

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0001	Boudreau, Stephanie	7	1	1		General comment: What official body is mandated to validate the accounting?		Noted	Noted - IPCC does not give guidance on accounting
E_7_0002	Radunsky, Klaus	7				It is noted that good practice guidance on the cross-cutting issues reporting and documentation, uncertainty estimation, key category analysis, completeness, time series consistency and quality control and quality assurance for the categories drained inland organic soils, rewetted organic soils and restored peatlands, coastal wetlands, inland wetland mineral soils and constructed wetlands - wastewater treatment can be found now under the respective chapters on methodological guidance of the 2013 supplement, chapter 7 on cross-cutting issues of the 2013 supplement and Voplume 1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. This is not very user-friendly and not practical at all. It should be therefore rewritten as part of another work-item, with the goal to provide a more user-friendly material.		Accepted	Accepted with modification - Chapter-specific guidance has been streamlined. Chapter 7 contains cross-cutting guidance.
E_7_0003	Radunsky, Klaus	7	68	69		The following wording is suggested: .. restoration of coastal wetlands, results ..and Other Land for some sources of ...		Rejected	Location unclear -therefore not addressed
E_7_0004	Brown, Lynette	7	75	75		Italicize "good practice" for consistency.		Partially accepted	Partly accepted - text revised; in all sentences "it is good practice to" the good practice will be italicized

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0005	Blondel, Ana	7	88	903		Section 7.2 and Annex 7.2 refer to reporting tables as provided in Volume 1, Annex 8A2 of the 2006 IPCC guidelines. However, the reporting tables for AFOLU were thoroughly revised in several SBSTA meetings and the final version was agreed in SBSTA 35, in Durban, Dec 2011. This final revised version defers to a great degree from the reporting tables presented in the 2006 IPCC guidelines. This looks like an apparent inconsistency at this moment. Is there a plan to consider this final revised version of reporting tables in the WL supplement? Recommend to include some explanatory text (e.g. a footnote) in section 7.1, providing some reference to the new reporting guidelines and tables		Accepted	Accepted - The difference between IPCC reporting tables and UNFCCC reporting tables will be explained.
E_7_0006	Brown, Lynette	7	99	99		Capitlaize and italicize "supplement" to be consistent throughout Chapter.		Accepted	
E_7_0007	Brown, Lynette	7	114	114		Awkward, suggest it read "is not however" - delete "anymore".		Accepted	
E_7_0008	Herbst, Mathias	7	143	150		I suggest mentioning the temporal variability of the emission factors here once again. This variability plays an important role in the text of Chapter 3 since CO2 and CH4 emissions usually change with time after rewetting. "Cross-cutting guidance" on how to use Chapter 3 should therefore include this aspect, and it should for example be pointed out that the Tier 1 methods neglect this variability and assume no transient period following rewetting.		Noted	Noted - The text is based on Tier 1 methods to provide guidance where /how reporting should be done. The issue relating to temporal variation will not be seen in the reporting tables but in documentation in the inventory report (addressed in chapters 2 to 6)
E_7_0009	Brown, Lynette	7	144	144		Insert period after "peatlands".		Accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0010	Radunsky, Klaus	7	191	191		The following wording is suggested: ..without trees may be classified as wetlands.		Accepted	
E_7_0011	Brown, Lynette	7	235	235		Capitlaize and italicize "supplement" to be consistent throughout Chapter.		Accepted	
E_7_0012	Herbst, Mathias	7	242	253		I suggest adding another case here that can be relevant for a country's GHG budget if grazing is used to manage rewetted sites. It should be reported where and how CH4 emissions from animals are counted. For example, as a part of the atmospheric exchange of a grazed wetland or marsh or as part of the agricultural budget? How was double-counting avoided?		Accepted	
E_7_0013	Federici, Sandro	7	247	251	7.2.2	I guess that default factors include only a portion of emissions from DOM i.e. emissions from litter; while emissions from dead wood are not included and should therefore be estimated and reported, if any, under DOM		Accepted	Text changes and clarified
E_7_0014	Radunsky, Klaus	7	249	249		The following wording is suggested: The risk is due to the fact that the flux ...		Accepted	
E_7_0015	Schlesinger, Peter	7	249	251		The reference is circular, because it refers back to 2006 Guidelines, and the 2006 guidelines show no reduction of uncertainty for land uses in IWMS areas		Noted	SEE response to comment 7 022 (not relevant here)

