

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0001	Brown, Sandra	1	general			A lot of hard work has obviously gone into these chapters but in many of them I find they missed the target. I had many problems with these chapters as my comments attached will show. My biggest concern is the apparent limited regard for the user of these materials. Most chapters are written like academic scientific reviews—all such material should be moved to annexes in each chapter. Also I read about CH4 in practically all chapters—could this not have been said once and then added as an annex to Ch 1. It seems a lot of the updates are in relation to CH4. Also it seems that even including these other sources of GHGs will hardly ever be that significant in the grander scheme of things within the AFOLU sector. And even as someone who knows a little about such inventories I did not find these chapters too helpful—but then maybe I missed a key section—perhaps this is in one of earlier chapters. But I would hate to be an inventory person in a country who had to wade through all this detail to find the punchlines.		Noted	Noted. Chapter One has been revised and shorted for cook book style.
E_1_0002	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			‘Peat type’ shall be define more clearly. In Chapters 1, 2 and 3 of this document peat type is sometimes used to distinguish between nutrient rich and nutrient poor peat (Chapter 3), however, sometimes to distinguish between climate zones (table 2.3). In line 431 type of peatland is being used for Spagnum (oligotrophic) and Sedge peat (minerotrophic) We advice to use ‘nutrient status’ to distinguish between nutrient rich and nutrient poor peat.		Accepted with modification	Accepted win modification. Definitions have been further elaborated in chapter 1.2.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0003	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			Are (shallow) lakes (table 1.2) that are part of (drained) peatland ecosystems being captured by current IPCC guidance on greenhouse gas inventories (e.g. under permanently flooded lands?) In the light of the high emissions that are being reported from drainage ditches and also shallow lakes in managed peatlands, it should be included in inventories since their extent might be large.		Noted	Noted. Table 1.2. has been deleted.
E_1_0004	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			<p>Consistency needed (also between the different chapters) in the use of the terms 'wetland soil', 'peatland soil' and organic soil and also 'wetland' and 'peatland' have to be defined clearly. One example is that perhaps a choice has to be made to either use 'peat soil' consistently or to use 'organic soil' or to use 'organic soil or peat soil'.</p> <p>Chapter 1 states that organic soil = peat soil (if there is at least 40 cm of peat in the first 100 cm of the soil and at least 12% C by weight). Furtheron in this chapter the term 'peat soil' is not being used anymore, the term 'organic soil' is being used (undrained organic soil, drained organic soil, rewetted organic soil). Is assumed that organic soil = peat soil?</p> <p>Chapter 2 uses the term 'organic soil', not peat soil. This chapter uses instead ' (drained) peatlands and (drained) organic soils (page 2, line 57, line 523, line 658). So, what are peatlands? Areas that have peat soils?</p> <p>Chapter 3 uses the term 'organic soil or peat soil'. Thus it includes also peat soils that are not organic soils because the criteria (40 cm peat in first 100 cm and 12% C by weight) are not met.</p>		Accepted with modification	Accepted with modification. Definitions of "organic soil" and "wet soil" and others have been further elaborated in chapter 1.2.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0005	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			Related to 'wetland': chapter 3 describes what a wetland is (lines 82 onwards), this should be (also) described in detail and in a compliant way in chapter 1. Chapter 1 states that wetland = wet soil = inundated or saturated soil for all or part of the year etc.		Accepted with modification	Accepted with modification. Definition of "wet soil" has been further elaborated in chapter 1.2.
E_1_0006	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			Related to 'peatland': There is no definition given for 'peatland'. Chapter 1: in the text, 'peatland' is being used, not 'peatlands and organic soils' as in Ch. 2 and 3, assuming that peatlands include organic soils (?). Chapter 2: in the text mostly 'peatlands' is being used and sometimes 'peatland AND organic soils (e.g. lines 85 and 523). Chapter 3: in the text mostly 'peatlands AND organic soils' is being used (lines 91, 95 etc), assuming that peatlands or not (always) including organic soils (?).		Accepted with modification	Accepted with modification. Definition of "organic soil" has been further elaborated in chapter 1.2.
E_1_0007	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			The term 'drained wetland' is often used. A wetland = defined as land characterized by saturated soil. This means that the term drained wetland is in fact not possible.		Rejected	Rejected. Definition of "wet soil" has been further elaborated in chapter 1.2.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0008	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			'Rewetting' might be defined as well. What is the definition of rewetting that is being used in this supplement? WT depth criteria? E.g.: is increasing the water table from 80 cm below field level to 40 cm below field level also rewetting? Or is it 'drained'? In Fig. 1.1 this has to be explained as well (lines 116-118 are not sufficient).		Accepted with modification	Accepted with modification. Definition of "rewetting" has been further elaborated in chapter 1.2.
E_1_0009	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	general			CO2 and CH4 are expressed in amount of C and N2O is expressed in amount of N. Why not expressing GHG emissions in GWP's (CO2-eq) (for all IPCC guidances) for GHG inventories.		Rejected	Rejected. GWP-values are regularly updated/improved.
E_1_0010	Wu, Shaohong	1	General			Generally, the chapter is not detailed enough. Many points are not easy to follow.		Noted	Noted, unconcrete
E_1_0011	Bedard-Haughn, Angela	1	General			In general, the chapters I reviewed were well done and I congratulate the authors and contributors on a tremendous amount of hard work. There are still many gaps to be filled in, but as the authors indicate, this reflects the state of the research as much as anything.		Noted	with thanks

