

# Methodology for Grazing in Vineyard Systems

## Methodology Review-

R2 Review Round

<b>CONTENT referenced by reviewer's comment</b> <i>e.g. Section number + paste exact text</i>	<b>REVIEWER'S COMMENT</b> <i>Please paste the comment from the reviewer</i>	<b>AUTHOR'S RESPONSE</b> <i>Please describe how the comment was addressed and include new content in quotations</i>	<b>Reviewer's Conclusion</b> [PASSED/ REJECTED WITH COMMENTS]
<i>This intro paragraph refers multiple times to unspecific "agricultural practices." I understand (and like) the initial introduction to justify this approach, but you should switch by this point to discuss this specific methodology, about the practice of vineyard grazing</i>	<i>This intro paragraph refers multiple times to unspecific "agricultural practices." I understand (and like) the initial introduction to justify this approach, but you should switch by this point to discuss this specific methodology, about the practice of vineyard grazing</i>	<i>Changed to: "targeted sheep grazing – as an agricultural practice"</i>	PASSED
<i>Numerous text edits throughout the manuscript</i>	<i>Several text edits were made to clarify the document</i>	<i>Thank you</i>	PASSED
<i>This should include, but is not</i>	<i>You should simply list all</i>	<i>A template condensing this information is now in</i>	PASSED

limited	required documentation. Why would someone willingly include additional documentation?	the appendix	
These practice standards should be integrated into a custom grazing management plan that and must accompany the project plan	Meaning that the "custom grazing plan" is both a requirement of the methodology and that it must be submitted as required documentation? If so, this should be made more explicit.	I added text noting that the grazing plan is required and to note that anyone can write the grazing plan but it needs to be approved by the Credit Class Issuer	PASSED
historical land management practices, current operations and site characteristics, farm goals, and how the project supports those goals. A brief statement of expected goals and outcomes from implementing this methodology should also be included.	Is there a template for providing this information? This maybe should be included in an appendix. There should be a very standardized and replicable method for producers to report this data and MRV individuals to collect and store this data.	A template condensing this information is now in the appendix	PASSED
Non-grazing areas, as well as grazing areas outside of the vineyard, can be included in the project boundary for convenience but the project proponent must provide documentation that the project has permission to	I'm having a difficult time understanding this. Why would non-grazed areas be included in the project boundary? Why would areas outside of the vineyard be included in the project boundary? It makes sense to "allow" people to graze	This was clarified in the new text. The project boundary has to include all possible land that might be grazing during the project duration. The grazing boundaries define where and specific grazing event took place and these could change every year.	PASSED

graze throughout the entire project area.	outside areas, but only grazed areas under vineyard production should be included in the project boundary, right? As I see it, the project boundary is intended the identify the total land area that qualifies for creditting?		
The project area can be fragmented into multiple temporary or permanent grazing areas	Shouldn't each area be a separate, distinct project area if the grazing style (parameters) are conducted differently?	This sentence was deleted	PASSED
Unique identifier (numeric or alphanumeric) for each grazing area polygon	Still not understanding quite what this is	Changed to: "Unique identifier (numeric or alphanumeric) for each grazing area polygon"	PASSED
photographs must be taken of the pasture within 24 hours before grazing starts and again within 24 hours after grazing ends for each grazing event within a grazing area	This technically was included in Section 1.2.2. May want to consolidate reporting requirements to be more clear, concise, and reduce redundancies.	There is now a template in the appendix where this information is consolidated	PASSED
The photographs should have sufficient detail to clearly see that the area was in need of grazing and that the area had been sufficiently grazed	Rather than have fairly vague and abstract guidelines for if an area was in need (or appropriate) of grazing, I would again recommend having more clear guidelines for grazing	The guidelines were improved to provide more details and there is now a template in the appendix where this information is consolidated	PASSED

	(based on pre-graze sward height, as described in comments above). These photos should instead "validate" the reported sward height numbers (i.e. vegetation taken next to a ruler to show sward height).		
grazers and vineyard owners	I'd imagine this impacts the contract grazing rate? This is obviously a detail to be worked out between producers, but is important to highlight early in the process.	We are starting with a 65%/35% split and will see how that works out.	PASSED
Within a grazing period, credits will only be allocated for up to two only one grazing events per grazing area to avoid overgrazing.	I still don't personally agree with this approach. I'd start by saying that I think it's fine to allow only one grazing event to qualify for credits. This will often be the style in which vineyard grazing is applied (as a single graze, to terminated vegetation before budbreak). ##However, optimal grazing management would likely include 2, maybe even 3 grazes within a single vineyard over the course of the vineyard dormant season. Again, it is unlikely that vineyard managers	This was addressed by requiring a regenerative grazing plan and we increased the number of grazing events per season to two.	PASSED

	will do this (especially when contracting a grazing service), but one should not be penalized for grazing multiple times when allowing for optimum understory vegetation re-growth. ##If you want to make it simple (and standardized), I would allow for 2 grazing events but say that they must be spaced at least 40 days apart over the course of the 5 month period. This would allow more flexibility for best management, while not penalizing people for only using grazing once (as a termination method).		
2-to-5 day rotation period per acre	I would recommend a slight broader grazing duration window	I changed this to 1 - 7 days.	PASSED
The photographs should have sufficient detail to clearly identify that the area was in need of grazing and that the area had been sufficiently grazed.	Rather than have fairly vague and abstract guidelines for if an area was in need (or appropriate) of grazing, I would again recommend having more clear guidelines for grazing (based on pre-graze sward height, as described in	I added sward height photos to the list of requirements and changed the section to: "The photographs should have sufficient detail to validate sward height recorded with the grazing area polygons"	PASSED

	comments above). These photos should instead "validate" the reported sward height numbers (i.e. vegetation taken next to a ruler to show sward height).		
--	---	--	--