

Regen Registry Internal Review of Watershed Nature-Based and Green Infrastructure Activities Avoiding Emissions from Water Management Gray Infrastructure Construction and Operations Methodology v1.0

Submitted by: Virridy

Date: July 13, 2023

Reviewers: Ned Horning, Gisel Booman

Summary of Internal Review Process

The intent of the [Regen Registry Internal Review](#) is to ensure methodologies submitted to the Regen Registry meet the integrity expected by our community and ensure the document is sufficient to warrant review by Expert Peer Reviewers. The task of an Internal 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 Regen Network Science Team has reviewed the *Watershed Nature-Based and Green Infrastructure Activities Avoiding Emissions from Water Management Gray Infrastructure Construction and Operations Methodology v1.0* to facilitate the creation of a strong methodology which can be submitted to External Peer Reviewers. Our feedback has been provided in two ways:

- 1) Direct Comments: To provide targeted constructive feedback to specific sections of your methodology, our team commented directly in your methodology document on what we found confusing, thought needed more definition, or what we thought was out of scope for this methodology.
- 2) Overall Reflections: To provide more generalized feedback to your methodology as a whole, our team provided the additional reflections in this document. Reflections were categorized by reviewers, each of whom had different thoughts on how to improve the

methodology. A final combined summary of comments, feedback and suggestions is found in the Combined Summary section.

Internal Comments

Internal Review:

Reviewer 1 - Ned Horning:

General Comments:

I read over the methodology and made a couple very minor comments that do not impact the quality of the methodology. It is clear and concise. I do not have any major comments.

Comments by Sections:

Final Decision: - Pass or Suggested for another round of Internal Review

This is ready for expert review

Reviewer 2 - Gisel Booman:

General Comments:

I didn't review in depth this time, as our comments have been well addressed during our live discussions and previous exchanges of comments. I tried to give it a more general look, to see if there was anything missing or confusing.

I left a few comments in the text, main ones being the following two:

1. Regarding the additionality definition I see in the upper part. I am not sure where we landed, as we had some exchanges about this before. The more financial definition I see now, from my perspective, conditions that the project is pre-financed... as most of the investment needs to happen upfront. Just flagging.

The second comment is about how to make sure that the target of the interventions is well described somewhere, in terms of desired water quality maintenance or improvement. I suggest creating a specific section requesting that the project proponent is very clear about the target-line

of water quality improvement that the project should meet, that would otherwise require gray infrastructure. So there's a threshold line to compare against (for the different parameters) when monitoring, and a clear way to technically check that the project is working as expected.

Otherwise, just saying "improvements" might be too loose.

Maybe this is already embed somehow in the other sections but I think it would be good to make it very explicit that this is a requirement.

I just wanted to make sure that you received these comments, more like suggestions, in case you find them useful. But to me the methodology is good to move forward to expert peer review.

Comments by Sections:

Final Decision: - Pass to external peer review.

Combined Summary/Feedback/Suggestions

General Comments:

This methodology is ready for expert review.