ASES ON-CHAIN PROTOCOL

STANDARD AND PROCEDURE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF METHODOLOGIES

Version 2.0

July 2023

www.nat5.bio

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACRONYMS

- **VNPC:** Verified Nature Positive Credit
- **VCC:** Verified Carbon Credit
- **VBC:** Verified Biodiversity-Based Credit
- **VWC:** Verified Water Credit
- **VCAC:** Verified Climate Action Credit
- **CDM:** Clean Development Mechanism
- **aOCP:** ASES Nature-positive Climate Action On-chain Protocol
- **GHG:** Greenhouse Gases
- **GHG-SS:** GHG Sectoral Scopes
- **GORD:** Gulf Organisation for Research and Development
- **GWPs:** Global Warming Potentials
- **IPCC:** The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
- **UNFCCC:** United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

INTRODUCTION

The ASES On-Chain Protocol was developed based on international best practices, which included: ensuring transparency through stakeholder participation; creating an institutional structure to develop standards (for example, baseline and monitoring methodologies); creating robust project cycles that include clear and streamlined project registration and issuance procedures for Nature positive credits, an international blockchain-based carbon registry, and effective approval of project validity.

This document has been created by the specifications established in the Program Manual, which serves as a link between the different aOCP documents and contains the regulations that govern the Program. This document contains the Standard for the Development of Methodologies, establishing the guidelines and specifications to be followed to create a new methodology within the framework of the aOCP Program, as well as the essential sections and elements that they should contain. Additionally, it contains the Procedure for the process of development, review, public consultation, and publication of new methodologies.

When using this document, the Project Proponent, aOCP Validators and Verifiers, the aOCP Operations Team, and the aOCP Steering Committee shall be subject to the requirements outlined in the Program Manual and Program Process.

I. PURPOSE

- To offer a comprehensive explanation of the justification for each section and element of the benchmarking and monitoring procedures, as well as the aOCP standards for the development of new methodologies.
- To detail the process for the development, review, public consultation, and publication of new aOCP methodologies.

II. STANDARD FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF METHODOLOGIES

This document specifies the requirements for developing each section of the methodology and describes the elements that must be present when developing a new methodology. These elements include the applicability criteria, the baseline scenario, the calculation of project benefits such as emission capture, or others (biodiversity, health, soil erosion, water recharge), and monitoring.

The following describes the mandatory sections and components of the aOCP baseline and monitoring approach.

II.1. aOCP SCOPE AND GHG SECTORAL SCOPE

The aOCP Framework and Program Manual describe the aOCP Scopes and GHG Sectoral scopes (GHG-SS) covered by the aOCP Program.

The applicable GHG-SS must be defined according to the guidelines in section IV of the aOCP Framework and those listed below.

GHG Sectoral Scopes	GHG Sectoral Scope Title
13	Waste handling and disposal – for the aOCP, only agroforestry waste for biochar production
14	Afforestation and Reforestation
15	Agriculture

For biodiversity methodologies, the baseline study's scope refers to the values of the biodiversity that will be examined. Additionally, the scope may specify the techniques and parameters to be employed, as well as the study's spatial and temporal scale.

II.2. Applicability conditions

When designing a Project activity, Projects' future benefits shall be assessed using methodologies approved by the aOCP. These methodologies set out applicability conditions that define the eligibility criteria a project must satisfy to be eligible for utilizing the methodology. These criteria encompass various factors such as technical, technological, policy, economic, and regulatory considerations that may influence the project activity's eligibility to employ the methodology.

In order to assess if a Project Activity is eligible to use the approach, the applicability conditions must be expressed clearly and without any ambiguity.

II.3. Project boundary

According to the adopted methodology, the project boundary of aOCP project activity is defined as the physical delineation and/or geographic area of the project activity as well as the specification of the aOCP Scope. Depending on the aOCP Scope, there are additional specifications that establish Project's boundaries. For instance, if it is GHGs, sinks and sources under the project proponent's control that are significant and reasonably attributable to the project activity shall be defined as the boundary. For biodiversity, the taxonomic groups to which biodiversity techniques apply should be specified. In the case of soil health and erosion methodologies, these are the scopes and the PSF shall state which is it considering.

