STEP 4: Common Practice Analysis.
        - → If **No**: Proceed to STEP 3: Investment Analysis

## STEP 3: Investment Analysis

Investment analysis is required if the outcome of Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers results in more than one land-use scenario that is not prevented by any barriers. It serves to determine which of the remaining land use scenarios is the most economically or financially attractive.

### Sub-step 3a: Determine the Appropriate Analysis Method

Determine whether to apply simple cost analysis, investment comparison analysis or benchmark analysis.

If the project intervention generates no financial or economic benefits other than PV Climate project-related income, then apply the simple cost analysis (Option I). Otherwise, use the investment comparison analysis (Option II) or the benchmark analysis (Option III).

**Outcome from Sub-step 3a**: Determine the Appropriate Analysis Method**:** Identification of the appropriate analysis method with a description of why it was selected.

### Sub-step 3b: Carry out the Analysis

DRAFT

The analysis should be carried out following the Option identified as the outcome from **Sub-step 3a**: Determine the Appropriate Analysis Method. Note, that Options I, II and III are mutually exclusive and only one of them can be applied for each project intervention.

### Option I. Simple Cost Analysis

- Document the costs associated with the project intervention and demonstrate that it generates no financial benefits other than results-based finance for carbon, ecosystem and livelihood benefits of the project, through the sale of PVCs or other finance mechanisms i.e. that the project intervention does not also result in production of marketable products such as timber or agricultural products.
- Document the incomes and costs associated with each of the land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier.
    - → If at least one land use scenario that is not prevented by any barrier generates financial benefits, select as the baseline scenario the land use scenario that allows for the highest difference between incomes and costs over the crediting period.
    - → Otherwise, select as the baseline scenario the land use scenario that is not prevented by any barriers with the lowest costs. If the baseline scenario is the project intervention, it is not additional.

### Option II. Investment Comparison Analysis

- Identify the financial indicator, such as internal rate of return (IRR)[2], NPV, payback period, cost-benefit ratio most suitable for the project type and decision-making context. Proceed to Sub-step 3c: Calculation and Comparison of Financial Indicators (Only Applicable to Options II and III).

### Option III. Benchmark Analysis

[2] For the investment comparison analysis, IRRs can be calculated either as project IRRs or as equity IRRs. Project IRRs calculate a return based on project cash outflows and cash inflows only, irrespective the source of financing. Equity IRRs calculate a return to equity investors and therefore also consider amount and costs of available debt financing. The decision to proceed with an investment is based on returns to the investors, so equity IRR will be more appropriate in many cases. However, there will also be cases where a project IRR may be appropriate.

DRAFT

- Identify a suitable financial indicator, such as IRR[3], net present value (NPV), payback period, cost-benefit ratio, or other most suitable for the project type and decision context (e.g. required rate of return (RRR) related to investments in agriculture or forestry; or bank deposit interest rate corrected for risk inherent to the project or the opportunity costs of land, such as any expected income from land speculation). Identify the relevant benchmark value, such as the required rate of return (RRR) on equity. The benchmark is to represent 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 coordinator. Benchmarks can be derived from:
    - → Government bond rates, increased by a suitable risk premium to reflect private investment and/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 bankers' views and private equity investors/funds' required return on comparable projects;
    - → An internal benchmark (weighted average capital cost of the project coordinator). The project shall demonstrate that this benchmark has been consistently used in the past, i.e. that project interventions under similar conditions developed by the project coordinator used the same benchmark.
- Proceed to Sub-step 3c: Calculation and Comparison of Financial Indicators (Only Applicable to Options II and III).

### Sub-step 3c: Calculation and Comparison of Financial Indicators (Only Applicable to Options II and III)

- Calculate the suitable financial indicator for the project intervention without the financial benefits from results-based finance and for all the land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier. Include all relevant costs (including, for example, the investment cost, the operations and maintenance costs), and revenues (excluding PVC revenues or other sources of results-based finance, but including subsidies/fiscal incentives where

[3] For the benchmark analysis, the IRR shall be calculated as project IRR. If there is only one potential project developer (e.g. when the project activity upgrades an existing process), the IRR shall be calculated as equity IRR.

applicable), and, as appropriate, non-market cost and benefits in the case of public investors.

