

Regen Registry Internal Review of #Pristine Planet Methodology and Credit Class

Submitted by: Gray Elkington

Date: October 4, 2024

Summary of Internal Review Process

The intent of the [Regen Registry Internal Review](#) is to ensure credit classes and 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 developers by providing critical feedback to help facilitate an understanding of how to improve the submission to best serve Earth Stewards while maintaining scientific and community integrity.

The Regen Network Science Team has reviewed the *#Pristine Planet Methodology and [Credit Class](#)* to facilitate the creation of a strong credit class and 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 credit class and methodology documents 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 credit class and 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 - Gisel Booman:

General Comments:

Here are a few thoughts and suggestions that might help clarify and strengthen the methodology. Please find my comments online in the pdf as well.

1. Clarifying the Buyer or Investor Audience:

- I noticed there isn't much detail on who the target buyers or investors for these credits might be. Would it help to specify if local or public organizations are potential buyers? It could also be worth noting if there's a plan to market the credits locally. This could show how the methodology might appeal especially to neighborhoods where there's a strong interest in community initiatives.

2. Universal Applicability of the Traditional Litter Approach:

- The methodology references biannual litter pick-ups as the "traditional" approach, but this might vary in different regions. I wonder if this methodology was developed based on UK and for OK or is it intended to be universally applicable? In the latter case this statement shall be checked across different countries and probably be adjusted to be more universal.

3. Cost-Effectiveness and Pricing Considerations:

- Basing credit prices on a bag of fries is a fun and accessible idea, but it seems like the effort involved might need a bit more incentive! Maybe a slightly higher benchmark (like a meal cost) would reflect the value of the work better and ensure volunteers feel well-compensated. Could you also add a bit more reasoning behind this pricing model? That could help make the approach clearer.

4. Operations and Reporting Suggestions:

- Adding a timestamp requirement for photos in reports could be an easy way to boost transparency. Please add this request and more details on which app is accepted or which type of data is required.

- Also, a bit more explanation on what's the expectation for the "de-littering", is it that the miles are 100% free of litter after each walk? Can that be verified only based on a single picture per haul? Or how many pictures per haul would be reasonable?

Also, is there a way locals or visitors can attest that the work has been done? Let's say, there's some way to rank the pickers by the local community.... Thinking of how to make sure that the full

area has been delittered and that the good pickers have a way to be verified and recognized by the community....

6. Adding Transparency with Walk Tracking:

- Including options like geolocated photos or a walk-tracking tool could be a nice touch for public transparency. This might make it easier for people to see the direct impact of the work and feel more connected to the program's results. From reading the method I am not sure if this is included in Eden's app? Please make sure to clarify if anything of this is already contemplated, or otherwise consider adding it.

I hope these suggestions are helpful, and I'm excited to see how the methodology evolves!

Comments by Sections:

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

Reviewer 2 - Tica Lubin:

Methodology General Comments:

This is a great start. I suggested a few ways to strengthen the method - such as a some additional citations, adding in a bit more about how if there is less trash picked that is improvement and that is as successful as showing images with large amounts of trash collected, clarification around some of the reporting, some additional information around linkage to biodiversity and human health and well being.

Methodology Comments by Sections:

I left comments in line in [this copy](#) of the methodology.

Credit Class General Comments:

This looks fine, I put in some comments in the [paper](#) itself.

Credit Class Comments by Sections:

See comments in the paper

Final Decision: - I would submit one more time for internal review.

Combined Summary/Feedback/Suggestions

General Comments:

Internal Comments