The methodology shall:

- With a figure or flowchart, describe the physical boundary of the eligible project activity;
- For GHG, clearly state which sources and GHGs are contained within the project boundary, and if any sources associated with baseline emissions or project emissions have been left out, explain why and justify;
- Project Proponents must use conservative assumptions when defining the emission sources that are present within the project boundary in the baseline and project scenarios. For instance, the magnitude of emission sources left out of the project emissions calculation must be equal to or lower than the magnitude of equivalent emission sources left out of the baseline emissions calculations.

II.4. Baseline scenario

The baseline scenario accurately depicts the GHG emissions and removals, biodiversity conditions, and soil or water dynamics conditions in the absence of the aOCP Project Activity. It can be assessed by considering the normal evolution of the Project area if the project was not implemented, as well as by comparing it with other parcels within the microbasin, where no project or land use changes are implemented.

Documentation and reporting of the methodologies, data sources, calculations, uncertainties, and assumptions involved in the assessment is critical. Accuracy and reliability of the calculations can be ensured by using standardized protocols and scientific best practices.

The aOCP enforces regulatory additionality as part of the integrity principles within the voluntary carbon markets. Consequently, in the determination of baseline emissions, the aOCP places particular emphasis on considering existing government policies and legal requirements that target greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions, for projects directly involved in GHG emission reductions. Such policies may encompass various initiatives, including incentives such as feed-in tariffs for renewable energy, mandates for minimum product efficiency standards, adherence to air quality requirements, or the imposition of carbon taxes.

To ensure the effective consideration of the applicability of these policies to emission reduction projects, the aOCP has implemented robust evaluation criteria. This entails conducting comprehensive reviews of the regulatory landscape in project jurisdictions to assess the stringency and enforcement mechanisms of relevant policies specifically targeting emission reductions. Additionally, meticulous evaluation of the level of compliance among project stakeholders is carried out, taking into account any grace periods or transitional arrangements provided by regulatory authorities. In addition to incorporating existing government policies and legal requirements aimed at emission reductions, the aOCP implements stringent provisions to ensure that ecosystem restoration projects registered within its framework are genuinely additional.

This involves verifying that these projects are not undertaken as part of a legal mandate or compensatory measure for environmental impacts caused by the project proponent. The aOCP meticulously evaluates project proposals to ascertain their voluntary nature and independence from any regulatory obligations or mitigation requirements imposed by authorities. By enforcing this provision, the aOCP upholds the principle of additionality, ensuring that certified ecosystem restoration projects result in tangible environmental benefits beyond what is legally mandated or required as compensation for project-related impacts. To effectively assess the additionality of ecosystem restoration projects, the aOCP employs robust verification processes that scrutinize project documentation and engagement with regulatory authorities.

This includes conducting thorough reviews of project proposals and associated permits or licenses to identify any indications of regulatory mandates or compensatory measures. Additionally, the aOCP engages in dialogue with project proponents and regulatory agencies to clarify the voluntary nature of the proposed restoration activities and confirm that they are not undertaken as a legal obligation.

II.4.1. GHG METHODOLOGIES

The baseline of aOCP Project Activity shall be set by clearly defining the geographical boundaries of the project area identifying the activities and land uses that will be included in the baseline assessment and considering both the direct and indirect GHG emissions associated with the project activities. The most likely scenario that would occur in the absence of the NBS project represents the business-as-usual or "do-nothing" scenario and serves as the baseline against which the project's emissions reductions or removals will be calculated. GHG emission sources and sinks within the project area shall be identified. This may include sources such as deforestation, land degradation, agricultural practices, or industrial activities. Sinks could include forest carbon sequestration, wetland restoration, or other natural processes that absorb or store carbon.

Relevant data on historical emissions, land use patterns, and activity levels within the project area can be obtained from various sources, such as national inventories, remote sensing data, field surveys, or scientific literature. A comprehensive understanding of the baseline scenario requires the assessment of the existing conditions and trends.

Appropriate methodologies and emission factors shall be used to calculate the GHG emissions and removals associated with the baseline scenario. It is important to consider factors such as carbon stocks, vegetation types, land-use changes, and relevant activity data.

II.4.2. BIODIVERSITY METHODOLOGIES

The baseline study is the process of gathering and analyzing data on a site's biodiversity values, including the species, habitats, and ecological systems that are there as well as their current conditions and trends before the start of a project. The methodologies used should show how natural groups and habitats might evolve in the absence of the project.

The designation of the research region is the first stage in creating the biodiversity baseline. The geographic area of anticipated project activities and impacts, or the project area of influence, should be included in the baseline research area. Expanding the study area based on the distribution of biodiversity and ecosystem assets across the landscape is a good practice.