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0012	Brandon, Andrea	1	general comment			It would be helpful to explain the definitional difference between peat soils and organic soils		Accepted	
E_1_0013	Rock, Joachim	1				Wetlands will quite often be a subcategory of soils in land-use classes or activity reporting. Please include a diagram showing where and when "wetlands" fit in with e.g. Forest Land and Grassland (see figures 4.2.1. and 4.2.2 of the GPG-LULUCF as an example).		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0014	Bedard-Haughn, Angela	1	1	1		This chapter was generally very easy to follow and defined the frame of reference for what is included in the supplement, and perhaps more importantly, what is not included and why.		Noted	
E_1_0015	Parish, Faizal	1	1	1		The chapter needs to clearly emphasise the difference between "wetlands" as in the wetland supplement and "wetlands" in the land use categories of the 2006 IPCC guidelines		Accepted	
E_1_0016	Lyde, Gund	1	34	34		"Extent' should be lower case		Accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0017	Eggleston, Simon	1	43	68		I think it would be better to start this chapter with a simple description of what the supplement covers BEFORE this worthy but boring description of the history. Something like " This supplement extends the coverage of the 2006 Guidleiens to all wetland types except flooded lands. It is not intended to replace the 2006 Guidleines but ensures that guidance is no longer restricted to organic soils and peatlands managed for peat extraction. In particular it provides guidance on the rewetted and resoration of organic soils and peatlands."		Accepted	
E_1_0018	Brown, Lynette	1	52	52		waste water should be revised to "wastewater"		Accepted	
E_1_0019	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	59	59		It is stated "provides new and supplementary guidance" - I suggest to be coherent with Chapter 0: new, extend, update, replace information, just to make clear to the GHG compiler and facilitate the use of this supplement.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0020	Lyde, Gund	1	61	62		Is anyone tracking emissions and removals from 'unmanaged' lands? These could be significant when natural disasters occur - fires, hurricanes, etc. If vegetation is lost to natural a natural occurence and the vegetation is restored by people how does one account for and balance out the change?		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0021	Batisha, Ayman	1	64	64		Chapter 3: Cross-cutting guidance on Rewetted Organic Soils and Restored Peatlands MAYBE Chapter 3: Guidance on Rewetted Organic Soils and Restored Peatlands		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0022	Brown, Lynette	1	64	64		Capitalize the g in "guidance" for consistency.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0023	Eggleston, Simon	1	69	69		This section does NOT describe the scope of the supplement - it is a guide to its use. Change the title		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0024	Eggleston, Simon	1	70	70		replace "is intended to provide" with "provides" - surely the authors are confident they know what this chapter does?		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0025	Lyde, Gund	1	70	70		Consider changing 'is intended to provide' to simply 'provides'		Accepted	
E_1_0026	Lyde, Gund	1	70	73		wetland mineral soils' In addition to organic soils inventories include mineral soils in other land use classes?		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0027	Blondel, Ana	1	73	73		Should be "Wetlands, Settlements" instead of "Settlements, Wetlands", following the order of IPCC land-use categories in the 2006 guidelines and reporting tables.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0028	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Asa	1	76	78		The decision tree. The last question; Is the soil drained? The answer No is valid for virgin wetlands which are not included since only managed land area is included. "Drained and rewetted" would be better answer than "No" pointing to chapter 3.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0029	Lyde, Gund	1	76	77		Figure 1.1 - Consider including a key for defining land classes such as given in figure 4 found in 'Guide for Classifying Lands for Greenhouse Gas Inventories'. Journal of Forestry 104 (4): 211-216(6) http://home.comcast.net/~gyde/Guide_for_classifying_GHG.pdf . then move on down to the wetlands figure 1.1.	Attachment_E_1_0029.pdf	Accepted with modification	
E_1_0030	Pan, Xubin	1	76	78		Do we need to give the specific consideration of "Alpine Wetland?"		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0031	Wu, Shaohong	1	76	77		Making a decision on "YES" or "NO" of figure 1.1 is not so easy. It should make clear that who and how decides such "YES" or "NO".		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0032	Brandon, Andrea	1	77	78		Decision 7) another option? If soil is not drained, never has been and is not being rewetted or restored - then what? Should you be referred to Ch 2? Or 2006 GL? Is tier 1 default to use 2006 GL?		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0033	Brown, Lynette	1	77	78		What if it is a created wetland? Option not included in flow chart.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0034	Ishizuku, Shigehiro	1	77	78		Because this supplement is aimed for the rewetting and drainage of organic soils, it is better to insert the diagram to sweep out when there is no activities in these soils. To insert the another option just before box 7 to divide by the activities, for example insert the decision branch as "Is the soil rewetted?" just before box 7, "Chapter 3, this supplement" for "Yes" answer, and "Vol.4, 2006 IPCC Guidelines" for "No" answer.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0035	Lyde, Gund	1	77	78		Figure 1.1 - If this is to be done for all land use classes then shouldn't this be in the IPCC Guidelines instead of a supplement?		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0036	Lyde, Gund	1	77	78		Consider including images illustrating areas at each decision point just to make the text more informative and interesting		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0037	Kishimoto, Ayaka	1	78	78		Figure 1.1) Is the soil used for rice cultivation? According to OVERVIEW (lines 166-167), this Wetlands Supplement provides additional emission factors for lowland rice production on drained tropical peatlands. Therefore, need to give a footnote for Figure 1.1.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0038	Sato, Atsushi	1	79	84		The decision tree of Figure 1.1 starts from classification into the six IPCC land use categories. In chapter 4, coastal wetlands seem to be possible to include sea area upto 40 m depth. It seems unclear whether IPCC six "land" use categories can include "sea" area or not. This point should be explained.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0039	Lyde, Gund	1	81	82		What are approaches 'two' and 'three'? Consider restating them here.		Noted	
E_1_0040	Lyde, Gund	1	82	83		Forest land can also be converted to Settlements		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0041	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	85	85		this chapter explicitly mention that countries "should" subdivide land use categories into subcategories. We have noticed that, in other chapters of the document, this subdivision is considered mandatory, for example, Chapter 2, line 393-394, where it is said that the land use has to be estratified "by climate domains, soil nutrient status, drainage class or additional criteria..."		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0042	Federici, Sandro	1	86	88	1.2	Only for forest land, grassland and wetland lands can be subdivided between managed and unmanaged. Indeed, it is not possible to have unmanged cropland and unmanaged settlements, while for other land, being composed by land without significant stocks of carbon, the subdivision between managed and unmanaged is not relevant.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0043	Sato, Atsushi	1	86	88		Separating managed land and unmanaged land is a standard way for whole LULUCF sector, however, how to separate "managed" and "unmanaged" in sea area is maybe new concept for inventory compilers. It seems better to note here that the way of separating "managed" and "unmanaged" is explained in each sector, and this point is clearly explained in each sector's discription.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0044	Abad Viñas, Raul	1	88	89		Wetlands Suplement considers a good practice to sub-divided each of the six managed lands-use categories into four subcategories: dry/wet organic soils and dry/wet mineral soils. For transparency and consistency purposes, could be convenient to provide in the reporting tables a place (i.e. cell) where report these areas.		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0045	Ishizuku, Shigehiro	1	88	89		I think It is impractical and not good practice to sub-divide all managed land into four subcategories, if there is no activities with wetlands in certain land-use category. For example, in many countries, wetland under forest land belongs to conservation area, such as national park. In these area, the boundary is not identified by the soil type, but geographycal one, and these areas have several soil types (i.e., they usually contain wet organic, wet mineral and dry mineral soils). Therefore, sub-division into wet organic soil, dry organic soil, wet mineral soil and dry mineral soil in these kinds of lands is too difficult to fix the area when the country does not have digital data of the soil map. In this supplement, the targeted emission is focused only on the rewetting and drainage activities, and the area identification of wet organic soil, dry organic soil, wet mineral soil and dry mineral soil is out of the issue if there is no activity with wetland in a category (and it is too heavy duty if there is no digital soil map). For this reason, to insert "If there is any human-induced activity with wetlands in each category," and so on, at the begining of this sentense.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0046	Lyde, Gund	1	88	89		Do the other land use classes have to be subdivided into 'inland' and 'coastal'?		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0047	Ishizuku, Shigehiro	1	92	93		Please re-review the linkage between the decision tree and the guidance of the chapter, especially chapter 3. Because this supplement is supplied for the all land categories which have wetlands (see Overview line 92-93), the wetland remaing wetland with no activity reaches to the bottom box in the figure (Chapter 3, this supplement). But in chapter 3, it deals only rewetting peatland and organic soils, and there is no description about the wetland remaining wetland. This mismatch seems to derive from the lack of the description about the applicable area of this supplement in this chapter or the overstatement of Overview line 92-93 (therefore, I recommend to replace "need to" by "can" in line 92).		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0048	Brown, Sandra	1	98	102		wet soils----agree can be inundated for part of yar but many wetland swamp forests or riverine forests do not develop anaerobic conditions in the upper soils levels during the growing season--however palnst are adapted to flooded confditions. There are many such riverine forests in the US that flood every year for some time, but usually in growing season are not flooded nor anaerobic--but if do flood can tolerate it for relatively short period--days to couple of weeks. So where do they fit in your system. No need to add growing season		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0049	Podest, Erika	1	98	98		what length of time defines part of the year?		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0050	Tiemeyer, Bärbel	1	98	102		If wet soils equal "Hydric soils", how are then drained Hydric soils treated within the scope of the framework given in Fig. 1.1?		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0051	Herbst, Mathias	1	101	101		Insert „parts of“ between „during“ and „the“.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0052	Sato, Atsushi	1	103	107		Maybe "Flooded land" and "Inland mineral soil wetland" are not mutually exclusive. Chapter 5 often refers dam and rivers. Thus, the chart of "Flooded land or not" in decision tree figure 1.1 should be moved much bottom direction at least the place after the chart for IMSW.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0053	Wu, Shaohong	1	103	111		Reservoirs might be constructed wetland.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0054	Zheng, Xunhua	1	104	105		Change "Flooded Land excludes regulated lakes and rivers unless a substantial increase in water area has occurred." to "Flooded Land excludes regulated lakes and rivers unless a substantial change in water area due to anthropogenic activities has occurred."		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0055	GUTIERREZ_BELTRAN, Natalia	1	104	106		The wetlands Supplement should also include guidance on how to deal with emissions and removals of greenhouse gases from flooded land and soils, and moist soils (rate aquic, udic). Colombia has lots of reservoirs.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0056	Wiseman, Michael	1	112	115		Cannot Inland Wetlands depending on salt mineral subsoil and evaporation reach a definition of brackish, if during the process the dissolved salt content was to reach 500ppm		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0057	Wiseman, Michael	1	118	118		needs only to be established not re-established		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0058	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Asa	1	119	120		...but also covers undrained inland organic soils, As I understand many EF has been based on measurements of undrained soils but these soils are not the intention to cover by the chapter 3.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0059	Brown, Lynette	1	120	120		Capitalize the c in "chapter" for consistency.		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0060	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	paragraph 1.3			could be improved by having the following 'build up': 1) importance of wetland emissions 2) details about emissions related to peat drainage 3) details about emissions related to undrained peat 4) details on emissions related to peat rewetting.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0061	Vermaat, Jan	1	122			section 1.3 draws too much on a few papers, notably by Joosten and Couwenberg. The literature coverage in subsequent chapters (fx 2 and 4) is so much richer and also so much more up to date. To me this is more than a slight difference in style		accepted with changes	we will use more review and synthesis papers for this section
E_1_0062	Batisha, Ayman	1	123	124		Maybe omitted		accepted	section will be deleted and included in a text box in section 1.1
E_1_0063	Parno Guimaraes, Giselle	1	125	155		all references and information are related to peatlands when they should refer to wetlands in general. This topic should be rewritten.		accepted	we will broaden the reference list with a focus on citing more review articles and including more geographic coverage and coverage of different wetland types.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0064	Brown, Sandra	1	126	127		I see you cite many papers but these papers are citing similar studies --this statement can be true but not in all cases peatlands can have shallow peats so depends on depth of peat, re mangroves--there are many types of mangroves but they get lumped as though all the same --they are not and they may or may not have deep highly organic soils--can vary...so need qualifiers here --they do not contain the largest--many do but not all--important to clarify this--the message is plain wrong as stated!		accepted	deleted direct reference to specific wetland types
E_1_0065	GUTIERREZ BELTRAN, Natalia	1	126	126		It is necessary for Colombia, to take into account the existence of flooded soils in Guandal and Naidazal ecosystems and therefore how the emissions and removals of GHG should be treated in this regard.		rejected	Are Guandal and Naidazal managed ecosystems? If so, we have likely covered them in this wetland supplement.
E_1_0066	GUTIERREZ BELTRAN, Natalia	1	127	127		Gorham, 1991; Mitra et al, 2005;. Joosten y Couwenberg 2008; Donato et al, 2011;.. Pendleton et al, 2012		rejected	not understandable
E_1_0067	Ogilvie, James	1	128	130	1.3	This statement is vague. What does 'significant' mean. How large must emissions be in order to be significant? Most emissions result from agriculture, forestry and plantations (tropics) while emissions globally from peat extraction are very small. Why are they significant?		rejected	this is meant to be vague and broad
E_1_0068	Brown, Lynette	1	129	130		The word "their" is not used properly - recommend changing 1st occurrence to "the" and deleting the second occurrence.		accepted with changes	updated text to be grammatically correct

