

# The #Pristine Parish Methodology and Protocol

NOTE: If there is a new credit class and methodology these should be reviewed as one under Credit Protocol - if it is a new methodology under an existing credit class/protocol list as a methodology review


External R1 Review Round

Reviewer 2


Date February 2026

<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>e.g. 2.1 - "approximately 25%</i>	<b>e.g. Replace</b> with "adequate"	<i>e.g. This was changed to "The majority of the material must have a moisture content of 25% or less, as measured in the field."</i>	PASSED
<i>The following comments refer to the credit class</i>			
On page 6, reference 15 cannot be read as requires subscription to	Cut and paste article in some way?	<i>Proposed change: Link to be removed.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Telegraph newspaper			
On page 6 statement 'One English farmer reported the loss of a cow per year to discarded plastic bags that they had ingested'.	Needs referencing or removing as bold statement.	<i>Proposed change: Statement to be removed.</i>	✓
Section 7.1. – Also need heavy duty gloves	Add gloves as sometimes have to use hands where litter grabbers can't access.	<i>Good point. Proposed text: “Equips the Pikkers with free hi-vis vests and heavy duty grabbers and gloves.”</i>  <i>Because the grabbers need to be heavy duty too.</i>	✓
Section 7.2.1. – timelines need to be a bit more flexible.	Just needs to be twice a week, 3-4 days apart as could easily be a Monday and a Friday.	Yes, already adopted. Proposed change to 14.5.2: <b>“A Pik should ideally be completed within the scheduled Picking Window or exceptionally a day either side.”</b>  <i>This has become Eden 's MO since the Methodology was written and seems to work well in that it helps to preserve the gaps between piks while not standing in the way of a pikker who doesn't want to miss their pik.</i>	✓
In Section 7.2. should include guidance on how to dispose of collected rubbish. I have recycled through my own recycling.	Include recycling of collection in 7.2.	<i>A tricky one, this - it's difficult to be prescriptive. The Methodology is designed to be universal. There are many neighbourhoods in the world that don't have rubbish collections let alone recycling.</i>	✓

<p>Some Councils will provide bags and labels and will collect mixed recycling. The aim must be to get as much of the haul recycled rather than going into landfill.</p>		<p><i>In such conditions, one has to trust that someone who is minded to collect litter will dispose of it in the best way available.</i></p> <p><i>In any event, it's something that would need to be spelled out in the PPO's Project Plan where it will be subject to the scrutiny of potential sponsors.</i></p>	
<p>Section 8 - where reference a haul photo maybe good idea to show an example?</p>	<p>Include haul picture</p>	<p><i>Proposed photo:</i></p> 	<p>✓</p>
<p>Section 8: 'The photo file must contain geodata and the time of creation.' Many pickers may not have the skills do this.</p>	<p>Change to: 'The PPO will ensure that all photo files include geodata and the time of creation.'</p>	<p><i>Proposed text: "The PPO is to specify an upload method that preserves a photo's metadata."</i></p> <p><i>For example Dropbox, but not WhatsApp.</i></p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Section 8. 'At the end of a</p>	<p>It is very unclear who the</p>	<p><i>You've correctly spotted a weak link in the</i></p>	<p>✓</p>

<p>PPP, the PPO submits a PPR to a third-party Verifier and submits to the Registry Agent proof of the Verifier's participation in the PPP!</p>	<p>Verifier would be. It is not explained anywhere.</p>	<p><i>chain. Environmental Stewardship Credits are so new that it's difficult to identify an obvious candidate to be a Validation &amp; Verification Body (VVB), especially at the necessary price point. See <a href="https://chatgpt.com/share/69b025c5-54d0-8006-bd67-7e54d89f5ea3">https://chatgpt.com/share/69b025c5-54d0-8006-bd67-7e54d89f5ea3</a></i></p> <p><i>That said, by the time a PPO will need a VVB, I'd hope to see one or two affordable contenders in the space.</i></p>	
<p>Page 9, reference 23. Same problem as above with newspaper link.</p>		<p><i>Proposed change: Link to be removed.</i></p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Section 13: 'The PPO will be confident of not having to bear the costs of management given that no PPP has ever achieved less than 50% compliance.'</p>	<p>This is a very strong statement and based on very few PPPs I would guess. As the programme expands there could be 'failures' and a PPO could end up funding a PPP and losing money? Suggest that this statement is removed or moderated.</p>	<p><i>Agreed and deleted. In fact, Clause 13 contained funding details, which more properly belong in the Project Plan - written by a PP Organiser who therein will specify the funding they are counting on to set up a PP Program. In other words, on reflection, funding is outside the scope of this document.</i></p> <p><b><i>I've thus reduced the clause to two sentences: "The PPO is remunerated through credit revenue upon achieving the Standard of Performance set out in Section 14.5. The specific commercial arrangements between the PPO and the Credit</i></b></p>	<p>✓</p>

