REGEN
REGISTRY

Expert Peer Review of ERA Brazil's

Biodiversity Stewardship Tokens Methodology

Date: June, 2023
Reviewer Name or ID#: ERA_R#1

Summary of Expert Review Process

The intent of the [Expert Peer Review](#) is to ensure methodologies meet the integrity expected by our community and ensure the methodology will work to regenerate ecosystems. The task of an Expert Peer Reviewer is to act as an ally to methodology developers by providing critical feedback to help facilitate an understanding of how to improve the methodology to best serve Earth Stewards while maintaining scientific and community integrity.

The *Biodiversity Stewardship Tokens Methodology* and the *Umbrella Species Guideline* has been reviewed and feedback has been provided in two ways:

1) **Direct Comments**: To provide targeted constructive feedback to specific sections of your methodology, the reviewer commented on your methodology document on what they thought was confusing, needed more definition, or was out of scope for this methodology. The comments can be found in the [Revision Report](#)

2) **Overall Reflections**: To provide more generalized feedback to your methodology as a whole, additional reflections are recorded in this document.

Expert Peer Review:

Reviewer's Blind Review Comments to Methodology Authors

The review should provide feedback on the validity of the methodology.

Kindly enter your comments based on these questions in the table below. Also, if referencing specific text, please include text excerpt or row/page no. from the methodology for ease of reference by the methodology authors. All reviewer comments will remain anonymous unless you choose to be named.

Is the methodology clearly written with adequate detail for implementation?	Yes, the methodology is clearly written with adequate detail, though there are some sections where more clarity is needed, as indicated in comments in the revision report document.
Is the underlying foundation of the methodology clear?	Yes, though could be bolstered through additional citations of source documents, and explanations of some key decisions - for example, why specific EBVs were chosen to be leveraged for the methodology. Also - Figures 2 and 3 are helpful, I think could be expanded upon with simple graphics that more comprehensively cover specifics of the methodology - when validation/verification happens, reporting frequency beyond year 2, etc.
Is the methodology feasible?	Feasible for who? For project proponents, it could be feasible with sufficient funding - following & implementing the methodology requires high levels of expertise and in many cases relies on technology that may be expensive and requires expertise to operate. Also completing the administrative requirements to earn tokens requires expertise. Is there a concern that potential project proponents will not be able to participate given these barriers? How could these barriers be mitigated to

	encourage broad participation, especially if tokens arent awarded until a year after start date, and there may be some uncertainty that a project will ultimately meet the validation/verification thresholds to be awarded tokens.
Will the proposed methods achieve the results defined in the methodology?	This will be case specific of course, and many variables affect the results defined in the methodology that are outside the control of the project. Another concern is the impact of climate change on ecosystems and USps. We know climate will affect and is already affecting how animals use a landscape, and move around it. Areas where animals are found now will shift, and its important to be thinking about corridors and climate adaptive strategies that build resilience. Furthermore, people will adapt and be changing their use of landscapes in response to climate change, which will also affect biodiversity & USps. I did not see recognition of this in the methodology.
Are the sampling and measurement protocols robust?	They appear to be robust - it can be a challenge converting qualitative indicators into quantitative measures. I have a general concern in that I am unclear how Indigenous knowledge can be incorporated into the methodology overall, especially sampling and measurement. Many valuable ecosystems are sustainably managed by Indigenous People, and have been for millennia. How can this methodology be flexible to apply in a way that can integrate Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous approaches to natural resource management,

	but not in a way that interferes with or disrupts the customary management of these lands?
Are there any alternative or additional steps that should be considered?	As noted above - there is a need to think about this methodology in relation to the realities of accelerating climate change, and the uncertainty associated with how climate change impacts social ecological systems, and vice versa. A tight methodology that locks in projects for years and does not allow for adaptation and foster resilience may be counter to goals of the methodology. Another question relates to the definition of USp - since this entire methodology hinges on the USp, how can project proponents ensure that the species of mammal or bird they choose to focus on would meet the criteria, and be able to be validated/verified? I also wonder about the use of area as a multiplier, as this incentivizes large blocks of area, which would quickly lead to large token sums. Does it disincentivize critical smaller patches that may be corridors, especially for animals with large ranges, that migrate, or are being affected by climate change?
Additional comments	I enjoyed reading this methodology and thinking about its application - I appreciate how much of a challenge it was to create this methodology, and how important it is.

Reviewers Methodology Ratings

Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = Poor)

Is the methodology clearly written with adequate detail for implementation?	2
Is the underlying foundation of the methodology clear?	2
Is the methodology feasible?	3
Will the proposed methods achieve the results defined in the methodology?	3
Are the sampling and measurement protocols robust?	3
Total Score:	13

Reviewer's Confidential Comments to Editor by Section:

<<define any section if needed>>	<<please enter your comment here>>

Additional Information

Please answer the following questions

Do you want to be named in the review? (Expert Reviewers will be anonymous unless you choose to be named)	Yes / **No**

Recommendation

Kindly mark with an X

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Revision:	X
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Reject and re-submit:	
Rejection: (Please provide reasons)	

General/Additional Comments: