

GHG & Co-Benefits in Watershed Carbon v1.0

Expert Peer - R1 Review Round

Reviewer #2

August 15, 2023

CONTENT referenced by reviewer's comment <i>e.g. Section number + paste exact text</i>	REVIEWER'S COMMENT <i>Please paste the comment from the reviewer</i>	AUTHOR'S RESPONSE <i>Please describe how the comment was addressed and include new content in quotations</i>	Reviewer's Conclusion [PASSED/ REJECTED WITH COMMENTS]
<i>e.g. 2.1 - "approximately 25%</i>	e.g. Replace with "adequate"	<i>e.g. This was changed to "The majority of the material must have a moisture content of 25% or less, as measured in the field."</i>	PASSED
Table of Contents	Include definitions or refer the reader to the other document	Will address in final formatting.	P for passed
Section 2.2 - 2.2.-2.2.4	There are lists of key benefits in these three sections, consider reformatting and use bullets to highlight	Will address in final formatting.	p
Section 2.2.4	I printed the PDF for this document. In my TOC the page # is incorrect	Formatting on the TOC - refresh before final version.	p

Section 3.1 Under 'WaterShed Program Project Types'	The benefit 'Temperature Reduction' is not listed in Section 2 with the other benefits. Add to section 2.2.3 or 2.2.4	Section 3.1 has the applicable Project Types, of which Temperature Reduction is one. Section 2 has Co-Benefits, so temperature (and nutrients, sediment, etc) are not listed b/c they are the primary benefits, not co-benefits.	p
Add a reference in the TOC for Page 7 of the PDF	This page has a list of reference websites for this paper. Add new Section 3.1.2.	Will address in final formatting.	p
Section 3.2.3	Begins on Page 8	Will address in final formatting.	p
Section 3.5 & 4.1	These sections begin on Page 9	Will address in final formatting.	p
Page 7 Websites - Shade A Lator	Page 2 of the website under the section called 'Data Sources', several key links are not connected. Last update was 2014	Shade A Lator remains a well established and used model in several states, including Oregon.	p
Page 7 Websites 7th Bullet down is the same Website as third Bullet down	Shade A Lator may not be fully functional?	Shade A Lator remains a well established and used model in several states, including Oregon.	p
Page 7 Websites Last or 10th Bullet down	Old Material: e.g. Water Quality Manual is from 2007. Other important updates are from 2009. Is this still relevant ?	State and federal regulatory agencies in the US only update manuals when there is a dramatic change in circumstances or policies. Manuals from the early 2000s are still in use in the US to support alternative compliance solutions in the 2020s.	p
Page 8 5th and 6th Bullets	These are the most well done and comprehensive examples	Will address in final formatting.	p

	for the traders. The others could be indented or something, as they cover the same ground		
Page 8 7th Bullet	Interesting Website, kind of random but cool and it has a great bibliography	Confirmed	p
Section 4.2 Project Plan	Another list → Bullets	Will address in final formatting.	p
Section 5.4 Permanence Approach	Sounds like MVR. Monitor, Verify, Report	See section 6.	p
Section 6	The first sentence is so well written and in a nutshell tells us what this whole thing is about. Consider putting in the Intro in Bold. Better than the first sentence in the Intro now.	Thanks, we have extensively edited a preamble in the methodology (and in final form we'll add to the credit class) to contextualize these projects.	p

Post here any additional feedback or comments that are more general:

One thing I did not fully grasp for a minute: The qualifications for the Verifier are listed and are impressive. What I learned is:

The expertise and skills necessary to cogently plan one of these projects are virtually the same as the skills listed for those who will verify these projects.

Does anybody else want to know that this is the case? As in, here is what you will need to know in order to orchestrate and present one of these projects.

Not being overly familiar with the subject of credit classes, I read both papers a number of times. I am certainly much better informed about what these organizations are doing. That is a plus. My comments consist of a couple of corrections and a couple of suggestions on format, for what they are worth.

Clarification from Reviewer: Reading my comment now, I can see why they asked for clarification; it was not well written.

Simply put, might the same list of skills and expertise set out for the 'verifier', be separately outlined to help prepare the project proponent team?

There is a pretty solid list of requirements for the verifier but not for the project proponent. Those planning a project may not have all the specific skills needed to complete the methodology and satisfy the verification process. Given that possibility, a list of skills and expertise necessary to submit a successful project might be useful for the planner/proponents in the early stages.

We haven't seen precedence in the carbon markets for requirements of project developers.

Not being overly familiar with the subject of credit classes, I read both papers a number of times. I am certainly much better informed about what these organizations are doing. That is a plus. My comments consist of a couple of corrections and a couple of suggestions on format, for what they are worth.