

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_001	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2020		Disturbances. Type of disturbances possible to include could have been included here as a table. And some disturnaces should not be included, an example; Fires on drained peat/wetlands cannot be defined as a natural disturbance, since the draining itself made the fire possible. Huge amount of CO2 and other gases are emitted from these fires, which should be accounted and not possible to omit, blaming a disturbance.		Rejected	Rejected. This is addressed by the decision itself and the guidance provided request Parties must show that the disturbance was not materially influenced by the party
2d_E_002	Schrier-Uijl, Arina		2020	onwards	Line 2020 onwards (Disturbances). Descriptions are focused towards forests related activities and natural disturbances. Suggestion: include also natural disturbances in peatlands and definitions of these. Flooding and fires are disturbances that in some cases could be attributed to peat degradation and changes in peat emissions. If the assumption is that all peat fires have an anthropogenic cause (because peat only burns if it's drained), then this could be defined in the section 'definitional issues' under 'wild fires'. One major 'peat fire control' is rewetting of the peat. Wet peat will rarely burn. Zero burning practices on-site is another fire-control measure.		Rejected	Rejected. This is addressed by the decision itself and the guidance provided request Parties must show that the disturbance was not materially influenced by the party
2d_E_003	Ambulkar, Archis	2	2029		Term NPP is already defined in line 1836 and hence need not be re-defined in this sentence.		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_004	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2038	2038	I guess it would be more clear to say "...additional removals .." since in the site impacted from the disturbance, removals would have been generated, even if in different quantities, anyhow		Accepted	Accepted with modifications. The introduction to section 2.3.9 was revised. Text in its original form don't exist anymore.
2d_E_005	Feest, Alan	2.3.9.	2041		Biodiversity can be a disturbance such when natural outbreaks of pests occur		Rejected	Rejected. Discussions around biodiversity are outside of the scope of this section and is not necessary for the purpose of applying the provision.
2d_E_006	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2051		Again; The risk for Wildfires may have increased due to management, and this should not be possible to include as Disturbance (not natural). Insects and diseases may also have been worsened by the usual land use management.		Rejected	Rejected. The guidance provided request Parties must show that the disturbance was not materially influenced by the party. This includes land management.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_007	Gao, Qingxian	2	2053	2055	In the report it was reported that "Recent studies on wildfires and forest include: Hirsch and Fuglem (2006); Williams and Bradstock (2008); Swetnam and Anderson (2008); Girardin et al. (2010).", but there is no clear definition about "Wildfires and forest" in this chapter, such as the contents and meaning of this two words. the modification is suggested to be add in revision report to clearly define the meaning of wildfire and forest.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Wildfires occur in many forests and interact with the functioning of the forest ecosystems in which they occur. Wildfires can be important to the functioning of forest ecosystems but can also have undesirable environmental, social and economic impacts. Fire regimes (fire intensity, frequency and season of occurrence (Gill, 1975)) can have significant impacts on forest carbon stocks across considerable spatial and temporal scales (King et al., 2011). Recent studies on wildfires and forest include: Hirsch and Fuglem (2006); Williams and Bradstock (2008); Swetnam and Anderson (2008); Girardin et al. (2010)."

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_008	Gao, Qingxian	2	2061	2062	The original text "extreme weather events include droughts, floods, snow (Fujimori et al. 1987), avalanches, ice, and strong winds...", in fact the "Snow" and "ice" is a natural phenomenon, can not be the "extreme weather events", the specific terms are suggested used in the report and clearly defined the type of disaster. Such as snow storm or freeze injury etc.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Extreme weather events can involve droughts, floods, heavy wet snowfall, avalanches, ice, and strong winds, either as a single event or in combination, e.g. ice storms (Lindner et al., 2010; Yamashita et al., 2002; Allen et al., 2010; Kato 2008, Kramer et al., 2008; Bebi et al., 2009; Phillips et al., 2009; Chambers et al., 2007, Fujimori et al., 1987). Besides causing emissions e.g. through decay of dead organic matter (DOM) following storm damage or stem breakage due to high snow loads, extreme weather events can negatively affect forests and make them more susceptible to other natural disturbances. For example wildfires have higher incidences after drought periods."
2d_E_009	CHEN, MINPENG	2	2066	2066	"...geological disturbances include, for example, volcanic eruptions...", please delete "include" or "for example. The literature of "Kurz, 2010" is not listed at the Reference lists. Please add it.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_010	Feest, Alan	2.3.9.1.	2067		Include biodiversity as defined by Feest et al. and de Baan et al.		Rejected	Rejected. Discussions around biodiversity are outside of the scope of this section and is not necessary for the purpose of applying the provision.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_011	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2071		"not materially influences by, the Party in the commitment period" This is a very narrow perspective, since land use change have longer time spans than a few years,		Rejected	Rejected. Is as requeriment of 2CMP.7.
2d_E_012	wang, chunfeng	2	2089	2090	I think example being taken in this para is not expressed clearly, I think it should be revised as follows: "for example, the percentage of expenditure on the fire suppress to the total budget of forest management", this revision may reflect the Party really took practicable efforts to manage or control individual disturbance.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Information which shows that the Party took practicable efforts to manage or control the individual disturbances included under the natural disturbance provision (for example, expenditure on the fire suppression effort and/or the incident management plans for the disturbance, and the relationship to total budget for FM forest)."
2d_E_013	wang, chunfeng	2	2097	2099	I suggest change the sentence " It is good practice to provide transparent and verifiable information that no practical action could be taken to prevent, manage or control the occurrences of the event or circumstance" into "It is good practice to provide transparent and verifiable information to prove that no practical actions in policy, finance and implementation could be taken to prevent, management or control the occurrences of the event or circumstance that is beyond the control of, and not materially influenced by, a Party". This revision is following the Decision 2/CMP7.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "In some instances it may not be practicable to prevent, manage or control the disturbance. When a Party wants to include such events or circumstances under the natural disturbance provision, it is good practice to provide transparent and verifiable information demonstrating that no practical action could be taken to prevent, manage or control the occurrences of the event or circumstance to comply with paragraph 34(d) of Annex to Decision 2281 2/CMP .7."