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0069	Federici, Sandro	1	129	129	1.3	delete the word "anthropogenic" before "fires"; it is simply not needed, indeed you did not write anthropogenic oxidation of soil organic matter		accepted	removed "anthropogenic"
E_1_0070	Sikar, Elizabeth	1	130	130		"and nitrogen balance therefore their greenhouse gas emissions (Billett et al., 2010 Figure 1 depicts carbon fluxes in a peatland catchment carbon balance)" instead of "and nitrogen balance as well as their greenhouse gas emissions" Reason for my suggestion to modify line 130 in Chapter 1: Measurements involved in a carbon (C) balance are not thoroughly obvious. According to Billett et al., 2010 (pdf file attached) "the C balance of any terrestrial ecosystem is measured by quantifying the fluxes (amount of C lost or gained) of all known C species into and out of a specific landscape unit of known size". This implies that internal C transformations such as primary production and decomposition are irrelevant and only landscape C-inputs and landscape C-outputs are considered.	Attachment_E_1_0070.pdf	accepted	changed wording in line with comment
E_1_0071	Brown, Sandra	1	131	153		would think from reading this section for example, that all work on wetland soils and emisisions have been done in the last few years--is this the trend now--work done in the 1990s or even 1980s is old and not relelvant?		rejected	always best to cite new literature, but the main aim with the literature citations is to focus on review and synthesis publications, since the text in this section is meant to provide a very general overview

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0072	Brown, Sandra	1	131	155		I find this whole section a bit worrisome as it does not contain enough info to make a better judgement and I am not sure I see where this fits into the guidance for doing emission inventories--I would drop most of this and stick to the goal--developing guidance without going into details but not enough detail. To me these guidance documents need to be made succinct and short and to the point so that people will actually use them--this kind of introductory text which is not well written and gives one perspective is not appropriate in my mind.		accepted	section will be deleted and included in a text box in section 1.1
E_1_0073	Blondel, Ana	1	133	133		Reference "Blodau 2002" is missing in page 1.20)		rejected	deleted reference from text entirely
E_1_0074	Brown, Lynette	1	133	133		Blodau 2002 is not listed in the Chapter 1 References, please add to References or remove this citation.		accepted	see line 74
E_1_0075	Lyde, Gund	1	133	133		Blodau not listed in references.		accepted	see line 74
E_1_0076	Tiemeyer, Bärbel	1	133	133		Please try to quote peer-reviewed studies with actual measurements (Couwenberg & Fritz, 2012)		accepted with changes	see line 72

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0077	Brown, Sandra	1	134	136		I will argue that periodically flooded wetland mineral soils will not emit much methane --but they do emit high levels of CO2 --anaerobic respiration is slow thus decomp of OM under anaerobic conditions will be slow and emissions low.		accepted	will check for consistency with chapter 5
E_1_0078	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	134	137		merge with lines 152-155. Redundancy.		accepted	will check for redundancy when we rewrite the text for inclusion in a text box
E_1_0079	GUTIERREZ BELTRAN, Natalia	1	134	135		Article requested by Colombia. "Couwenberg 135 and Fritz 2012; Tian Xu 2012" and others related to wetlands without drainage.		rejected	not understandable
E_1_0080	Villamizar, Alicia	1	135	136		Do the fact that just on pag 135 Couwenberg is named six times, I suggest erase at least one or two of his references and add Crooks et al. 2011. Mitigating climate change through restoration and management of coastal wetlands and near-shore marine ecosystems. Challenges and opportunities. Environment Department Papers, 121. World Bank, Washington, DC	Attachment_E_1_0080.pdf	accepted	see line 62
E_1_0081	Tiemeyer, Bärbel	1	142	142		Please try to quote peer-reviewed studies with actual measurements (Joosten & Couwenberg, 2008)		accepted	see line 62

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0082	Hakalahti-Siren, Teija	1	144	145		Please, specify that this is valid only to soil emissions (biomass sequestration excluded)		accepted	this has been clarified in the text.
E_1_0083	Mutka, Kari	1	144	145		Please, specify that this is valid only to soil emissions (biomass sequestration excluded)		accepted	see line 83
E_1_0084	Ogilvie, James	1	144	145		Please, specify that this is valid only to soil emissions (biomass sequestration excluded)		accepted	see line 83
E_1_0085	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	144	151		bring to beginning of paragraph to demonstrate the importance of (drained) peatland emissions.		rejected	we are planning to delete lines 147-151 and speak more generally about carbon fluxes
E_1_0086	Wu, Shaohong	1	144	151		Such estimation came from a few literatures. Could they give the whole picture of all over the world?		accepted	see line 62
E_1_0087	Parish, Faizal	1	147	148		I believe that the area of peatland globally is 4 million km2 (see line 196) which is equivalent to 3% of the global land area. I believe that the 0.3% of global land area for peatland for peatland referred to here is the proportion of peatland that is either drained or managed - this needs to be clarified here. differs from the 0.5% in table 1.2 for bog, Fen, Mire of 0.5%		rejected	see line 86
E_1_0088	Tiemeyer, Bärbel	1	147	147		Is there a reference for the 0.5 Pg per year?		rejected	see line 86