- Present the investment analysis in a transparent manner and provide all the relevant assumptions in the PDD, so that a reader can reproduce the analysis and obtain the same results. Clearly present critical economic parameters and assumptions (such as capital costs, lifetimes, and discount rate or cost of capital). Justify and/or cite assumptions in a manner that can be validated by the validator or verifier. 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. insurance premiums can be used in the calculation to reflect specific risk equivalents).
- Assumptions and input data for the investment analysis shall not differ across the project intervention and its alternatives, unless differences can be well substantiated.
- If **Option II** (investment comparison analysis) is used then apply the following decision tree:
    - → Is implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project included in the list of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier?
        - → If **Yes**: Has the project intervention a less favourable financial indicator (e.g. IRR), than at least one land use scenario that is not prevented by any barrier?
        - → If **Yes**: Select as the baseline scenario the land use scenario that allows for the highest value of the financial indicator (e.g. IRR). If **No**: The project intervention is not additional.
    - → If **No**: Select as the baseline scenario the land use scenario that allows for the highest financial indicator (e.g. IRR).
- If **Option III** (benchmark analysis) is used then apply the following decision tree:
    - → Is implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project included in the list of land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier?
        - → If **Yes**: Has the project intervention a financial indicator (e.g. IRR) that does not meet the benchmark and at least one of the land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier has a financial indicator that meets the benchmark?

DRAFT

- If **Yes**: Select as the baseline scenario the land use scenario that meets the benchmark and allows for the most favourable financial indicator (such as IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio).
- If **No**:
  - If the financial indicator of the project intervention meets the benchmark, then the project intervention is not additional.
  - If the financial indicators of neither the project intervention nor any of the alternatives meets the benchmark then the baseline scenario is the continuation of the pre-project land use.

- If **No**: Has at least one of the land use scenarios that are not prevented by any barrier the financial indicator that meets the benchmark?
  - If **Yes**: Select as the baseline scenario the land use scenario that has the most favourable financial indicator (such as IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio).
  - If **No**: The baseline scenario is the continuation of the pre-project land use.

## STEP 4: Common Practice Analysis

Common practice analysis is applied to assess whether activities similar to project intervention are commonly practiced is the project region under conditions similar to those in the project area(s). This complements the barrier analysis completed in STEP 2: Barrier Analysis and, where applicable, the investment analysis in STEP 3: Investment Analysis to provide further evidence that the project intervention would not be implemented in the absence of a PV Climate project.

For each project intervention, provide evidence of the extent to which similar activities have been implemented within the last 10 years or are currently underway in the project region. Similar activities are defined as those which are of similar scale, and take place in a comparable environmental, socioeconomic and regulatory context to the project area(s). Project interventions implemented under other PV Climate Projects or projects registered under other programmes that generate carbon credits should not to be included in this analysis.

If activities similar to project intervention are identified, then compare the project intervention to the other similar activities and assess whether there are essential distinctions between

DRAFT

them. Essential distinctions may include a fundamental and verifiable change in circumstances under which the project intervention will be implemented when compared to circumstances under which similar activities were carried out. For example, barriers may exist, or promotional policies may have ended. If certain benefits rendered the similar activities financially attractive (e.g., subsidies or other financial flows) explain why the proposed project intervention cannot use the benefits. If applicable, explain why the similar activities did not face barriers to which the proposed project intervention is subject.

**Outcome of STEP 4**: Common Practice Analysis: Analysis that demonstrates either: i) The project intervention is not additional – if similar activities to the project intervention are widely practiced in the project region, and essential distinctions between the project intervention and similar activities cannot be made; or ii) That the project intervention is not the baseline scenario and is therefore additional.

## 5.2 Reassessment

PV Climate Project Requirements state that:

- The Baseline Scenario must be reassessed and updated whenever a crediting period is renewed, and at least every 10-years throughout the Project Period (Project Requirement 3.1.2); and
- Additionality of the Project Interventions must be reassessed whenever a crediting period is renewed and at least every 5-years by reassessing barriers preventing new project participants from implementing the project interventions, and the regulatory surplus of each project intervention (Project Requirement 3.7.5)[4].

### 5.2.1 Baseline Scenario Reassessment

Baseline scenario reassessment must be completed whenever a crediting period is renewed, and at least every 10-years throughout the project period following the steps below:

- STEP 1: Identification of alternative land-use scenarios;
- STEP 2: Barrier analysis to identify barriers to implementing the alternative land use scenarios; and

[4] Consideration of regulatory surplus is beyond the scope of this tool, and should follow the relevant PV Climate Project Requirements.

DRAFT

- STEP 3: Investment analysis (if needed) to determine which of the alternative land-use scenarios with no barriers is the most likely.