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_014	CHEN, MINPENG	2	2100	2275	This section is not so readable. Could the authors please give a decision tree or schematic diagram to show major content in 2.3.9.2? Also, the italicize words from line 2105 to 2120 can be deleted in the main text. Those words can be placed in the footnote.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Section was revised to improve clarity but no decision tree or diagram was added.
2d_E_015	Schrier-Uijl, Arina		2100	onwards	Line 2100 onwards (section 2.3.9.2): include peat and its natural disturbance, not only forest. In the case that peat fires are considered 'natural', also info on 'monitoring' 'peat area burnt' (RS monitoring of area burned, and overlying with a peat-base-map)		Rejected	Rejected. Peat is either covered because it is part of the soil pool or it is covered by WDR.
2d_E_016	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2112	2113	"not materially influenced" ? Forest fires may be ignited by human activities, machines etc. which is a direct influence. An indirect influence is draining actions, which could have been performed decades ago and before 1990, which makes the organic material accessible for fire. And there are other examples of influences.		Rejected	Rejected. The text is quoted from CMP decision.
2d_E_017	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2122	2122	Here should be "...underlying approaches..." instead of "...underlying methods..." for land identification. See also your text at line 2169		Rejected	Rejected. The term "method" is not used as a substitute for the three "approaches" e.g. in the AFOLU 2006 GL, CH. 3, but to refer to scientific and inventory methods and techniques.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_018	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.2	2135	2139	<p>What is the basis for request for identification of disturbances at the minimum area as defined by the Party?            What are consequences of possible identification of disturbances at a coarser scale?            In my opinion the decision on scale at which NFI identifies natural disturbances that are not followed by D should be left to the country.            Please note that disturbance that is followed by D will have to be identified following requirements for identification of D.            On the other hand, if disturbance is not followed by D - why it is necessary to identify it with D specific approach.</p>		Accepted	Accepted with modification: Changed "the" to "a" in Line 2136, and the text on examples were revised.
2d_E_019	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2165	2166	<p>I guess your example is not correct. Indeed, by remote sensing you may determine whether a clearcut is occurred before or after (salvage logging) the disturbance (e.g. the forest fire). Furthermore, in both cases the associated emissions should not be excluded from the accounting; so that is not so relevant whether it was a normal harvesting operation or a salvage logging. What is relevant is to know whether it was harvesting (either normal clearcut or salvage logging) or a disturbance that determined the tree cover loss. So I would suggest to redraft as follows: "wall-to-wall approaches based on remotely sensed data may not discriminate among losses of tree cover associated with harvesting (either planned clear-cut or salvage logging) and those associated with natural disturbances"</p>		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_020	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2168	2168	I guess nowhere else in the IPCC Guidelines a desired level of precision is defined or is targeted. According with IPCC definitions, uncertainties need to be reduced as far as practicable. So a more correct wording should be "...the practicable level of precision..."; however my suggestion is simply to delete the word "precision".		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "... with the level of precision and accuracy desired by the Party."
2d_E_021	wang, chunfeng	2	2178	2182	To improve the effectiveness of the systems, I suggest give a further guidance on what event-based supplementary information should be collected so as to clarify concrete information to be collected.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Ancillary data may be needed (e.g. concerning disturbance characteristics, location, management activities), and this may be provided by amending or tailoring an existing inventory scheme to detect deforestation events in a way that it also assesses whether land-use change has occurred on previously disturbed lands, or by incorporating the detection of SL in harvest records as well as by collecting completely new data."