Desk-based assessment should be used as the major source of data in the baseline research for biodiversity methods. After that, the information gaps found in the desk-based analysis, stakeholder consultation, and other sources should be filled by the field evaluation of biodiversity values.

The involvement of experts and stakeholders in the baseline investigation and monitoring process is beneficial. By engaging stakeholders, the ecosystem services and biodiversity values and dynamics within the project’s region can be comprehensively described. In addition to identifying biodiversity values that should be considered in the scope of the biodiversity baseline study, experts familiar with the study area can provide valuable assistance by excluding values that are unlikely to be present and reviewing the results of field-based assessments as they become available.

Long-term biodiversity monitoring is necessary to verify the Project's impacts on biodiversity and as a requirement for the award of Verified Biodiversity Based Credits when the baseline study is finished and the project is registered in aOCP. The baseline study and the long-term monitoring program should be integrated throughout the project's lifespan, with the monitoring program continuing to use the same techniques and some of the same survey sites while using data from the baseline report as the baseline against which to measure project impacts.

II.4.3. Soil and Water Restoration Methodologies

The baseline scenario represents the expected outcome if the Project activities were not implemented. This baseline scenario should consider factors such as existing land use practices, regulatory requirements, and environmental conditions. It serves as a reference against which the project's impact can be measured. The polygons comprised within the project boundary will be assessed at the following periods:

- Before deforestation (if it occurred and if satellite images are available for this period)
- Before project implementation.

A counterfactual analysis is conducted to assess what would have happened in the absence of the project. The baseline will be surveyed synchronically via the remote monitoring approach throughout the life of the project. This will be done in areas within the microbasin with similar conditions at the beginning of the project and which do not undergo anthropogenic land use/land cover change. This will allow the comparison of the natural evolution of the ecosystem soil health and/or erosion, or water balance in the absence of restoration activities.

Methodologies might involve stakeholders and other sources of consultation as well as a desk review as the initial source of data for the baseline research.

II.5. Project additionality

According to the aOCP Project Standard, projects shall demonstrate that the GHG emissions and/or removals, biodiversity, soil health and/or erosion, and/or groundwater recharge are better to what would have happened in the absence of the project activity. To ensure ‘additionality’, the solutions must deliver carbon benefits compared to the business-as-usual situation, without the intervention.

By focusing on the unique ecological benefits that a project brings, it recognizes the importance of protecting and restoring ecosystems beyond their carbon sequestration potential. This broader perspective aligns with the objective of sustainable development, as it addresses the interconnectedness between human well-being and the health of ecosystems.

Each methodology, depending on its scope, shall establish the mechanism to assess additionality.

Ultimately, the Carbon Offset Research and Education program recommends to *“think of additionality in terms of risk: how likely is a project to be additional?*” rather than simply considering a Project as additional or not additional.

The aOCP recognizes and supports the use of the following barrier analyses and guidelines to substantiate project additionality. These recognized tools are important support for claims of additional environmental benefits of projects. In particular, the aOCP places particular emphasis on ecological additionality, consistent with its overarching mission to promote climate action and ecological restoration.

1. **Ecological Barriers:** Evaluate the impact of degraded soil, catastrophic events, unfavorable meteorological conditions, and grazing pressures, which present significant obstacles to achieving lower emissions and emphasize the project's ecological significance.
2. **Financial Analysis:** Conduct an in-depth evaluation to determine if the project relies on carbon funding to sustain its operations. This analysis can include an investment assessment to ascertain that the project is not the most financially attractive option.
3. **Technological Barriers:** Identify any limitations in accessing essential resources such as planting materials, equipment, or infrastructure necessary for implementing a technology. Demonstrating that the business-as-usual scenario would result in higher emissions underscores the importance of the project.
4. **Alternatives to the Project Scenario:** Provide evidence that the project mitigates a genuine threat, particularly in terms of land use, preventing the conversion of the land to alternative harmful uses.
5. **Institutional Barriers:** Examine any institutional challenges, such as inadequate enforcement of land use regulations or changes in government policies or laws, that hinder the project's implementation.
6. **Local Tradition:** Consider traditional knowledge, laws, customs, market conditions, and practices that impede the adoption of a more carbon-efficient scenario.
7. **Social Barriers:** Assess factors like population growth, social conflicts, widespread illegal activities, land tenure issues, property rights, and the absence of defined property rights that create additional challenges for the project.

