

Review Comments by Experts on First Order Draft of 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (General comments)

Comment ID	Volume	Chapter	From line	To line	Comment	Expert	Response	Authors note
782	General				This is the "Refinement" of guidelines that already have seen "Revised supplementary methods" and a "Wetlands supplement". Will it be possible to provide, at the end of the process, a harmonized, at least digitally available version that covers the full state-of-the-art - without cross-referencing between different volumes?	Wilfried Winiwarter	Rejected	IPCC decided to prepare a "2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories" (2019 Refinement), which will not replace the 2006 IPCC Guidelines; it will be used in conjunction with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Consolidating all methodological guidance into a single report would require a new IPCC decision. However, guidance will be included in the Overview Chapter on how to use this report in conjunction with the 2006 Guidelines and other IPCC Methodology Reports.
784	General				In several instances (e.g. Vol. 4, Chapter 11, p. 11.12 footnotes) remarks are provided of a change to the 1996 guidelines. While I understand that this is original 2006 text (back then the remark may have been relevant) in the 2019 Refinement it is confusing, at best. Suggest to modify, e.g. by wording like: "change has been introduced with 2006 IPCC GHG inventory guidelines"	Wilfried Winiwarter	Accepted with modification	The proposed change is accepted in some cases while it is not in other cases, depending on the context of the text referring to 1996 Guidelines. The footnotes 11 and 12 on page 11.12 in Chapter 11, Vol.4 (which includes reference to 1996 Guidelines) should be modified, because the equation referred to here is Equation 11.6 which has been refined from 2006 Guidelines in this draft. However, reference to 1996 Guidelines in the other parts of this draft may still be valid depending on the context, which should not be changed.
39	General				The authors have done an excellent job at updating the Guidelines in my view, There are several sections and quite a few EFs that are 'TBD', but if these can be provided in the way the existing edits have been delivered then this will serve as an excellent report.	David Reay	Accepted	In principle, there should not be "TBD" in the Second Order Draft.
7292	General				With Annex 2.A1, for the first time IPCC GLs refer directly to "REDD-plus". I would strongly caution that any such step should be very carefully considered, and shall only be taken when full consistency with the existing regulatory framework for REDD-plus under the UNFCCC is maintained. Here, this doesn't seem to be the case (detailed comments to follow).	Dirk Nemitz	Accepted with modification	Vol.1, Chapter 1 should clarify that the IPCC Guidelines are for national GHG inventories. Vol.1, Chapter 1 also mention that it may be useful for other purposes. Other Volumes may provide examples of the use of the IPCC Guidelines for other purposes (including REDD+). Those examples should not be interpreted as guidance. Examples should be provided within a Box (not in Appendices or Annexes) clearly separated from the guidance in relevant Volumes.

Comment ID	Volume	Chapter	From line	To line	Comment	Expert	Response	Authors note
6326	General				I am the manager of California Air Resources Board's GHG inventory program. The comments submitted here contain ones from staff of the California Air Resources Board, Glenn Gallagher and Klaus Scott. They are lead staff for fluorinated gases inventory and AFOLU inventory, respectively.	Anny Huang	Noted	
454	General				my understanding is that the IPCC uses British English spelling; in which case there are many instances throughout of "program" that should be corrected to "programme". The exception being computer programs and where the word is part of the title of a (US) Program. In particular, e.g. in Chapter 2 of Vol. 1, the use should be consistent as here both programme and program are used for no good reason other than lack of editing	Pauline Midgley	Accepted	British English should be used except for proper nouns.
5342	General				I think a reference to the General Data Protection Regulation, which comes into force in May 2018, should be added as GDPR imposes obligations on persons requesting personal data to justify the need for the data and to only request data that they need i.e. not the full file. Personal data includes data relating to sole traders and partnerships as well as persons. Similarly a household file with any unique identifiers such as address or X/Y coordinates would come under GDPR requirements.	Gerry Brady	Accepted with modification	Data protection regulations differ depending on the country but the issue could be addressed generally in Vol. 1.
2282	General				The Parties who are using models should report the parameters of models as an appendix	Eray Özdemir	Rejected	Some models may include hundreds of parameters, it would not be sensible to have this as a general rule. Section 6.7.1.2 of the Volume 1 of the 2006 GLs already provides some useful guidance on how to transparently document the use of models.
10150	General		Abbreviation		Use NSO (National Statistical Office) instead of NSA	Wafa About Hosn	Accepted	