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0089	Penman, Jim	1	148			Replace 'global hotspot' with 'important source'. The former is journalistic.		rejected	see line 86
E_1_0090	Brown, Lynette	1	149	149		Why is the word "change" italicized?		agree, but rejected	see line 86
E_1_0091	Penman, Jim	1	149			Unsure why there is the text in parenthesis - suggest delete		accepted	see line 86
E_1_0092	Parno Guimaraes, Giselle	1	153	155		This sentence sums correctly about what this topic should approach, however this does not reflect what was discussed above.		rejected	planning to delete this text when we reformat section 1.3 into a text box in section 1.1
E_1_0093	Wang, Chunfeng	1	154	155		Numerous variables, also including microbe and the exchange of nutrients. Therefore, its temporal and spatial variation as well as uncertainty are very large. This view should be integrated into the sentence.		accepted	we will caveat the new text box in section 1.1
E_1_0094	Herbst, Mathias	1	155	155		Add the phrase “as well as on the time since rewetting” to the end of this sentence. This aspect is repeatedly discussed in Chapter 3 (for example Chapter 3 lines 267, 294, 369, 636 etc.) and should be mentioned briefly here, too.		accepted	we will cross-check our text with the other chapters

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0095	Batisha, Ayman	1	156	156		Maybe omitted		accepted	we will indeed delete this section
E_1_0096	Brown, Sandra	1	156			Section 1.4--do we really need this section if a GHG inventory manual--this is not an assesment and such info should be in IPCC assessments--need to keep inventory manuals short as possible , to the point, and succinct--can cross reference IPCC assessment reports on extent, ecology, gases , etc...keep to main point on these new sections. Please strive to keep manuals to point and cut our unneeded text asuch as this section. not sure this is of use to anyone really--nice though it is but this is not a reference manual on wetlands		accepted	we will indeed delete this section
E_1_0097	Roelandt, Caroline	1	156	157		add " by weight" after " 12 percent"		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0098	Batisha, Ayman	1	157	157		OF Maybe omitted		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0099	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	158	166		Not clear if defining wetland ecosystem or wetland in general, how this is linked with definions and comparisons did in Chapter 0. A clear definition could be provided in both Chapter 0 and Chapter 1.		accepted	we will discuss where to define wetlands vs. wetland ecosystems.
E_1_0100	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	158	onwards		line 82 Chapter 3 shall be introduced here		rejected	good observation and we will refrain from citing individual sections when we combine sections 1.3 and 1.4 into a text box

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0101	Wu, Shaohong	1	160	162		Manmade wetland ecosystems refer to "1.3" that could be constructed wetland, including reservoirs.		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0102	Brown, Sandra	1	161	161		can we be more general and use human made--I knowit is a bit cumbersome but it is better use		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0103	Lyde, Gund	1	161	162		Since drainage canals and reservoirs are considered wetlands, shouldn't lakes and rivers also be considered as such?		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0104	Lyde, Gund	1	162	166		What definition of wetlands is used for the GLWD and how does it differ from that used by IPCC?		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0105	Nielson, Ole-Kenneth	1	164	165		The quoted area of 12.8 million km2 does not match the area included in Table 1.1, where an area of 9.167 million km2 is listed for the same database.		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0106	Lyde, Gund	1	165	166		Consider including a general map showing the global distribution of wetlands		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0107	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Asa	1	168	169		Table 1.2 "GLWD-3" is not explained		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0108	Lyde, Gund	1	168	169		Consider indicating which estimate is closest when using the definition used in this supplement.		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0109	Lyde, Gund	1	168	169		Consider adding year of publication after each author in footnote c)		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0110	Wu, Shaohong	1	168	168		Differences of total area of wetland in table 1.1 is so great, which might influence carban emissions and removals estiamtion. The total areas could have 10 times difference and regioanlly more than 340 times! IPCC should not only list the data, but should also point out which one would be taken for assasment and give the reasons, and illustrate a relevant map.		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0111	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Asa	1	169	170		Table 1.2 "GLWD-3" is not explained		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0112	Parish, Faizal	1	169	169		The area under category 8 (bog, Fen, Mire) is significantly less that the total for peatland as in line 196 (4 million ha). Either the figure needs to be adjusted or a footnote is needed if peatlands are divided among several categories.		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0113	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	Table 1.2			see earlier comment. Is the category 'lakes' captured fully in current IPCC guidelines. This table would be more informative if its' possible to separate between mineral and organic soils.		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0114	Nielson, Ole-Kenneth	1	169	170		The area from GLWD in Table 1.1 and Table 1.2 does not match 9.167 vs. 9.226!		rejected	no longer relevant, see line 96
E_1_0115	Batisha, Ayman	1	172	172		Maybe omitted		Accepted	
E_1_0116	Batisha, Ayman	1	173	173		OF Maybe omitted		Accepted	
E_1_0117	Brown, Sandra	1	177	178		it might clarify this definition a little if the word The was added --to read The A horizon...etc..but still I am not clear here so there are two conditions--either thickness of organic horizons >=10 cm OR the A horizon must be less than 20 cm depth and contain >=12% organic C?... need to clarify		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0118	Lyde, Gund	1	177	177		Consider rewording 'greater than or equal to 10 cm' to 'equal or greater than 10...'. 		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0119	Lyde, Gund	1	177	185		For consistency in format, should we be using 'percent' or '% '?		Accepted	
E_1_0120	Ogilvie, James	1	177	186	1.5	Organic soils are not regarded (by most soil scientists, peatland ecologists and peatland managers) as peat until there is a minimum accumulation of 30cm (others believe it should be 40 or 50 cm). It is important these characteristics and differences are emphasised since they are important to understanding what happens to peat when it is drained and converted to other land uses.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0121	Yu, Kewei	1	178			percent and "%" are mixed in usage in this chapter. Replace "percent" with "%".		Accepted	
E_1_0122	Fenton, Nicole	1	179	180		This criteria is not very precise. It must contain more than 20% ... Or approximately 35%. These are not the same. A clarification would help.		Noted	
E_1_0123	Yu, Kewei	1	179	180		percent and "%" are mixed in usage in this chapter. Replace "percent" with "%".		Accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0124	Lyde, Gund	1	180	180		For consistency in format, should we be using 'percent' or '%' as done earlier in the supplement?		Accepted	
E_1_0125	Brown, Sandra	1	181	186		I understand comes from 2006 Guidelines but can you remind readers that the depths etc refer to point 1 condition. Just to make sure everyone is clear.		Accepted	
E_1_0126	Yu, Kewei	1	182			percent and "%" are mixed in usage in this chapter. Replace "percent" with "%".		Accepted	
E_1_0127	Yu, Kewei	1	184			percent and "%" are mixed in usage in this chapter. Replace "percent" with "%".		Accepted	
E_1_0128	Fenton, Nicole	1	186	186		This criteria is also not very precise. What is meant by intermediate?		Accepted	
E_1_0129	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	187	201		Include reference in the paragraph or in note 1 as follows, if applicable: FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC, 2012. Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.2). FAO, Rome, Italy and IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria.		Accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0130	Ogilvie, James	1	187	189		This may be true but several internationally used definitions do exist		Accepted	
E_1_0131	Ginzo, Hector	1	188	188		Replace ...links (and even largely equates) organic soils to peat soils...with ...and even equates organic soils with peat soils...because ...even equates...presupposes a linkage, and ...largely equates...is confusing since one can equate or not equate, but one cannot, e.g., half-equate.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0132	Penman, Jim	1	188			Replace 'and links (and even largely equates)' with 'and largely equates'. The latter formulation is simpler, and entails the former.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0133	Yu, Kewei	1	191			percent and "%" are mixed in usage in this chapter. Replace "percent" with "%".		Accepted	
E_1_0134	Parish, Faizal	1	192	193		The wording "require a slightly thinner organic layer for peatland (30cm)" is misleading as it is the minimum requirement for definition as peatland. The current wording is ambiguous and could be misread as organic layers thicker than 30cm are not peatlands		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0135	Fenton, Nicole	1	193	194		The discussion here is interesting, but it doesn't seem to lead anywhere, and then the lead in to the map. Maybe a better linkage would be to discuss how the map informs the discussion of definitions? And in fact a line beneath the map does just this - but it seems to be all on its own (The three highest classes give a good indication of the occurrence of organic soils)		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0136	Yu, Kewei	1	193			percent and "%" are mixed in usage in this chapter. Replace "percent" with "%".		Accepted	
E_1_0137	Sato, Atsushi	1	194	195		For the purpose of transparency, providing information how organic soil was defined by country is maybe recommended as "good practice"		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0138	Wu, Shaohong	1	195	197		Refer to figure 1.2 high organic carbon concentration is distributing in temperate areas, especially in the Northern Hemisphere. However, it only mentioned the 10% of soil organic carbon in tropical region, why?		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0139	Brown, Sandra	1	196	198		once again not needed--already mentioned on overview and not needed again....reduce irrelevant material . If going to provide the map in fig 1.2 suggest you add the web link in a footnote as well		Accepted with modification	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0140	Lyde, Gund	1	196	196		Consider changing 'A total of around' fo 'About'		Accepted	
E_1_0141	GUTIERREZ_BELTRAN, Natalia	1	196	197		Article requested by Colombia: Lappalainen 1996; 197 Joosten and Clarke 2002) of which 10% are found in tropical regions (Page et al., 2011		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0142	Brown, Lynette	1	199	199		Insert the word "organic" after the word "soil" in the figure title (assuming the legend OC stands for organic carbon).		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0143	Lyde, Gund	1	199	200		Figure 1.2 - Legend - What is 'OC'?		Noted	Will be explained in the text.
E_1_0144	Wu, Shaohong	1	199	199		Figure 1.2 should be a map of soil carbon content within wetland extents. What the map shows has been out of the discussion.		Accepted	
E_1_0145	Brown, Lynette	1	201	201		Delete the open parentheses before 2011 for consistent formatting.		Accepted	
E_1_0146	Brown, Lynette	1	after 201	after 201		In footnote #1 capitalize the h in "histisols".		Accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0147	Lyde, Gund	1	201	201		Consider using the same format for the year of a publication. For example - (Hiederer and Köchy (2011)) or (Hiederer and Köchy 2011) or (Hiederer and Köchy, 2011)? Each of these formats have been used in this chapter.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0148	Lyde, Gund	1	201	201		Footnote 2 - Consider adding that the same definition be used for each reporting period.		Accepted with modification	
E_1_0149	Brown, Sandra	1	202			section 1.6--seems to have be written by someone else and repeats material in overview andi find a lot of this section is not needed. Please edit and leav in the pertient sections such as delete lines 203-216 for starters--this is a repeat and not needed. If someone is going to use this supplement they will alaready be aware of this material--this supplement doe snot stand alone--please remember this and delete redundancies. Can start at end of line 218		accept	the first two paragraphs (lines 203-216) have been deleted
E_1_0150	Blondel, Ana	1	205	205		Should be "Cropland, Grassland" instead of "Grassland, Cropland", following the order of IPCC land-use categories in the 2006 guidelines and reporting tables.		noted	in the interest of making the report more user-friendly the section has been replaced with revised text
E_1_0151	Lyde, Gund	1	205	205		Cropland' is the only classification that is clearly a use. The others are more likely a refelction of vegetation cover or condition.		reject	These are land-use categories defiend in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines..., see also response to comment E_1_0154