II.6. PROJECTS' IMPACTS QUANTIFICATION

The aOCP deploys a system of methodologies categorized by aOCP-Scope, covering GHG, biodiversity, soil, and water. Methodologies can be further subcategorized; for instance, GHG can be quantified in vegetation, soil, or biochar, each having its own methodology. Since aOCP Project activities can produce positive results in many of these Scopes, it is necessary to assess their impacts using appropriate methodologies as needed.

The aOCP harnesses the capabilities of digital technologies and remote sensing to enable frequent, cost-effective, semi-automated, and replicable evaluations of ecological conditions and functions within the Project area. Methodologies designed for use under the aOCP should encompass both in situ assessment techniques and remote sensing methods, ensuring a robust comparison of their respective outcomes to validate their accuracy. In all cases, details on aspects such as data collection, aggregation, analysis, reporting, and other significant monitoring requirements shall be provided.

The methods and techniques utilized should be founded on robust scientific knowledge documented in peer-reviewed papers. Simultaneously, they should be presented in a manner that is comprehensible and reproducible. The methodologies shall also incorporate detailed instructions on the calculation process to determine the number of credits (for the respective VNPC type) to be issued, as a function of the quantified benefits generated by the Project. This approach ensures transparency by enabling public stakeholders to scrutinize and comprehend the calculations involved in VNPCs issuance.

It is essential to establish quality control measures, such as:

- **Standardized Sampling Techniques:** Specify standardized procedures for sampling, including sample size, distribution, and number of replicates, to ensure consistency and accuracy in data collection.
- **Laboratory Analysis Standards:** Define specific laboratory analysis methods and protocols. This ensures consistent and reliable results across different testing facilities.
- **Data Validation and Quality Control Checks:** Establish criteria for data validation and quality control checks to identify and address any errors or inconsistencies in the collected data. This may include checks for outliers, missing values, or data entry errors.
- **Field Observation Protocols:** Standardize the methods for recording field observations to ensure consistency and comparability.
- **Remote Sensing Protocols:** Standardize the methods and data sources for making remote observations, promoting high spatial and temporal resolution. This will help to ensure accuracy, consistency, and comparability.
- **Quality Control Audits:** Conduct periodic quality control audits to assess the overall effectiveness and reliability of the methodology. This can involve independent verification of data and analysis procedures to ensure compliance with the established standards.
- **Documentation and Reporting:** Document all procedures, protocols, and data collection methods in the methodology. This includes documenting any deviations from standard procedures and providing detailed information on how the data was collected, analyzed, and interpreted. It is important to have a transparent and comprehensive report that can be reviewed and replicated by others.

All methodologies approved for use within the aOCP framework shall include a comprehensive assessment of the overall uncertainty regarding the ecological benefits derived from implemented Project activities. Whether about emission reductions or removals, biodiversity restoration or conservation, soil health enhancement, soil erosion reduction, or water infiltration enhancement, methodologies must diligently account for uncertainties across all dimensions. This assessment shall encompass a thorough examination of various sources of uncertainty, including assumptions regarding baseline scenarios, estimation equations or models, parameters such as representativeness of default values, and the accuracy of measurement methods. The determination of overall uncertainty shall be based in the combined assessment of uncertainties arising from individual causes, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of the reliability and robustness of the ecological benefits assessment leading to the issuance of VNPCs.

II.6.1. GREENHOUSE GASES

For GHG, methodologies must specify how baseline and projected emissions, leakage and emission reductions/removals from GHG pools and sources, relevant to the proposed Project activities, will be calculated and provide techniques for calculating project emissions and leakage.

II.6.2. Biodiversity

Biodiversity methodologies should establish guidelines for the identification and selection of ecological communities to be assessed, as well as the use of appropriate indices to evaluate the ecological condition of the Project area and its surrounding area of influence.

II.6.3. Soil health and erosion

Soil assessment methodologies can focus on soil health, soil erosion, or both. The elements to assess shall allow the evaluation of sustainable soil management practices implemented on the Project area. Project benefits can be quantified in terms of improvements to soil conditions or reduction of soil degradation, both about the baseline scenario.

II.6.3. Water

Methodologies for water assessment may focus on water quality improvement, water retention and recharge, water availability and supply, habitat conservation, flood mitigation, etc.