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0016	Brown, Lynette	7	260	264		Italicize "Wetlands Supplement" to be consistent throughout Chapter.		Accepted	
E_7_0017	Vermaat, Jan	7	300			Is n't this very much undergraduate textbook statistics? Is this needed?		Noted	Noted - Section 7.3 provides methods for inventory compilers with a range of statistical expertise. Some methods may seem basic to some, but it is necessary to ensure a minimum, consistent level of treatment of uncertainty.
E_7_0018	Nair, Malini	7	312	326		the approach is not scientifically correct. Need to make use of probabilities		Rejected	Rejected -The approach has been published in scientific references (e.g. Mandel, J. 1984. The statistical analysis of experimental data. Dover Publications, Mineola, NY, USA) and in the 1996 IPCC Guidelines. Probabilities are used in Approach 2.
E_7_0019	Herbst, Mathias	7	338	338		Insert “and temporal” between “spatial” and “variability”. This is relevant since N2O emissions are often closely related to fertilization and irrigation events.		Accepted	Accepted - Text inserted.
E_7_0020	Federici, Sandro	7	353	353	7.3.2	dissolved? I guess there is an error and the word "dissolved" should be deleted		Noted	Noted but no longer relevant - Text was deleted from Chapter 4, so it is deleted from Chapter 7.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0021	Blujdea, Viorel	7	409	414		I see a conflict between the statement on line 409 "derive a pdf from a random sample" which actually leads to an estimate of the variability of the population which is taken as a proxy for its uncertainty (this supports any type of distribution) and statement on lines 414-416 where SE of the mean is proposed to be used (in which case we should always deal with a normal distribution). I would suggest to add on line 409 that "... but be aware that the uncertainty of the estimate in this case can be overestimated" (as long as SD of dataset is involved instead of SE of the mean of the dataset). But, indeed a random sample as mentioned in 409 can be also used to derive SE by MC (bootstrapping), so if this is intention of the authors then maybe to review a bit the text.		Accepted	Accepted - The second sentence has been edited to note the different error measures for PDFs that follow different types of statistical distributions.
E_7_0022	Schlesinger, Peter	7	458	458		The reference is circular, because it refers back to 2006 Guidelines, and the 2006 guidelines show no reduction of uncertainty for land uses in IWMS areas		Accepted	Accepted with modification - Actually, the text did not refer to the 2006 Guidelines, just to Chapter 5 of this 2013 Supplement. The revised text includes information from Chapter 5.
E_7_0023	Brown, Lynette	7	487	487		Delete space between "per cent", it is one word.		Rejected	Rejected - UK English includes space - no change made
E_7_0024	Brown, Lynette	7	489	489		Delete space between "per cent", it is one word.		Rejected	Rejected -UK English includes space - no change made
E_7_0025	Schlesinger, Peter	7	489	489		Typographic error "per cent" should be "percent"		Rejected	Rejected - UK English includes space - no change made