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_022	Feest, Alan	2.3.9.2.	2211		This is an ideal opportunity to include biodiversity monitoring and achieve efficiencies of effort and integrate with IPBES		Rejected	Rejected. Discussions around biodiversity are outside of the scope of this section and is not necessary for the purpose of applying the provision.
2d_E_023	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2213	2213	what is a land register-based system? A GIS? Could the authors provide some more elements?		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The line was modified as follows: "A Party uses remotely sensed data or a complete land register-based system, which is a database containing information on land holdings based on ground-based administrative systems for forest management or land use, for land use and land-use change estimation."
2d_E_024	Sato, Tamotsu	2.3.9	2219	2222	As compared to other examples, the expression "have to be validated" is strongly-worded instruction for applying this approach. Although "validation" is essential for QA/QC act, it is not necessary to state clearly in this Box. So I think it would be better to change from current sentence to the following. "It is a good practice to demonstrate how the methods are appropriate."		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Parties are encouraged to demonstrate the suitability of the approaches by presenting well-documented and transparent supplementary information, such as ground truth or equivalent data."

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_025	Mora, Brice	2.3.9.2	2221	2221	... have to be calibrated and validated using		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Parties are encouraged to demonstrate the suitability of the approaches by presenting well-documented and transparent supplementary information, such as ground truth or equivalent data."
2d_E_026	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2254	2254	please, replace "double-accounting" with "double counting".		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_027	Sato, Tamotsu	2.3.9	2261	2262	As compared to other examples, the expression "need to be validated" is strongly-worded instruction for applying this approach. Although "validation" is essential for QA/QC act, it is not necessary to state clearly in this Box. So I think it would be better to change from current sentence to the following. "It is a good practice to demonstrate how the methods are appropriate."		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Parties are encouraged to demonstrate the suitability of classification algorithms and estimators, such as ground truth observations. "
2d_E_028	Mora, Brice	2.3.9.2	2262	2262	to be calibrated and validated		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Parties are encouraged to demonstrate the suitability of classification algorithms and estimators, such as ground truth observations. "

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_029	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2273	2274	the second part of this sentence is unclear. To which level of uncertainty it refers? It is not a good practice for a country to establish an acceptable level of uncertainty; uncertainties need to be reduced as far as practicable. I suggest to delete the second part of this sentence; otherwise authors should clarify what an acceptable level of uncertainty is.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Another challenge is the calibration and validation of the algorithms and minimizing uncertainties consistent with good practice requirements."
2d_E_030	Schrier-Uijl, Arina		2276	onwards	Line 2276 onwards (section 2.3.9.3): include peat emissions related to natural disturbances.		Rejected	Rejected. Peat is not a separate pool for the purposes of the Kyoto Protocol. Emissions due to peat are included where appropriate under the Soil Pool - Organic soils. Any emissions from fire on peat is therefore captured here. Therefore, disturbance events which cause emissions in the peat (organic soils) are assessed in the same way as for all other pools for the purposes of satisfying the requirements of the Natural disturbance provision.
2d_E_031	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2291	2291	carbon losses caused by harvesting needs always to be excluded from the estimates of emissions associated with natural disturbances. Therefore, I do not understand why harvesting is listed as a cause of transfer of carbon occurring during a disturbance event. I strongly suggest to delete it to avoid to ingenerate confusion and misunderstanding in applying this GPG on natural disturbances.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Redrafted along the following lines: 'Temporal variability refers to the occurrence of natural disturbances over time and the extension of post-disturbance effects over time: there may be direct releases of carbon to the atmosphere (e.g., fires during the disturbance), delayed emissions (due to decay processes), and redistribution of carbon among carbon pools (e.g., transfer to the litter or soil pools, which may then also decay causing emissions in subsequent years.'

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_032	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2307	2309	"subsequent years" How many years?		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "The estimation of carbon stock changes due to natural disturbance should include the effect of the disturbance on carbon stock changes in subsequent years of the second commitment period so that reporting reflects emissions associated with carbon stock changes in the year they occur."
2d_E_033	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2312	2314	FMRL accounting. A Party may plan to use plot-based approach to estimate CP2 emissions and removals, but this cannot be used to calculate the background level in the calibration period before the plots were established. What does "consistent with" mean in that case?		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "It is also good practice to estimate emissions associated with carbon stock changes from natural disturbance in a manner consistent with the method used for the calculation of emissions in the background level, and to conduct a technical correction of the background level and the FMRL if that is not the case."
2d_E_034	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2315	2319	"Carbon stock changes" This is not applicable for drained organic soils in FM and CM since the stock is unknown, due to a possible deep peat layer, where it is the fluxes at the surface that counts.		Rejected	Rejected. The standard reporting unit for CO2 emissions in the reporting tables is carbon stock change - countries do not necessarily need to know the stock to estimate the stock change (ie the Gain-loss method does not require countries to actually know the carbon stock).
2d_E_035	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2321	2325	This sentence shows how difficult this may be to execute.		Noted	