The procedures followed for each of these steps are as described for the initial assessment (see Section 5.1). The alternative land-use scenarios identified in Sub-step 1a: Identify Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios to the Project Intervention, applicable laws and regulations in Sub-step 1b: Demonstrate Consistency of Credible Alternative Land-use Scenarios With Enforced Mandatory Applicable Laws and Regulations, and barriers identified in Sub-step 2a: Identify Barriers That Would Prevent the Implementation of at Least one Alternative Land-use Scenario(s) and Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers must take account of any new regulations, policy changes or other relevant developments in the project region that have occurred since the previous baseline assessment.

When identifying alternative land-use scenarios in Sub-step 1a and identifying barriers in Sub-step 2a: Identify Barriers That Would Prevent the Implementation of at Least one Alternative Land-use Scenario(s) and Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers, it should be assumed that project interventions have not been implemented in project areas.

Potential outcomes of the baseline scenario reassessment are:

i. The baseline scenario from the previous assessment is reconfirmed,
ii. A new baseline scenario is established, or
iii. The project intervention is not additional

Project interventions found to be not additional cannot be applied to new project areas.

A new baseline scenario must be established for existing project areas where project interventions that are found not to be additional are being implemented, if the intervention is still within its crediting period. The new baseline scenario for project areas where a project intervention has been found to be not additional must include implementation of the project intervention from the date of baseline reassessment. For example, if a tree planting intervention is found not to be additional 10 years after the project intervention started, the revised baseline scenario for the project area must include tree planting from the time when the baseline scenario was reassessed (i.e. 10 years after the start of the project intervention).

DRAFT

If a new baseline scenario is established as a result of baseline reassessment, carbon, livelihood and ecosystem baselines must be updated to reflect this.

A baseline reassessment report must be included with the project's annual report and will be assessed by the verifiers. This report should highlight any changes from the previous assessment.

### 5.2.2 Additionality Reassessment

Barriers preventing new project participants from implementing the project interventions must be reassessed whenever a crediting period is renewed and at least every 5-years throughout the project period.

Additionality reassessment can take place at the same time as baseline scenario reassessment, or independently of baseline scenario reassessment.

#### 5.2.2.1 Reassessment of Additionality at the same time as Baseline Scenario Reassessment

If additionality reassessment takes place at the same time as baseline scenario reassessment, the procedures for baseline scenario reassessment in Section 5.2.1 also provide a reassessment of additionality.

Potential outcomes of the assessment are:

i. The project intervention is not the baseline scenario and is therefore additional, or
ii. The project intervention is not additional

Project interventions found to be not additional cannot be applied to new project areas, and a new baseline scenario for existing project areas must be established (see Section 5.2.1).

#### 5.2.2.2 Reassessment of Additionality Without Baseline Scenario Reassessment

If additionality reassessment is not carried out at the same time as baseline scenario reassessment, the following step is required:

- STEP 2: Barrier analysis to identify barriers to implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project

The procedures followed for this step are as described for Sub-step 2a: Identify Barriers That Would Prevent the Implementation of at Least one Alternative Land-use Scenario(s) and Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers of the initial assessment (Section 5.1), except that the only alternative land-use

DRAFT

scenario considered is the implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project. The barriers identified in Sub-step 2a: Identify Barriers That Would Prevent the Implementation of at Least one Alternative Land-use Scenario(s) and Sub-step 2b: Eliminate Land-use Scenarios That are Prevented by the Identified Barriers must take account of any new regulations, policy changes or other relevant developments in the project region that have occurred since the previous additionality assessment, and should assume that project interventions have not been implemented in project areas.

Potential outcomes of the assessment are:

i. There are no barriers to implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project, so the project intervention is not additional, or
ii. Implementation of the project intervention without being registered as a PV Climate project is prevented by one or more barriers, so the project intervention is additional.

Project interventions found to be not additional cannot be applied to new project areas, and a new baseline scenario for existing project areas must be established (see Section 5.2.1).

# 6 Parameters

No parameters are defined in this tool

# 7 References

AR-TOOL02 Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality in A/R CDM project activities, Version 1.0. Available from: https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/ARmethodologies/tools/ar-am-tool-02-v1.pdf/history_view

PM001 Plan Vivo Agriculture and Forestry Project Carbon Benefit Assessment Methodology Version 1.1. PV Climate Methodology. Available from: https://www.planvivo.org/pv-climate-methodologies

PV Climate Glossary Version 1.4. Available from: https://www.planvivo.org/pv-climate-documentation

PV Climate Project Requirements Version 5.5. Available from: https://www.planvivo.org/pv-climate-documentation

DRAFT

DRAFT