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0026	Herbst, Mathias	7	493	514		Section 7.4.2 is very difficult to understand, especially the last paragraph. If I were an “inventory compiler”, I would have no idea what to do...		Accepted	Accepted - Text revised
E_7_0027	Schlesinger, Peter	7	499	505		move sentence about testing for significance in 499 to the next paragraph at end of line 505, to make it flow better		Accepted	
E_7_0028	Federici, Sandro	7	506	508	7.4.2	However, in page 4.8 of Volume 1 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines is written: "Those subcategories that contribute together more than 60 percent to the key category should be treated as particularly significant.".		Noted	Noted - The reason why this approach to identify the significant subcategories is presented here is that it is consistent with the guidance in the AFOLU for identifying significant categories, see decision trees in Figures 1.2 and 1.3 in Chapter 1 of volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.
E_7_0029	Brown, Lynette	7	507	507		Delete space between "per cent", it is one word.		Rejected	Rejected - UK English includes space - no change made
E_7_0030	Sato, Atsushi	7	518			The word of "national territory" may have confusion because coastal wetland may include sea area. This concept should be more precised (maybe in chapter 1).		Accepted	Accepted with modification - text how sea areas are included in the reporting is added
E_7_0031	Nair, Malini	7	533	548		bullet point 1 and bullet point 3 are the same		Accepted	Accepted with modification - Text changed to more clearly distinguish between the scientific methods advances of the first bullet and the wetlands management advances of the third bullet.
E_7_0032	Rock, Joachim	7	556	557		Given that land once classified as forest will most likely have to undergo a "deforestation" (in a formal sense) to be reported under "wetland" this might not be possible so easily. Please check.		Noted	Noted and checked - The text is merely noting that a country may chose to change its definition of wetlands to include mangrove forests.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0033	Lyde, Gund	7	574	574		Figure 7.1 - Consider inserting the Netherlands National Forest Inventory (NFI)		Accepted	Accepted - The legend for each figure is continued below the graphic. This has now been placed in bold to indicate this to readers. The long legend for Figure 7.1 provides details about the Netherlands National Forest Inventory.
E_7_0034	Schlesinger, Peter	7	602	603		Add that checks should be made of recent published literature for additional uncertainty data (e.g. Table 7.1).		Accepted	Accepted - Text has been added.
E_7_0035	Federici, Sandro	7	609	609	7.7.2	According to 2006 IPCC Guidelines, volume 1, chapter 6, this is a "verification", not a "validation"		Rejected	Rejected - The generally accepted scientific term is "validation."
E_7_0036	Nair, Malini	7	614	624		why not any validation studies from Asia? There is very little theory and validation techniques need references. In the current form, this section does not reflect enough scientific thought process		Noted	Noted - The section provides illustrative examples. It is not possible to provide examples from every part of the world. The current section provides numerous scientific references backing the thought process used.
E_7_0037	Schlesinger, Peter	7	620			The reference to the Kappa coefficient in Figure 7.3 should be removed (see Pontius & Millones, IJRS, 2011, Death to Kappa, that concludes that such indices are useless & misleading.)		Noted	Noted - The text identifies the fractional accuracy as the validation measure. It does not mention the kappa coefficient, although the original source table has both measures.
E_7_0038	Lyde, Gund	7	628	723		References - Check format for listing co-authors. Other chapters put last name first followed by initials. Should be consistent.		Accepted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0039	Brown, Lynette	7	629	634		Make sure there is a line between each reference.		Accepted	
E_7_0040	Brown, Lynette	7	772	773		I do not see footnote 3 referenced within the table.		Accepted	Accepted - added
E_7_0041	Rock, Joachim	7	774	775		Table XY: Organic soils may not only emit C-GHG but also non-C-GHG (N ₂ O, NO _x) when burnt like any other biomass. The table neglects the non-C-GHG.		Noted	Notd - See explanation in Chapter 2, Table 2.7, which does not provide default values for N ₂ O or NO _x .
E_7_0042	Brown, Lynette	7	776	777		2 should be subscript in all occurrences of CO ₂ -C.		Accepted	
E_7_0043	Rock, Joachim	7	783	793		These tables can be deleted since they are redundant with information contained in Chapters 2 and 4 of the 2006 GL and represent only one method to estimate emissions / removals anyway. A simple reference to the respective chapters should suffice.		Rejected	Rejected - For completeness, the tables remain.
E_7_0044	Brown, Lynette	7	828	829		Delete dash in "Subcategories".		Accepted	
E_7_0045	Blondel, Ana	7	852	852		Should be "7.2" instead of "7A. 2"		Rejected	Reject - formatting used in this Supplement
E_7_0046	Blondel, Ana	7	852	903		Naming and structure of reporting tables are not consistent with the reporting requirements as agreed in SBSTA35 meeting and as defined in the Annex 1 to the new reporting guidelines actually under final review.		Noted	Noted - No change made in tables but issue will be clarified (diff. With IPCC and UNFCCC tables)

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 7 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_7_0047	Abad Viñas, Raul	7	888	889		Table 3.4 AFOLU background Table is named as Biomass burning, however this Table reports emissions from Biomass burning, DOM burning, and SOM burning (i.e. not only biomass burning as stated in the title). In order to avoid this inconsistency, could be convenience to change the table title or, to call the carbon pool as Living biomass instead of, only biomass.		Accepted	Accepted with modification - Title changed to "Burning"
E_7_0048	Abad Viñas, Raul	7	888	889		CH4 and CO emissions from biomass burning are split on three carbon pools (i.e. Biomass, DOM and SOM). Could be interesting for consistency and comparability reasons, to split on those carbon pools CO2 and N2O emissions as well.		Rejected	CO2 split into three pools, but N2O not split due to relatively low amount of emissions from SOM, according to Chapter 2.
E_7_0049	Abad Viñas, Raul	7	893	894		In line with previous comment; foot note (3) says: " if CO2 emissions from biomass burning are not included in Table 3.2....". Since Wetland emissions are reported in Table 3.3 and since CO2 from biomass burning under Wetland are also considered, the foot note should be rewritten as: "if CO2 emissions from biomass burning are not included in Table 3.2 and/or Table 3.3...."		Accepted	
E_7_0050	Abad Viñas, Raul	7	908	908		There are a foot note (3) in the bottom of the Table 3.7, however, I cannot find the reference (3) in the Table.		Accepted	Accepted - added
E_7_0051	Brown, Lynette	7	908	908		Footnote 3 is not referenced within the table.		Accepted	Accept - added