II.7. Baseline and Project Monitoring

The methodology must specify the parameters to be monitored (such as those used to determine baseline emissions, project and leakage emissions, as well as emission reductions for proposed projects). The methodology must specify whether the parameter value for each parameter will be fixed ex-ante (before registration) or routinely monitored. For parameters to be monitored, it shall establish guidelines for the frequency, manner, accuracy, and other requirements for measurement.

If default values for parameters are allowed, it shall define which ones and under which circumstances, provide references and guidelines, and justify the representativeness and conservatism of the values chosen.

The methodology shall provide guidelines for the elaboration of the monitoring plan, including sample design, and monitoring frequency and procedures, detailing recommendations for on-site and remote sensing monitoring.

After the baseline study is finished and the project has been registered in aOCP, regular monitoring must be conducted using the same approach to confirm the project's benefits by contrasting the initial state with the status at the monitoring period. Verified Nature Positive Credits are issued as soon as the monitoring-reporting-verification (MRV) process confirms positive outcomes.

II.8. Global Warming Potentials

To determine the GHG emission reductions or removals attained by an aOCP Project Activity, the methodology shall apply the global warming potentials (GWPs), as specified in the aOCP Project Standard.

III. PROCEDURE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF METHODOLOGIES

The aOCP conducts an internal screening process to determine the appropriate project categories and accompanying methodology. When creating a new methodology or updating an existing methodology to simplify and streamline it, the aOCP considers several factors. In addition, all methodologies developed by the aOCP's internal team of technical experts are validated by the Scientific Committee who are responsible for approving and giving scientific rigor to the standard's calculation methods.

III.1. PRINCIPLES

III.1.1. APPLICABILITY OF STANDARDIZED METHODOLOGIES

For simple project categories that are not technically demanding, methodologies should use defined concepts. The AOCP will revise methodologies to make them simpler and more efficient for complex project categories where standard concepts cannot be adopted, or will allow project proponents, if they wish, to use its methodologies directly when submitting project documentation to the AOCP.

III.1.2. MITIGATION POTENTIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY

By adopting objective and simple criteria to ensure the ecological integrity of projects, aOCP approaches aim to lighten the burden of project development. The techniques developed by the aOCP are scale-neutral; all methodologies are applied with the same degree of rigor to small and large-scale projects, making them replicable in their approach.

III.1.3. REPLICABILITY

The aOCP prioritizes project types with mitigation opportunities that have high replication potential, are anticipated to cause no net harm to society or the environment, and have positive effects on biodiversity and sustainable development in line with United Nations Sustainable Development Goals while developing methodologies through a top-down process.

III.1.4. RELIABILITY OF RESULTS

aOCP prioritizes its efforts in generating reliable methodologies suitable for continuous evaluation. Therefore, constant revision is a clear and transparent process that allows for the identification, suspension, and/or elimination of methodologies that present errors or overestimations in their calculations. The detection process will be:

- **Error detection:** Error detection can come from various sources such as internal or external review, analysis of the results obtained, and/or complaints or reports from users of the methodologies.
- **Error evaluation:** Once an error has been detected, an evaluation will be conducted to determine its impact on the accuracy and reliability of the results which will consider: the magnitude of the error, the frequency with which it occurs, and the impact it has generated.
- **Decision making:** Based on the evaluation of the error, a decision will be made based on:
    a) Correcting the error;

b) Suspend the methodology;
c) Eliminate the methodology definitively.

- **Communication:** All users of the methodology shall be informed of the decision taken, the reasons given, and the actions to be taken.
- **Documentation:** A report shall be generated documenting the entire process of revision, suspension, and/or elimination of the methodology.

III.1.5. Data/information availability

Credible and up-to-date sector-specific data/information (such as default emission factors and penetration rates of technologies, fuels, and feedstocks) are required for the aOCP's work to produce global or region-specific standardized parameters and methodology.

III.2. Methodology revision process

III.2.1. Policy or technical revisions

Significant changes to project definitions and/or eligibility, baseline determinations, the measurement of emission reductions and/or removals, monitoring requirements, and/or additionality provisions are all examples of policy or technical amendments. The aOCP ITTE may consult external experts with the relevant sectoral and technological skills to provide particular recommendations, depending on the scope of the required modifications. A Steering Committee agreement is required for any changes to policies. The version number of the approach must be increased by one integer for policy and technical modifications (e.g., from 1.0 to 2.0).

III.2.2. Program revisions

Editorial changes to the program do not need the Steering Committee's approval. An entirely new sub-version of the methodology is created via program changes. The methodology's version number must be increased by 0.1 for editorial changes (e.g. from 1.0 to 1.1).