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0152	Lyde, Gund	1	207	208		Are slums, favelas and informal settlements (refugee camps) considered managed?		noted	yes, they are settlements and they are always managed, it required no further clarification in the text. see also response to comment E_1_0154
E_1_0153	Wang, Chunfeng	1	212	213		For peat burning, the inter-annual variation is very large, it is not reasonable to assume the variation will average out over time.		noted	this is consistent with the 2006GL and does not require further clarification, see also response to comment E_1_0154
E_1_0154	Lyde, Gund	1	213	216		Guidelines assume that all emissions and removals from managed land are anthropogenic (the so-called managed proxy' The eruption of Mt. St. Helens in the USA 'removed' thousands of acres of managed forest land. The cause was not anthropogenic.		noted	this is correct and acknowledged and is an aspect of the 2006GL land management proxy; it is noted in the 2006GL that emission and removals due to natural causes can be substantial, however, they tend to average out over time and space as defined in the 2006GL (Volume 4, chapter 1, 1.4-1.5.), lines 203-216 have been deleted
E_1_0155	Lyde, Gund	1	214	216		I think it is erroneous to assume that all emissions and removals from managed land are anthropogenic. Lightning caused fires, areas destroyed by hurricanes, etc. that occur on managed land are not human-caused.		noted	see response to comment E_1_0154

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0157	Parish, Faizal	1	219	222		It should maybe also be noted that the 2006 IPCC guidelines includes many managed wetlands in other categories such as forest land grazing land and cropland with different definitions..		noted	we classify them still as forest, cropland and grassland but if they have organic or wet mineral soil characteristics you can use the guidance in the supplement to estimate emissions and removals
E_1_0158	Lyde, Gund	1	221	222		If natural rivers and lakes are considered wetlands perhaps they should be included in the wetland definiton just to be clear. Are ses and oceans also wetlands?		noted	see response to comment G_1_0090
E_1_0159	Herbst, Mathias	1	224	224		Can “human activity” be specified further to give the reader a better idea of what we are talking about? Are activities such as hay making or grazing included, or does the expression refer to something different?		accepted with modifications	the revised text makes clear both what is managed land and how the MLP is applied
E_1_0160	Lyde, Gund	1	225	226		Given that emissions and removals need to be estimated on all managed lands, then what is the need for the 6 land 'use' classes? Why not have just two classes - managed and unmanaged and on the managed lands all one is interested is in is essentially the change in vegetation and organic material in soils and waters. If that is the case, what is the need supplements for each land 'use'?		noted	methodology is specific for each land-use class and they are defined in the 2006GL

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0161	Roelandt, Caroline	1	227	228		replace "Cropland and grassland management" with "Cropland and grazing land management"		reject	not relevant, wrong draft version
E_1_0162	Roelandt, Caroline	1	227	227		replace "removals on the wetlands" with "removals on wetlands"		reject	not relevant, wrong draft version
E_1_0163	Brown, Sandra	1	228	236		and table 1.3 --this is all very nice but I was hoping to see a table that included example interventions that actually resulted in increased removals or emissions? This table does not do the job. I am not sure what your table 1.3 tells me		accept	Table 1.3., the reference to the table (lines 229-232) and lines 238-248 have been deleted
E_1_0164	Federici, Sandro	1	231	231	1.6	territory seems a better word than "base"		reject	"base" is the more common wording as used in the 2006GL, however the text has been deleted given that Table 1.3. has also been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163
E_1_0165	Batisha, Ayman	1	235	235		TABLE 1.3 MANAGED WETLANDS AND ORGANIC SOILS can also serve as a catalyst for regional integration, economical and political.		noted	meaning of the comment is unclear. however Table 1.3. has been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163
E_1_0166	Brown, Lynette	1	235	235		Either capitalize the first word of each bullet (as in the Production functions column) or don't - format for consistency.		noted	TSU checks for consistency, however Table 1.3. has been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0167	Brown, Lynette	1	235	235		Either include punctuation after each bullet (as in the Social functions column) or don't - format for consistency.		noted	TSU checks for consistency, however Table 1.3. has been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163
E_1_0168	Brown, Lynette	1	235	235		Please check whether the D in "De Groot" should be capitalized - a small d is used in the Reference section (line 503).		noted	TSU checks for consistency, however Table 1.3. has been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163
E_1_0169	Hakalahti-Siren, Teija	1	235	236		Table 1.3. The ecological and social functions listed in the table are considered as ecosystem services of natural areas. Is it possible that e.g. tourism in natural mire lead to greenhouse gases from the soil and therefore it should be treated as a managed wetland?		accept	Yes, areas for tourism could be considered to be managed, as listed in the table. No further action required. However Table 1.3. has been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163
E_1_0170	Herbst, Mathias	1	235	236		I would have expected aspects such as “biodiversity” or “species protection” under “Ecological functions”. Something in this direction should be added here, complementary to the “protection of genetic resources” which is listed under “Production functions”. In some wetlands this is actually the main reason for management activities that keep the vegetation short and avoid overgrowing of the wetland by shrubs.		noted	We do not feel that it is necessary to list "biodiversity" specifically since it is inherent to the production functions and is influenced by the interventions and practices listed. , however Table 1.3. has been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163
E_1_0171	Lyde, Gund	1	235	236		Table 1.3 Consider including a title for the first column such as 'Example'. Also consider including 'Benefits' in the table title.		noted	see response to comment E_1_0163