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_036	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2334	2335	"..changes that affect the growth rate of the forest...". Some disturbances may decrease growth rates without necessarily causing "emissions" - is the provision really meant to apply in these cases, and if so, how are Background level "emissions" calculated.		Rejected	Rejected. This sentence only describes the factors that need to be taken in to account when estimating and reporting emissions due to disturbances. For example, post fire, the growth rate of the forest may be quite different due to changes in the age class structure. It does not define what can and cannot be considered to be natural disturbance for the purpose of the provision.
2d_E_037	Federici, Sandro	2.3.8	2353	2353	this section should be moved after 2.3.9.4		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_038	CHEN, MINPENG	2	2370	2434	The difference between normal removal and removal due to salvage logging is very vague. I strongly recommend the authors put the terminology and definitons in 2.3.9.1. How to differentiate the definiton of salvage logging, removal and other management practices should be very clear in this part.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The authors believe that this would be best done by deleting one sentence which was perhaps unclear (sentence starting with "If it is conducted on areas...") An additional sentence was added to make it clearer that the box is a defition of salvage logging for the purposes of the natural disturbance provision. The authors did not think that moving the box further up into the section would improve the text, therefore it was decided to leave the box in its current position.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_039	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2390	2395	This sentence is misleading and do not add any new information to the section; I suggest to delete it. Indeed, in any case harvesting of forest subject to FM or AR shall be accounted for, it is not matter whether it is salvage logging or normal harvest operation; the text as it is seems to suggest that normal harvesting operations may be excluded from accounting since only salvage logging shall be included.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "In case a Party chooses to exclude emissions due to natural disturbances, it shall account for emissions associated with salvage logging (paragraph 33(c) of Annex to Decision 2/CMP.7). Therefore, if a Party chooses to apply the natural disturbance provision, it is good practice to report in a transparent manner the emissions due to SL on land subject to natural disturbance so that these emissions can be transparently accounted for. For the purposes of the provision these emissions result from the following:..."
2d_E_040	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2418	2418	this section should be moved after 2.3.9.4		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_041	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		2422	2425	"have to be clearly differentiated from ..." This is important, why I want to stress the importance of drained areas having an increased fire risk. These fire occasions should not be able to count as "natural disturbance", which needs to make clear.		Rejected	Rejected. The decision and section 2.3.9.1 is clear on how a party can define events as being natural disturbance or not. In particular: the requirement for parties to provide information that demonstrates that the occurrences were beyond the control of, and not materially influenced by, the Party in the commitment period, by demonstrating practicable efforts to prevent, manage or control the occurrences that led to the application of the provisions contained in paragraph 33 of the Annex to the Decision 2/CMP.7. Parties must be able to provide this information for all natural disturbances, including forests which have soil organic carbon pools (peat).

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_042	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.3	2428	2430	Please explain what are conditions under which the removals on lands previously disturbed shall be estimated because in line 2427 it is stated that: " According to paragraph 33 (a) and (b) of the Annex to the Decision 2/CMP.7, any subsequent removals during the commitment period on the lands affected shall also be excluded from the accounting		Accepted	Accepted. Clarifying sentences have been included to better describe what is meant by removals. Refer to 34(b) in Annex to Dec.2/CMP7 and 2(f)(ii) in Annex II to Dec.2/CMP8
2d_E_043	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2432	2432	please, replace "double accounting" with "double counting".		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_044	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2432	2434	Not clear why the loss of old trees would make FM methods appropriate - more likely to make AR methods appropriate.		Accepted	Accepted. Sentence was deleted.
2d_E_045	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2435	2435	this section should be moved after 2.3.9.4		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_046	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.3	2440	2440	<p>Please note that keeping track of rehabilitation effects on the affected lands is different from "information that demonstrates efforts taken to rehabilitate, where practicable". In my opinion a minimal information that demonstrates efforts taken to rehabilitate, where practicable is information that the affected piece of land continues to be subject to forest inventory. In AI countries forest inventory includes prescription of efforts that are needed to recreate productive function of this land. There is no need to collect info on what was actually done there because the system forces foresters to perform the proscribed actions.</p> <p>I am afraid that this request goes beyond the scope of 2/CMP.7.</p> <p>Please note that 2/CMP.7 requires demonstration of efforts and not keeping track of effects.</p>		Accepted	Accepted. Text was simplified to only request information rather than 'keeping track'.
2d_E_047	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.3	2443	2443	Please be more specific what is meant by "another disturbance event".		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "identify lands where the natural disturbance is followed by another disturbance event to avoid double-counting. "

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_048	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.3	2444	2448	If monitoring elements are defined in lines 2439 - 2443 then they are not consistent with those applied to identify the lands affected by the disturbance, e.g. the lands may be identified using remote sensing while the volume of salvage logging can't be estimated using the same method.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "Monitoring of natural disturbances and compilation of associated data on these lands including the disturbance type, size and location is required to provide consistent time series information about the affected area. The methods used in the post-disturbance monitoring of affected areas should be consistent within those to monitor forestry activities in general; i.e. the underlying assumptions and estimation methods should be in common and activity data estimates should be consistent even if supplementary data are gathered from different sources, e.g. greater use of remote sensing for disturbance monitoring."