		<p>Buyer are to be documented in the Project Plan.”</p>	
<p>14.4. ‘Parish ID • Year ID E.g., Little Rissington is ChIJEWPjhJkvcUgRPr QmoFI7zc E.g., 1 February 2024 to 31 January 2025 would be 2024-02-01 UPI format example: 2024-02-01- ChIJEWPjhJkvcUgRPr QmoFI7zc.26’</p>	<p>This is very complicated referencing. Consider simplifying this or just making a general statement that every PPP will have a unique identifier without the detail.</p>	<p><i>Fair point. Proposed change:</i>  <b>A PPP is assigned a Unique Program Identifier (UPI), comprising a:</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Parish ID - Example: E04004242</b></li> <li>• <b>Year ID - Example: 2026.</b></li> </ul> <b>UPI format example: E04004242-2026.</b>  <b>Years are to be calendar years with partial years charged pro rata.</b></p> <p><i>Since the Methodology was drafted I have in fact switched from Google’s coding to that of the Office of National Statistics, as shown above.</i></p> <p><i>The exact start and end dates would be stated in the PP Project Plan. The reason for sticking to calendar years is that they are more meaningful for the main constituency: the Pikkers.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"></p>

## Reviewer's Blind Review Comments regarding Protocol/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 number from the protocol/methodology for ease of reference by the authors. All reviewer comments will remain anonymous unless you choose to be named.

<p>Is the protocol/methodology clearly written with adequate detail for implementation?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the underlying foundation of the protocol/methodology clear?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the protocol/methodology feasible?</p>	<p>I tried to set up litter picking groups across The Cotswolds (but was not as rigorous as PristineParish. The hardest part was funding the equipment (grabbers, gloves, tabs and bags) without paying for them myself. Parish Councils claimed they had no budgets or met infrequently and deferred decisions. I managed to get a grant from a Charity. Individuals who are the PPO may not be able to afford to do this. Though they get the money back through the credit</p>	<p><i>There's no question that parish councils can have an outmoded approach to litter and be reluctant to change. But change they must.</i></p> <p><i>They must come to view litter in their parish as they do holes in the village hall roof and recognise the benefits of professional help in dealing with the former as much as with the latter.</i></p> <p><i>I hope that Eden's emulators will be businesses</i></p>

	<p>scheme many months or years later they may not want to take the risk or may not have the funds.</p>	<p><i>that recognise there will be start-up costs and that revenues in future years will compensate the founders for their initial investment.</i></p>
<p>Are there any alternative or additional points that should be considered?</p>	<p>Getting upfront sponsorship to fund the set up is very important. As it states in the methodology it may be beneficial commercially to local supermarkets, food outlets, hotels etc to not have litter from their products visible or a litter free environment for tourism. These organizations could purchase credits, some of which are used to fund a PPP upfront and some are used to reward the PPP if successful. They may also pay for the get-togethers. In return the PPP could include their logo on the tabards and acknowledge sponsorship in social media. Creating a mutually beneficial partnership would be a good way forward.</p>	<p><i>The financial outlay at the beginning for equipment can indeed be beyond the means of a PPO. How a PPO deals with funding must be left to their commercial nous.</i></p> <p><i>Eden proposes to have the parish or district council bear the cost of all equipment and the Credit Buyer fund the other costs of running a PPP.</i></p> <p><i>Steve is correct in suggesting that credit receipts could be used for upfront funding. Indeed, Eden proposes to trial ex-ante credits. See <a href="https://chatgpt.com/share/69ad7305-67e4-8006-b65e-3c25eff6fe33">https://chatgpt.com/share/69ad7305-67e4-8006-b65e-3c25eff6fe33</a></i></p>
<p>Will the proposed guidelines and regulations achieve the results defined in the protocol/methodology?</p>	<p>Yes they could but I think de-risking it for the PPO would help.</p>	<p><i>Agreed. Eden's role is to act as an icebreaker, leaving a comparatively risk-free channel for others to follow.</i></p>

<p>Do you want to be named in the review? (Expert Reviewers will be named after review is completed unless you choose to be anonymous)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	--

### Recommendation

Kindly mark with an X

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

**General/Additional Comments:**