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0172	Mutka, Kari	1	235	236		Table 1.3. The ecological and social functions listed in the table are considered as ecosystem services of natural areas. Is it possible that e.g. tourism in natural mire lead to greenhouse gases from the soil and therefore it should be treated as a managed wetland?		noted	same comment as E_1_0169, see response to that comment
E_1_0173	Ogilvie, James	1	235	236		Table 1.3. The ecological and social functions listed in the table are considered as ecosystem services of natural areas. Is it possible that e.g. tourism in natural mire lead to greenhouse gases from the soil and therefore it should be treated as a managed wetland?		noted	same comment as E_1_0169, see response to that comment
E_1_0174	Penman, Jim	1	235	236		In Table, suggest delete 'signalisation', the meaning of which is unclear in this context, and replace 'symbolisation' with 'symbolical meaning'. 'Symbolisation' is very uncommon in English usage.		noted	Table 1.3. has been deleted, see response to comment E_1_0163
E_1_0175	Fenton, Nicole	1	237	247		If I have understood this properly this would imply that all emissions from a managed forest landbase would be considered anthropogenic. For boreal forest countries with a natural fire regime (e.g. Canada, Russia, USA) this seems vastly unfair. Wild fire in peatland forest (not human lit) is a major source of carbon emissions probably and in a changing climate it probably won't balance out in the long run (i.e. More carbon will be lost via fire than will be fixed in peatland forest growth)		noted	in the interest of simplification and maintaining the cook-book style of the supplement this paragraph has been deleted, see also response to comment G_1_0093

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0176	Parish, Faizal	1	237	247		What implications does this issue have on the efforts to differentiate between heterotrophic and autotrophic respiration in Chapter 2. Does it mean that there is no need to differentiate and that all emissions from managed land whether heterotrophic or autotrophic should be considered as emissions?		noted	this should not have any implications. In the interest of simplification and maintaining the cook-book style of the supplement this paragraph has been deleted, see also response to comment G_1_0093
E_1_0177	Rock, Joachim	1	237	247		The managed land proxy has been restricted by Descision 2/CMP.7 (Durban Decisions), especially by the annex to this decision. This paragraph does not reflect this, unfortunately.		noted	This Supplement is meant for general guidance for national GHG inventory - not specifically for the Kyoto Protocol Reporting. See also response to comment E_1_0175
E_1_0178	Sookan, Anand	1	242	247		These problems include ... Can we put these in a Box as they are important?		noted	in the interest of simplification and maintaining the cook-book style of the supplement this paragraph has been deleted, see also response to comment G_1_0093

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0179	Brown, Sandra	1	249	Fig 1.3		<p>nice figure --however all I see are gas effluxes--surely there are some removals so need ot show arrows for the three gases going the opposite way mangvoe restoration should have CO2 arrow going down for enahncement in biomass --also in rewetting peat soils--yes you can get increae in CH4 but then there has to be a reduction in CO2 emisisions--so need an black arrow pointing down here too--please make sure all sub figures have the arrows in both directions as needed. also onwetlands used for wastewater treatment--these could be forested and sequester carbon and theya re not always constructed..there is a body of literature on using forested wetlands for wastewater treatment in the USA. Some examples from my work taht could lead to other sources: Brown, S. 1981. A comparison of the structure, productivity, and transpiration of cypress ecosystems in Florida. Ecological Monographs 51:403-427.; K. C. Ewel and H. T. Odum 1984, (eds.), Cypress Swamps. University Presses of Florida, Gainesville--this contains many chapters about forsted wetlands and use for wastewater treatment. Brown, S. and R. Van Peer. 1989. Response of pondcypress growth rates to sewage effluent application. Wetlands Ecology and Management 1:13-20</p>		accept with modification	all arrows related to the greenhouse gas emissions are removed from the figure. The purpose of the figure is to convey to the reader what typical managment practices are addressed in the respective chapters. Therefore the gas flux arrows are unnecessary and there is insufficient space to include all possible arrows. Figure 1.3 is moved to section 1.7.2.
E_1_0180	Fenton, Nicole	1	249	250		<p>The figure implies that all managed peatland forests are drained. This is not the case.</p>		noted	as the caption states, the figure includes typical management practices, and is not inclusive. Non-drained managed peatland typically represent a very small area. Figure 1.3 is moved to section 1.7.2.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0181	Herbst, Mathias	1	249	253		I would add a “CH4” arrow to the “grassland management” part of the “coastal wetlands” too. Depending on the water table height CH4 may be emitted from the soil, and it is in any case emitted from the cow shown in the figure! This brings me to the figure below, “cropland and grassland management”, where the same applies to the cow. It should get a “CH4” arrow, because this will highlight an important case regarding the potential “double-counting” of greenhouse gases. If the GHG balance of such a site is monitored through Eddy Covariance, for example, CH4 emissions from animals will be included, although they might already be part of the emissions from the agricultural sector! Last, but not least, I wonder if the horizontal export of carbon as DOC should be indicated in this nice figure too, wherever it is relevant. It is mentioned quite a lot in chapter 3 and could easily be illustrated here.		accepted with modifications	see response to comment E_1_0179; Figure 1.3 is moved to section 1.7.2.
E_1_0182	Lyde, Gund	1	249	251		Great examples. Use of color brightens up the supplement and makes it more interesting.		noted	no change required
E_1_0183	Nair, Malini	1	249	253		The diagram although informative does not convey the total scientific meaning? Would some more processes and some less colors be helpful? The diagram would look more formal of in a black and white color scheme		noted	The purpose of the figure is to convey to the reader what typical management practices are addressed in the respective chapters rather than scientific processes. See also response to comment E_1_0179. Figure 1.3 is moved to section 1.7.2.
E_1_0184	Parish, Faizal	1	249	251		It is not clear that the diagrams show all the removals eg paludiculture and restored peatlands should lead to CO2 uptake. Ditches in drained peatlands should have CH4 Emissions		noted	see response to comment E_1_0179. Figure 1.3 is moved to section 1.7.2.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0185	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	1	Fig. 1.3			CH4 from drainage ditches could be added e.g. in the figure on forest management and cropland/grassland management.		noted	see response to comment E_1_0179. Figure 1.3 is moved to section 1.7.2.
E_1_0186	Parno Guimaraes, Giselle	1	251	251		The figure of chapter 5 should be before chapter 6		accepted	will be done. Figure 1.3 is moved to section 1.7.2.
E_1_0187	Batisha, Ayman	1	254	254		COHERENCE AND COMPATIBILITY Maybe CONSISTENCY		Consider this change	
E_1_0188	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	257	315		I am not sure which is the purpose of this section on Guidance in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, which is the link with the Wetlands Supplement chapters that are described later on. Maybe an introductory section after the tile 1.7 could be useful, and to better understand the purpose.		The text will be revised to add this clarity. An introduction has been added.	
E_1_0189	Blondel, Ana	1	269	269		Missing a blank space in sentence "Volume 4of the 2006 IPCC"		Agreed	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0190	Brown, Sandra	1	275	275		aminor point in the sentence starting Generic equationsthere is no need for a comma and the which should be repalced by that. In general you will always use that with no commas rather than which--which is used when following phrase is incidental--I do not think the phrase here is incidental		Agreed as required	
E_1_0191	Herbst, Mathias	1	281	284		I haven't checked, but did the 2006 IPCC guidelines say anything about such double-counting of CH ₄ fluxes? Would it be worth mentioning briefly whether this was considered or not in the 2006 guidelines? See also line 389!		Will include text under the heading "Methane Emission from Managed soils" to address this.	
E_1_0192	Penman, Jim	1	285	287		Should some of ' $\Delta C_{\text{mineral,LU}}$ ' be subscripts?		Editorial point is correct, however text of section includes unnecessary technical detail, therefore the specific sentence will be delete	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0193	Lyde, Gund	1	292	295		Shouldn't settlements and other lands be included with Forest, cropland and grassland?		Agreed, the 2006 guideline include generic guidance on emission burning from settlements and other lands. Text will be ammended according.	
E_1_0194	GUTIERREZ_BELTRAN, Natalia	1	294	295		The guidelines should include emissions of GHG generated by burning of peatland and soil organic matter, since it could be an important emission source for some countries.		No translation available	
E_1_0195	Roelandt, Caroline	1	299	299		replace "REMOVALSFROM" with "REMOVALS FROM"		Accepted	TSU is corrected. Probably captured in automatic spell check