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_049	Federici, Sandro		2449	2452	I guess you should be more precise here. First, you should say that this applies to emissions associated with natural disturbances that have been excluded from accounting. Second, you should say that only a portion of those emissions was excluded from accounting and that therefore only that portion of emissions should be accounted for when the land use change will occur. Third you should provide the equation to calculate that portion, my suggestion is to calculate the portion by adding the total emissions associated with the natural disturbances that have been originated in that area in the year (or years) in which emissions associated with natural disturbances have been excluded from accounting, and to multiply it by the complement to 1 of the ratio between the background level (per hectare) and the total emissions (per hectare) associated with natural disturbances in that land. (see attached file "natural disturbances followed by land use change")	Attachment_2d_E_049.pdf.	Accepted	Accepted with modification. The paragraph has been clarified to reflect section 2.6.1 such that land that is subject to natural disturbance and is subsequently subject to land use change, should actually be reported under deforestation rather than as FM or AR land. Hence the emissions from the disturbance event are captured under D.
2d_E_050	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.4	2453	2458	the sentence 2453 - 2458 is too long		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_051	Kasimir Klemetsson, Åsa		2455	2457	It is good the new wetland supplement is not included in the list of Guidelines here, which points to the drained peat soils not to be included in this category of natural disturbance. But needs to make clear.		Noted	Dealt with by Cluster 4 (WDR Section) authors