III.2.3. Grace period

Before a changed methodology is accepted, project proposers have up to 30 days to prepare a PSF using an earlier version of the aOCP methodologies—unless the most recent version is already available. When submitting project documentation to the aOCP after 30 days, the use of the most recent version of the aOCP methodology is required.

III.3. Approval and publication process

According to the needs of the Project Activity, the aOCP ITTE top-down refines, streamlines, expands, and/or enhances the current aOCP processes. Depending on the type of revision, as indicated below, revised versions of aOCP methodologies are generated and released to aOCP's website no later than three months after due procedure.

III.3.1. Steering committee approval

III.3.1.1. Methodology updates

- The Internal Team of Technical Experts must submit the draft methodology to a designated member of the Steering Committee once it has been updated to reflect public input;

- The designated member of the Steering Committee shall provide their comments on the draft methodology within 7 calendar days of receiving it;
- The Internal Team of Technical Experts shall take into account the comments of the designated members of the Steering Committee when creating the final drafts of the methodology;
- Within 7 calendar days of receiving the comments from the Steering Committee members, the final drafts shall be submitted to the Steering Committee for review and approval.

III.3.1.2. Development of new methodologies

Draft Submission and Review:

- When creating a new methodology, the Internal Team of Technical Experts (ITTE) shall submit the draft methodology to a designated member of the Steering Committee;
- The designated Steering Committee member will have 10 calendar days from the date of receipt to review the draft methodology electronically or in person and recommend any necessary revisions.

Finalization and Approval:

- The ITTE will consider the feedback provided by the designated Steering Committee members when finalizing the methodology drafts;
- Within 10 calendar days of receiving the feedback from the Steering Committee members, the final drafts shall be submitted to the Steering Committee for review and approval.

Publication and Implementation:

- The aOCP ITTE shall publish the approved methodology on the aOCP website within 5 days of the Steering Committee's approval, with the appropriate version number (e.g., Version 1.0);
- New methodologies are immediately usable after their publication on the aOCP website.

III.2.2. GLOBAL STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Following the approval of a new methodology, it undergoes a public stakeholder consultation process and is subsequently submitted to the external Scientific Committee for thorough assessment and approval. Upon closure of the consultation period, received comments are diligently analyzed and incorporated, where applicable, resulting in the version ready for implementation. Continuous monitoring and review mechanisms are then instituted to assess the performance of approved methodologies over time, facilitating iterative refinement and enhancement as necessary.

IV. General Rules for Projects When Applying aOCP Methodologies

Unless otherwise stated in a GHG methodology or tool that applies, IPCC default values must only be used when data that are documented to be project- or country-specific are either:

a) Not available;
b) Not trustworthy or of insufficient quality according to the project proponent's or the aOCP validator's/evidence-based verifier's assessment.

The same data sources (e.g., IPCC values, national values) and calculation and/or measurement procedures for each parameter (e.g., calculation of annual average flow rate, hourly measurements) shall be applied for both baseline- and project-monitoring calculations when using methodologies or tools that demand determination of parameter(s) for calculating baseline scenarios and project impacts but do not specify procedures for determining those parameters. If, for instance, a calculated emission factor based on measured data is used to calculate emissions in the baseline, the same calculated emission factor must be used to calculate emissions in the project, unless otherwise specified in the methodology or tool being utilized. The conservativeness of emission reductions shall be the basis for the selection of data sources if it is not practicable to use the same data sources.

It is necessary to record the observed or default parameter values that are used to calculate baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage, , and the condition of biodiversity, soil, and water. The most conservative value among the suitable values should be utilized if more than one is determined to be appropriate.

The Project Proponent shall publicly state and describe the sources of all values used (e.g., peer-reviewed literature, test findings, government reports/statistics) to show that appropriate and conservative values have been employed.

Instead of quoting secondary publications that refer to sources, sources must be cited using a standard referencing style.

When combining data from multiple sources to derive a value, the sources must be identified.

The Project Proponent must provide evidence for the suitability, applicability, and conservatism of the values chosen and their sources.

DOCUMENT HISTORY		
Version	**Date**	**Comments**
V2.0	07/07/2023	• Second version. Guidelines for soil and water methodologies were added, as well as deeper considerations on additionality.
V1.0	19/01/2023	• Initial version released for review by the aOCP Steering Committee under the aOCP Version 1.