

# 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: Evan Thomas

Date: June, 2023

Reviewed by: Ned Horning, Gisel Booman, Sam Bennetts, Tica Lubin

## **Summary of Internal Review Process**

The intent of the <u>Regen Registry Internal Review</u> 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 methodology and credit class. 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. Inline comments can be found in the document.
- 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 Review:**

## Reviewer 1 - Ned Horning:

#### **General Comments:**

This methodology is well-written. It was a pleasure to read. I think the section on calculating GHG reductions and sequestration could be more explicit about how CO2e will be calculated. There is a heavy focus on co-benefits, which will likely increase credit value. Still, a concern is that the extensive monitoring outlined in the methodology will be pretty expensive. That said, the data generation will have significant knowledge generation value. A brief explanation of how transparency and data management, in general, will be achieved would be useful.

I left some comments in the document that are being addressed in near real-time.

Comments by Sections:

**Final Decision:** - Pass or Suggested for another round of Internal Review I recommend making the credit calculation and how they plan to address transparency more clear, but this is pretty much ready for expert review

Reviewer 2 - Gisel Booman:



#### **General Comments**

The Methodology looks ready for expert peer review to me. Very well written, wonderful methodology, and aligned to our registry. It's not too specific of how sampling and quantification will be done, but also acknowledging this will be very use case specific, I think it's set to the right level of requirements for scientific rigor.

## Comments by Sections

The authors sent an online version to review and I provided my questions and suggestions on the online document.

Once the authors choose a definition for additionality, please make sure it is consistent in both Methodology and Credit Class sections.

Final Decision: - Pass to external Review

Reviewer 3 - Tica Lubin:

#### **General Comments:**

I was a bit confused on the metrics of green versus grey build and differentiating those from the continued monitoring of the water quantity and quality

Comments by Sections:

Final Decision: - Pass to external Review



### Reviewer 2 - Sam Bennetts:

#### **General Comments:**

First things first, great job! You guys are clearly experts in this space and it was really interesting reading about gray water LCA.

In terms of feedback, I would categorize my recommendations for improvement into two categories:

- 1) Content Reorganization, i.e. restructuring where information lives in the Methodology vs Credit Class
- 2) Providing additional specificity

### Comments by Section:

Section 1.1 - Applicability

I would move this section to the Credit Class under the Project Eligibility section.

Section 1.1 - Co-Benefits

#### Credit Class Structure:

Things to be migrated from the methodology:

- Applicability
- Monitoring & Reporting
- Co-Benefits
- Additionality (if not ongoing)
- Project Activity Project Definition

•



# **Combined Summary/Feedback/Suggestions**

**General Comments:**