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_052	Gao, Qingxian	2	2459	2459	the title of this section is "NON-N2O GREENHOUSE GAS", but in the line 2459, it was reported as "non-C greenhouse gas (e.g., N2O)", please check if there is a mistake. If not, and the N2O is the only one non-C greenhouse gas in this section, there is no need to give an example.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_053	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.5	2466	2484	Lines 2466 - 2484 require general rewriting.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_054	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.5	2468	2468	FYI: zero is also a positive number. Rewrite.		Rejected	Rejected. Zero is an even number that is neither positive nor negative
2d_E_055	Ambulkar, Archis	2	2470	2471	Terms FMRL and AR are already defined earlier in the report and hence need not to be re-defined.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_056	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2471	2471	Please, add "in a year of" before "the commitment period". Indeed the Background Level is an annual value		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_057	Ambulkar, Archis	2	2474	2475	Term FM is already defined earlier in the report and hence need not to be re-defined.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_058	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2474	2475	Separate background levels for FM and AR - It would be better to split the whole Natural Disturbance Baseline discussion into separate sections for AR and FM. The accounting approaches are completely different so the text is confusing - it seems that "avoiding an expectation of credits/debits" is aimed at FMRL accounting, whereas alternative methods for setting accounting exclusion thresholds are only relevant to AR accounting (if relevant at all).		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_059	Sato, Atsushi	2.3.9.5	2488	2488	According to paragraph 1(k) of Annex I to decision 2/CMP.8, each Annex I Party will include the information on their intension of application the rule for exclusion of emissions from natural disturbance event in "Report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount". Including this information as a footnote is considered valuable.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_060	wang, chunfeng	2	2494	2547	To create a better background level, I think application of longer time series is much better, for this reason, we should allow a Party use longer time series, for example, the time series 1990-2009 may be adjusted to 1990-2013 if a Party has the relevant data. If the time series applied for construction of the background level are changed, the corresponding adjustment of reference level of FM may be adjusted further.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_061	Gao, Qingxian	2	2499	2501	the sentence "If emissions from a disturbance type can be demonstrated to be zero (which will usually be the case for rare events, e.g., volcanic eruptions), then the time series will contain zero for all years in the calibration period." may cause misunderstanding, it was suggested to be rewrote as "If emissions from a disturbance type can be demonstrated to be zero (which will usually be the case for rare events, e.g., volcanic eruptions), then the time series will contain zero for the years in which the disturbance occurring during the calibration period.".		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_062	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.5	2509	2511	"the time series is inconsistent with the treatment of disturbances in the FMRL" - time series is a set of numbers while treatment of disturbances is an activity - how they could be consistent. Activity is not comparable to numbers.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_063	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2511	2512	Table 2.3.2. Table is required separately for FM and AR (as it says on line 2506) - perhaps for clarity the Table should include a field to record a heading: "FM" or "AR".		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_064	wang, chunfeng	2	2515	2519	Since each year has two closest years, how to select the closest year, or to use the average of the two closest years, I suggest give a much clear description of the sentences in this para.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_065	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.5	2529	2530	The source of data should be reported but not "The way in which the data have been provided"		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_066	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2532	2532	Please replace "credits or debits" with "net credits or net debits"		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_067	CHEN, MINPENG	2	2556	2564	SD formula is not necessary listed in the maintext, since it is very general.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_068	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2562	2562	Please, delete the word "or removal". In the legal text of the annex to decision 2/CMP.7 the background level and the margin are built for, and with data on, emissions associated with natural disturbances only; removals are not included in the background level as established by the legal text of decision 2/CMP.7.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_069	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2562	2566	Please, delete the following text: "or smaller than the mean minus twice the SD". The exclusion of values smaller than the mean minus twice the SD generates the expectation of net credits during the commitment period. See the attached file "calculation of a background level"	Attachment_2d_E_069.xlsx Attachment_2d_E_069.pdf.	Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_070	wang, chunfeng	2	2565	2565	According to the decision 2/CMP7, the emissions which can be excluded should be the part that is nonhuman-induced and beyond the control of the party. Symmetrically, checking whether any data points are smaller than the mean minus twice the SD is reasonable, but we think this case is hard to happen and not fully following the decision 2/CMP7, therefore, I suggest the sentence " or smaller than the mean plus minus twice the SD" should be deleted.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_071	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2571	2571	<p>Alternative methods. The Durban Decision says that the relevant natural disturbances are "those that cause significant emissions in forest" - emissions from these events can be excluded from accounting. The default approach then appeared to define "significant" - some emissions from natural disturbances do still have to be accounted for, while the outliers (beyond 2 sd) do not. But this is apparently not the case at all, because the alternative methods seem to allow ALL emissions from natural disturbance to be excluded from accounting. The Default method appears to be superfluous - has it only been described because it was included within the Durban text? The implications of using it need to be spelled out - it would be much easier to just use the lowest level found in the calibration period as the BL with a margin of zero (or easier still to just use a zero baseline) so if there is any advantage in doing something different it should be made explicit. Perhaps the method used is irrelevant for FMRL accounting, but not for AR accounting?</p>		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_072	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2579	2579	<p>What is the relevance of "expectation" of credits/debits on AR lands? Under gross-net accounting, a Party is liable for all emissions and removals on that land. Excluding all areas subject to natural disturbance from accounting (i.e. baseline and margin of zero) could result in higher or lower net removals per unit area, depending on whether the area excluded was less or more productive than average. You don't know which it will be in advance - is that sufficient for avoiding an expectation of net credits/debits? What if you did suspect that the least productive sites were more likely to be subject to disturbance? Adjusting the threshold for excluding disturbed areas from accounting isn't going to change the fact that the sites left in the accounting system are the more productive ones.</p>		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_073	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2580	2580	<p>Please, delete "or debits". Footnotes 7 and 8 of the annex to decision 2/CMP.8 simply establishes that approaches for calculating the BL or the margin should avoid the expectation of net credits only.</p>		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_074	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2584	2584	Please, delete "or debits". Footnotes 7 and 8 of the annex to decision 2/CMP.8 simply establishes that approaches for calculating the BL or the margin should avoid the expectation of net credits only.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_075	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2593	2593	FMRL accounting. A typical situation would be that some level of natural disturbance is implicitly captured within the FMRL, for example because growth models assume a level of mortality or growth loss due to attritional effects of weather, pests and diseases. But major (catastrophic) disturbance is not included. It would be helpful if the Guidance could explain how to treat this situation.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_076	CHEN, MINPENG	2	2598	2599	The authors mentioned how to deal with net credit but not discuss how to deal with net debits.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_077	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2601	2608	The authors should note that for AR the area changes considerably in the calibration period (it starts from 0, in 1990, to the actual value) and therefore should state that for AR is always a good practice to report values in Table 2.3.2 in terms of emissions per unit area.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_078	CHEN, MINPENG	2	2610	2643	Please add legend and texts to explain the meaning of x axis, y axis, each block and each line for every figure in Box2.3.6		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_079	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2610	2643	The units should be in CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_080	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2619	2620	Please, delete the lower bar since it is neither requested by decision 2/CMP.7 (NOTE that paragraph 33 of the annex to decision 2/CMP.8 says "...plus the margin."; it did not say "minus the margin) nor applied in the calculation. So the text should say: "(shown by a thin horizontal line above the background level)		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_081	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2622	2622	The tick dashed line should be moved up at the same level of the horizontal line of the margin (i.e. a little bit higher than 16 MtCO <sub>2</sub> eq).		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_082	Iversen, Peter Aarup	2.3.9.5	2628	2629	Figure b) It seems 2001 should also be removed as an outlier following the text under step 3 on how to develop the background level.		Rejected	Rejected. The text has been modified so that outliers on the lower side should not be removed
2d_E_083	Kasimir Klemetsson, Åsa		2631	2633	As I understand it, it would maximise the risk for overestimation, but I may be wrong.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_084	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2645	2672	Box 2.3.7. This box could be a lot more concise - it is saying that if FM area is expected to change, the BL should take this into account, e.g. by: (1) Calculating average BL per unit area during calibration period; (2) Projecting FM area during CP; (3) multiplying average BL per unit area to projected average FM area.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_085	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2653	2655	This sentence is not very clear. If the area decreases then there is an expectation of net debits since the BL and its margin are higher than they should be (less emissions than needed will be removed from accounting). If the area increases then there is an expectation of net credits since the BL and its margin are smaller than they should be (more emissions than needed will be removed from accounting)		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_086	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2661	2662	Why to project the area? (also the projected area could be higher or smaller than the real one) The most accurate and effective way to avoid problems associated with area changes is to use the actual area of the year in which the Natural-Disturbance provision is applied. I suggest to delete the current text of steps 3 and 4 and to states, in a single step, to be a good practice to use the real area under FM or AR during the commitment period		Rejected	Rejected. Parties should submit information about the BL in NIR 2015 which requires a projection of areas