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0196	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	306	307		Reservoirs or impoundments for water supply are not mentioned here. Are their included in the guidelines? Where? They should be mentioned here, saying if they are included or not, and where.		Agreed,	Additional text: "Specific guidance for emissions and removals associated from resevoirs or impoundments for water supply are not provide in the 2006 IPPC guidelines or in the Wetlands Supplement. However, it is suggested that invenotry complier assess whether the information provided in both documents related to similar water management systems (e.g. constructed wetland for waste water treatment) is applicable to their circumstances. "
E_1_0197	Brown, Sandra	1	312	315		Re wastewater...given IPCC 2006 GL aimed to be more comprehensive I am a little disturbed that C sequestration in constructed wetlands is not included...all work I have seen on this subject whether forested ones or herbaceous one is tht carbon accumulates on the site from high production and slower decompositon of organic material?		Noted	This comment was forwarded to Chaper 6 will add text as appropriate, to clarify that carbon emission and sink (CO2) will be not be specifically addressed in this supplement, and to refer to 2006 IPCC Guidelines and Chapter 3 of this Supplement

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0198	Brown, Sandra	1	316			section 1.7.2-it seems to me that this section could pretty much be this whole chapter--it says it here and to me this is all tht is needed....details will be given in each chapter and this ch 1 only needs to set up the scene--and I think this sections does it--tells reader what is being provided in the supplement--might want to reconsnder re-organizing this whole chapter and cutting it down to about 10-15 pages max. Could start with decison tree given near fron and then follow with this section. Please make sure material is not repeated		Accepted with modification	The text of chapter 1 has been revised to improve clarity, and condensed when possible. However, the authors are contrained by the agreed Table of Contents as regards structure
E_1_0199	Federici, Sandro	1	320	320	1.7.2	Other land are lands that have not significant stocks of carbon so should not be listed here		Rejected.	There is flexibility in the reporting system to allow unmanaged lands (with signifincat natural carbon stocks) to be reported in Other Land (where there is not sufficient activity data to differentiate the unmanaged category). The Other Lnad category is therfore often used as a catch-all. while this is not ideal, it is allowable. Other Land is included in the list of land use categories here for completeness, although the reviewer is correct, it is unlikely that a drained land would be reportable in this category.
E_1_0200	Batisha, Ayman	1	337	338		Chapter 3: Cross-cutting guidance on Rewetted Organic Soils and Restored Peatlands MAYBE Chapter 3: Guidance on Rewetted Organic Soils and Restored Peatlands		Noted	This is an issue for Chapter 3 to consider, We will adopt their solution

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0201	Brown, Lynette	1	340	340		site should be plural		Accepted, edit made	
E_1_0202	Ginzo, Hector	1	344	344		...Chapter 3 covers but only...What does Chapter 3 cover? Undrained inland organic soils, etc. (L345-L346)? Is the style not a bit twisted?		Accepted, edit made to provide clarity.	
E_1_0203	Wiseman, Michael	1	344	344		remove words (covers but})		Accepted, revision made to text to add clarity	
E_1_0204	Roelandt, Caroline	1	352	353		Table 1.4: this table is not clear and I don't see if its usefulness. Revise content, presentation and clarity.		Accepted with modification.	This table will revised, and moved to relevant section of Chapter 7, where the detailed discussion is useful.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0205	Bedard-Haughn, Angela	1	361	362		Why are methods for estimating N2O emissions not included in this chapter? Is this included elsewhere? (It is discussed in Ch. 5 but should perhaps be elaborated on here by way of very brief justification.)		Noted	added text will be added in this section to reflect the statement in Chapter 5.5 Future Methodological Development, and the need for more research before guidance can be provided. Suggested text: "There is insufficient information to provide guidance is not provide in the Wetlands Supplement to estimate N2O emissions from Inland Drained Mineral Soils, the generic methodology provided in 2006 IPCC Guidelines for mineral soils remains valid, the relevant emission factors are revised in this Supplement in Table 2.5. "
E_1_0206	Kishimoto, Ayaka	1	361	362		Please explain why "Methods for N2O are not included".		Noted	added text will be added in this section to reflect the statement in Chpter 5.5 Future Methodological Development, and the need for more research before guidance can be provided. Suggested text: "There is insufficient information to provide guidance is not provide in the Wetlands Supplement to estimate N2O emissions from Inland Drained Mineral Soils, the generic methodology provided in 2006 IPCC Guidelines for mineral soils remains valid, the relevant emission factors are revised in this Supplement in Table 2.5. "
E_1_0207	GUTIERREZ_BELTRAN, Natalia	1	370	371		Es necesario considerar las emisiones indirectas de gases de efecto invernadero procedentes de la lixiviación; escorrentía y volatilización de los suelos y por ende su metodología.		No translation available	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0208	Penman, Jim	1	379			Suggest delete ' General' in the heading - makes one wonder where the specific linkages are		Accepted	Accepted, delete "General", suggest text "OF GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS IN USING " the documents instead
E_1_0209	Wiseman, Michael	1	382	384		No need for second explanation (dead wood and litter)		Accept with modification,	We will review section to avoid unnecessary repetition. Much of this material is better placed in previous section
E_1_0210	Wiseman, Michael	1	386	386		Last word shouldn't be plural. Chapters		Agreed, it is "Chapter"	
E_1_0211	Brown, Lynette	1	388	388		Delete the extra period.		Agreed	
E_1_0212	Herbst, Mathias	1	389	392		I suggest mentioning grazing explicitly as an example of management of seasonally flooded land and as a potential source of double-counted CH4.		Reject,	this might cause confusion regarding animal emissions within Agriculture.
E_1_0213	Batisha, Ayman	1	402	402		TABLE 1.4 Should be reformatted.		Accept.	This table will revised and moved to chapter 7 where the information provided is more relevant to the detailed discussion.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0214	Blondel, Ana	1	402	402		Table 1.4: identifiers of land use or land-use change categories mentioned in this table (e.g. 3B1 to 3B6, 3B4ai, 3C4, 3C8) should be revised considering the new version of CRF tables as agreed in SBSTA meeting 35. Example: 3B1 to 3B6 should be 4.A to 4.F		Accept.	This table will revised and moved to chapter 7 where the information provided is more relevant to the detailed discussion. It is not possible at this stage to make the notation compatible with SBSTA 35 as the SBSTA process is not finalised
E_1_0215	Blondel, Ana	1	402	402		Typo in first row. Should be "climate domain, for all land-use" instead of "climate domain ,for all land-use"		Agreed, delete comma	
E_1_0216	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	402	402		Table 1.4: I found it useful to identify the differences between the IPCC 2006 and Wetlands Supplement, however, I am missing information regarding reporting notation: If to include notations such as 3B1 to 3B6. 3C4 etc.. then another table with a summary of this notation should be included somewhere.		Reject,	it is not possible at this stage to provide this notation as the SBSTA is not finalised. This table is moved to Chapter 7 where is more relevant.
E_1_0217	Kasimir Klemetsson, Asa	1	402	403		Table 1.4 It is unclear what the code 3B1 to 3B6 (and the others) refers to. The table is difficult to read.		Reject,	it is not possible at this stage to provide this notation as the SBSTA is not finalised. This table is moved to Chapter 7 where is more relevant.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0218	Wiseman, Michael	1	402			Table 1.4 Wetlands Supplement CH4 category section last part add word Land to Other all through the table this has been omitted		Accept, text will be revised. Table is moved to Chapter 7 where it is more relevant.	
E_1_0219	Nielson, Ole-Kenneth	1	402	403		The form of the bullets should be harmonised. In many cases the same variables are described (land-use category, climate domain, etc.) but in some cases these are separated into individual bullets while in other they are written in one bullet. This makes it very difficult to get an overview of the actual changes which presumably is the purpose of the table.		Noted	This is an editorial issue
E_1_0220	Batisha, Ayman	1	404	405		FOR WETLANDS AND ORGANIC SOILS Maybe omitted		rejected	this section heading has been agreed upon by IPCC
E_1_0221	Brown, Sandra	1	406			section 1.8--useful section so keep		accepted	
E_1_0222	Podest, Erika	1	407	408		proxy data....could also include soil organic layer depth and water table fluctuations		noted	the list is not meant to be comprehensive
E_1_0223	GUTIERREZ BELTRAN, Natalia	1	408	408		When referring to the variables in a database on soils, does the variable temperature refer to ambient temperature or soil's temperature? It should be specified.		rejected	see line 222