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_087	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2661	2662	Box 2.3.7 How can you demonstrate that a projection of area change "will not lead to net credits or debits"?		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_088	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2666	2667	Edit: "Note that the above approach assumes that the probability of natural disturbances occurring will not change over time".		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_089	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2666	2667	Where is the approach described for the case where the probability IS clearly changing over time (e.g. shown as a trend in background level data).		Rejected	Rejected. This is part of the example and not a text on detrending.
2d_E_090	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2668	2669	This should be a good practice, for any kind of approach (excluding when the BL is set to 0), and when the area of FM and/or AR is increased (or decreased)		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_091	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2668	2669	Edit: "The same approach may be needed [DELETE THIS NEXT PART? when not the default method is used,] if the area of land under FM increases, and if the area of land under AR is expected to increase (or decrease)."		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_092	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2670	2672	Edit: "Where this or similar approaches are necessary, it is good practice to report the methodology and data used and to show how the approach ensures that the expectation of net credits or net debits during the commitment period is avoided.		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_093	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2672	2672	There is much mention of avoiding an expectation of net credits or debits when setting the Background Level - it would be useful to have a box showing examples where applying the default or alternative methods do not avoid this. For example: in CP2 the AR forests will obviously be older than they were during the calibration period, but probably younger than FM forests were during that period and also younger than FM forests are during CP2. They would therefore have a different risk profile and contain a different level of biomass. Compensating for age-dependent risk is covered by the paragraph starting at line 2535 - what else might cause an expectation of net credits/debts?.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_094	Wakelin, Stephen	2.3.9	2672	2672	Edit: "...how the approach ensures that its application ensures ..." DELETE "that its application ensures"		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_095	Federici, Sandro	2.3.9	2674	2685	<p>What about drought? Drought may affect in a year almost all the country causing a generalized loss of trees because of mortality. Not all removals occurring on following years will be caused by that disturbance, further if the removals on 80% of the country forest area will be excluded from accounting how the country will achieve its FMRL? This in practice means that only spot-disturbances may be included in the Natural-Disturbances provision, drought, pests are implicitly excluded.</p> <p>Guidance, on how to separate the portion of removals associated with the disturbance from those removals that would have occurred anyhow, should be provided to make possible to exclude emissions from disturbances that affect the most part of the country territory, as drought. A simple way is to assign removals to the disturbance-cause in proportion to the biomass losses the disturbance caused; e.g. if in an area the 80% of the biomass was killed (either oxidised or transferred to DOM and SOM pools) by the disturbance then the 80% of following removals are considered having been caused by the disturbance and therefore excluded from the accounting.</p>		Rejected	Rejected. Drought is referenced. If drought events don't meet the other conditions, they cannot be excluded. Partial exclusion are not practicable.
2d_E_096	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.6	2677	2677	Insert reference to paragraph number		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_097	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.6	2682	2685	in order to exclude removals from an area affected by the natural disturbance provision it is not necessary to calculate them. It is easier to ensure that any data collected from this area is not used for calculation of the removals that are subject to accounting.		Rejected	Rejected. New text was introduced to justify the need: "It is good practice for Parties using a projected FMRL to provide information on how the estimation of emissions and removals following natural disturbances has been matched to the treatment of emissions and removals in the construction of the FMRL to avoid double counting. For example, the FMRL may contain a certain amount of emissions and removals associated with the disturbed area, but originating from FM activities, in case the area would not have been disturbed."
2d_E_098	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.7	2688	2703	lines 2688 - 2703 do not provide instruction how to provide transparent information that demonstrates efforts taken to rehabilitate, where practicable. Proposal: delete		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole section was revised. New text take into consideration the comment.
2d_E_099	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.7	2688	2723	Para 2.3.9.7 needs general rewriting in light of my remarks to line 2709.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text has been revised. However, this kind of information has to be provided in order to show that rehabilitation is undertaken and to allow for a distinction between e.g. rehabilitation and land use-change.
2d_E_100	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.7	2696	2699	Please note that seeds might be available in soil seed bank as well.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text was revised as: "... if seeds or seed trees are still available on the lands."

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_101	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.7	2707	2709	Please note that 2/CMP.7 requires only information that demonstrates efforts taken to rehabilitate, where practicable. It is post factum information. The decision does not requires information on planning and expected results. This applies also to lines 2710 -2711 and 2712 - 2714..		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Text has been revised. However, this kind of information has to be provided in order to show that rehabilitation is undertaken and to allow for a distinction between e.g. rehabilitation and land use-change.
2d_E_102	Feest, Alan	2.3.9.7.	2714		Biodiversity management to achieve biodiversity nehanement could be included here		Rejected	Rejected. Discussions around biodiversity are outside of the scope of this section and is not necessary for the purpose of applying the provision.
2d_E_103	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.8	2727	2729	It is unlikely that disturbance alone will invoke reforestation and especially afforestation that requires 50 years of non-forested state of a land.		Accepted	Accepted with modification: the text of the Durban decision was quoted; and revisions were made to remove possible pre-emption.
2d_E_104	Gao, Qingxian	2	2728	2729	“Emissions and removals from Afforestation and Reforestation under Article 3.3 or Forest Management under Article 3.4 of the Kyoto Protocol over the third and subsequent commitment periods are likely to ...”, please delete the words "third and" due to the the thrid comment periods belongs to the subsequent comment periods.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_105	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.8	2729	2731	This example is very weak - please provide a more suitable one.		Accepted	Accepted with modification: the text of the Durban decision was quoted; and revisions were made to remove possible pre-emption.

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_106	Galinski, Wojtek	2.3.9.8	2734	2740	Lines 2734 -2740 are repetition of lines 2732 - 2733. Proposal: delete.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_107	Weiss, Peter	2.3.9.8			Chapter 2.3.9.8 comes too early. There is not yet any specific decision on subsequent commitment periods. Decision 2/CMP7 just deals with subsequent emissions/removals after natural disturbances in the commitment period (para 33). And para 36 of this decision is rather ambiguous and may be interpreted in a controversial manner (e.g. emissions/removals due to natural disturbance should be 1) accounted in subsequent commitment periods or 2) non-accounted also in the subsequent CPs or 3) only post disturbance removals in subsequent CPs should not be accounted or 4) para 36 just indicates the need of consistency between accounting of emissions/removals due to natural disturbances and the time when they occur with respect to the following CPs without specifying how they should be treated in following CPs ?). So, the chapter should be limited to a guidance for the need of an identification of legacy emissions/removals due to natural disturbances - if the provision was used - in subsequent CPs). Furthermore, the methods/guidelines in this chapter would be under the actual decisions only be valid for those parties that make use of the "disturbance" clause which is not at all indicated in this chapter.		Accepted	Accepted with modification: the text of the Durban decision was quoted; and revisions were made to remove possible pre-emption.
2d_E_108	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7290	7290	Here and elsewhere - Should the name of the journal be in italics as shown in line 7452 and elsewhere?		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_109	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7299	7300	Bokalo et al. not cited in text		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_110	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7307	7307	Here and elsewhere - be consistent in how co-authors are listed - Last name first (see line 7311) or last name last as in this reference.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_111	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7309	7310	Co-Author's last name is missing. Should be Green.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_112	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7311	7311	ArticleDigital' insert space and/or : between Article and Digital.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_113	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7311	7311	Here and elsewhere - be consistent in what comes before the last author - Should it be '&' as shown on this line, 'and' as it is shown on line 7314 or just a ',' as given in line 7288?		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_114	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7317	7317	Here and elsewhere - Should there be quotation marks around the title of an article as shown on this line - o just the title without the quotes as shown in line 7327? Consider being consistent.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_115	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7327	7327	Australian Forestry, v. 38, no. 1, p. 4-25.' Consider changing the format to 'Australian Forestry 38(1): 4-25 to be consistent with other references. Check all for a common format.		Accepted	Accepted

<Review comments by experts on the Second Order Draft of KP Supplement (Section 2.3.9)>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
2d_E_116	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7353	7354	Kato not cited in text		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_117	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7361	7371	There are two Kurz et al for 2009 listed here (line 7361 and line 7369). One is cited in the text (see line 1731). Which one is the reference? Consider deleting the one that is not cited.		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_118	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7384	7385	List all the co-authors		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_119	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7418	7419	List all the co-authors		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_120	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7427	7428	List all the co-authors		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_121	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7434	7435	Tompo et al not cited in text		Accepted	Accepted
2d_E_122	Lund, H. Gyde	References	7443	7444	Xiao and Zhuang not cited in text		Accepted	Accepted