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0224	Brown, Sandra	1	410	410		see comment for line 275--same issue --will only point out twice but editors please get english correct in use of that versus which		accepted	
E_1_0225	Roelandt, Caroline	1	416	419		Please support this assumption with adequate references and definewhat "long term" means		rejected	not relevant
E_1_0226	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	437	470		Useful list but it will be necessary to include for the GHG compiler which type of information he/she can get from these sources, not all of them are specified. I will include as reference: FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC, 2012. Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.2). FAO, Rome, Italy and IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria, and the newly launch FAOSTAT Emission Database, domains Emissions-Agriculture and Emissions-Land Use which include activity data for drained organic soils (http://faostat.fao.org/). Metadata containing information on how activity data has been derived is also available from FAOSTAT.		accepted with changes	included a link to FAO website, but it is beyond the scope of this section to give technical recommendations about which soil database to use. The individual needs of each country will vary tremendously.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0227	Lyde, Gund	1	437	488		Good list of databases. Additional sources include FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC, 2009. Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.1). FAO, Rome, Italy and IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria. http://www.fao.org/nr/land/soils/harmonized-world-soil-database/en/ ; Harmonized World Soil Database v 1.2 http://webarchive.iiasa.ac.at/Research/LUC/External-World-soil-database/HTML/ ; World Soil Database' or WOSIS - http://www.isric.org/data/wosis ; JRC SOTER (Soil Terrain Database) http://eussoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/projects/soter/index.htm ; A Compendium of On-Line Soil Survey Information http://www.itc.nl/~rossiter/research/rsrch_ss_digital.html		accepted with changes	see line 226
E_1_0228	Artz, Rebekka	1	447			Link is broken		accepted	will fix
E_1_0229	Blondel, Ana	1	447	448		Broken link. The hyperlink string is being split between the two lines, this causes the link to be broken.		accepted	will fix
E_1_0230	Boudreau, Stephanie	1	460	460		Data available in the IMCG Global Peatland Database do not covered all countries/regions of the World. So far, the database contains information about peatland in Africa and Asia only.		accepted	deleted this reference from the list
E_1_0231	Brown, Lynette	1	469	469		The web site should be underlined for consistency.		accepted	will revise

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0232	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	471	487		Other potential sources: I will add a short paragraph on the purpose of this list,useful for GHG compilers		rejected	planning to delete lines 471-487 from the text entirely
E_1_0233	Tiemeyer, Bärbel	1	471	487		Further potential resource (precipitation data): Meteorological Offices or National Weather Services		rejected	planning to delete lines 471-487 from the text entirely
E_1_0234	Lyde, Gund	1	490	491		Not cited in text		Agreed	
E_1_0235	Brown, Lynette	1	after 491	before 492		Insert reference for Blodau 2002.		accepted	
E_1_0236	Lyde, Gund	1	492	493		Cogley 1987 and 1991 not cited in text		accepted	
E_1_0237	Lyde, Gund	1	493	493		Consider adding number of pages - 23		accepted	
E_1_0238	Blondel, Ana	1	495	496		Broken link. The hyperlink string is being split between the two lines, this causes the link to be broken.		accepted	
E_1_0239	Lyde, Gund	1	511	511		Consider adding URL http://www.fao.org/docrep/W8594E/W8594E00.htm .		accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0240	Lyde, Gund	1	517	518		Consider adding URL http://cedarcreek.umn.edu/biblio/fulltext/t1055.pdf		accepted	
E_1_0241	Lyde, Gund	1	519	520		Consider adding URL http://eusoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/esdb_archive/eusoils_docs/other/EUR25225.pdf		accepted	
E_1_0242	Blondel, Ana	1	532	533		Broken link. The hyperlink string is being split between the two lines, this causes the link to be broken.		accepted	
E_1_0243	Blondel, Ana	1	535	536		Broken link. The hyperlink string is being split between the two lines, this causes the link to be broken.		accepted	
E_1_0244	Lyde, Gund	1	540	542		Consider adding URL http://www.imcg.net/media/download_gallery/books/assessment_peatland.pdf		accepted	
E_1_0245	Lyde, Gund	1	545	546		Consider adding number of pages - 368		accepted	
E_1_0246	Blondel, Ana	1	548	549		Broken link. The hyperlink string is being split between the two lines, this causes the link to be broken.		accepted	
E_1_0247	Lyde, Gund	1	550	552		Consider adding URL http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/5/1379/2008/bgd-5-1379-2008-print.pdf		accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0248	Lyde, Gund	1	553	555		Consider adding URL ftp://esdora2.ornl.gov/pub/esdora_datasets/es/MAST-DC/SYNMAP_Chain/GLCC/es_MAST-DC.SYNMAP_Chain.GLCC+GLCC_Loveland_etal_2000.pdf+GLCC_Loveland_etal_2000.pdf.0.pdf		accepted	
E_1_0249	Brown, Lynette	1	556	556		Insert the word "and" between author names.		accepted	
E_1_0250	Lyde, Gund	1	556	556		Consider changing Matthews, E. and Fung.... to be in the same format as previous citations.		accepted	
E_1_0251	Lyde, Gund	1	558	559		Consider adding URL http://www.iisc.ernet.in/currsci/jan102005/25.pdf		accepted	
E_1_0252	Lyde, Gund	1	560	561		Consider adding URL http://peer.ccsd.cnrs.fr/docs/00/59/95/18/PDF/PEER_stage2_10.1111%252Fj.1365-2486.2010.02279.x.pdf (Note: this is a draft version)		accepted	
E_1_0253	Lyde, Gund	1	562	562		Consider adding a comma after Pendelton		accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0254	Lyde, Gund	1	562	567		Consider adding URL http://www.plosone.org/article/fetchObjectAttachment.action?uri=info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0043542&representation=PDF		accepted	
E_1_0255	Brown, Lynette	1	566	567		Delete reference - it does not appear in Chapter 1.		accepted	
E_1_0256	Lyde, Gund	1	566	567		Not cited in text. Change & to and to follow previous formatting.		accepted	
E_1_0257	Lyde, Gund	1	568	569		Not cited in text.		agreed	
E_1_0258	Lyde, Gund	1	568	569		Consider adding URL ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NSSC/Soil_Taxonomy/keys/2010_Keys_to_Soil_Taxonomy.pdf and number of pages - 338		accepted	
E_1_0259	Lyde, Gund	1	570	571		Consider adding URL http://nldr.library.ucar.edu/collections/technotes/asset-000-000-000-718.pdf and number of pages - 47		accepted	
E_1_0260	Brown, Lynette	1	576	576		The web site should not be underlined to be consistent.		accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
E_1_0261	Lyde, Gund	1	577	579		Consider adding URL http://www.epa.ie/downloads/pubs/research/climate/CCR_P_15_web.pdf		accepted	