

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0001	Alfredsen, Gry	1	1	1	Consistent use thruout the document 'geo-reference' vs. 'georeference'.		Accepted	Revised
1_0002	Alfredsen, Gry	2	1	1	Inconsistent use of abbreviations in different subchapters and section, e.g. KP vs Kyoto protocol, LULUCF vs full name, reforestation deforestaion aforestation, greenhouse gases vs. GHG. Should the abbreviations be reintroduced in each chapeter or sub chapter?		Accepted	Efforts have been made to improve consistency
1_0003	Alfredsen, Gry	1	1	1	How references to the key documents like e.g. Decision 2/CMP.7 and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines are written in the different chapters and sections vary a lot.		Accepted	Efforts have been made to improve consistency
1_0004	Alfredsen, Gry	1	1	1	When refereeing to other sections in the guidance it is usual done by giving the number of the section. But sometimes the full name of the section is given. Should aim for consistency in the document.		Accepted	Efforts have been made to improve consistency and use only the section numbers not their titles.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0005	Alfredsen, Gry	1	1	1	Regarding methodological issues, like uncertainty assessment, QA/QC, documentation etc. A lot is given in 2.4, but these issues are also addressed in other sub chapters/sections. Some parts are repetitions; some generally valid information is only given in one place. Can this be coordinated better? Like one general part and sections addressing section specific issues. Just an idea, I know it is difficult to change or reorganize structure. Could be a way to save some space.		Accepted	We have improved coordination across sections but may not have resolved all issues identified here.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0006	Elvidge, Craig	1	1	1	<p>Issue: The First Order Draft needs to be revised throughout to retain the original and CMP-agreed definition of 'reforestation', which specifies that reforestation is limited to lands that did not contain forest on 31 December 1989. This definition was not changed at Doha. The CMP decided at Cancun that the same definition of reforestation, contained in decision 16/CMP.1, will apply to LULUCF activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4 in CP2, and this was reiterated at Durban. Parties made this decision at Cancun in decision 2/CMP.6 (paragraph 2), which stated that the CMP “Agrees that the definitions of forest, afforestation, reforestation, deforestation, revegetation, forest management, cropland management and grazing land management shall be the same as in the first commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol”. This decision was again confirmed at Durban in decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 2, which stated “that anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks shall be accounted for in accordance with the principles and definitions referred to in decision 2/CMP.6, paragraphs 1 and 2, and in accordance with the annex to this decision”. It was also confirmed in paragraph 1 of the Annex decision 2/CMP.7.</p> <p>Allowing reforestation on lands that were forest at 1990, or even more recently, but which have subsequently been deforested, calls into question the 'additionality' of forestry removals under Article 3.3 accounting, and of any units issued for reforestation under this Article. Such a change has serious implications for the environmental integrity of</p>		Accepted	This change has been implemented throughout - and SOD is now consistent with 2.CMP/7.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0007	Elvidge, Craig	1	1	1	In addition to the points made above (comment ID 1_0006), about the incorrect revision to the reforestation definition, a further problem created by this change in definition is the change in the hierarchy of Article 3.3 activities. The First Order Draft needs to be revised throughout to retain the original precedence of Deforestation over A/R. Deforestation land must continue to be higher in the land classification hierarchy than Article 3.3 - A/R land. Once land is classified as D land, it must remain D land, to avoid future replanting on this land being confused with the genuinely 'additional' afforestation and reforestation under Article 3.3. The precedence of D over A/R, as contained in the original GPG Guidelines, therefore also needs to be retained in the revised guidelines.		Accepted	This change has been implemented throughout - and SOD is now consistent with 2.CMP/7.
1_0008	Federici, Sandro	1	1	1	In the report sometimes is used "natural disturbance" and sometimes "natural disturbances". It seems to me that the correct language is "natural disturbances" (plural). Such notation should be made consistent all over the report.		Accepted	Revised where appropriate
1_0009	Forbes, Keith	1	1	1	In general, I find the structure of an overview, generic methodologies, and then specific ones to be confusing and distracting. Suggest re-structuring this as a manual, with modular sections and not as a report. Readers should be able to consult only the section of interest and find everything they need. Stating what each section is going to contain and then doing so is unnecessary. The report seems repetitive and is hard to read.		Rejected	The instructions to authors were to maintain the same structure as in the 2003 GPG for consistency and clarity.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0010	Hoover, Coeli	1	1	1	Many terms are defined at the beginning of the chapter. I recommend including the definitions of land use and land cover, since these are key terms used in the document and the distinction between the two is often a point of confusion.		Noted	Yes - the definitions of Land-use and land-cover have been provided in the glossary of 2006GLs.
1_0011	Gonzalez, Patrick	1	7	7	To be consistent with other IPCC reports, add the author names and a citation for the report on the cover page of each chapter, so that all pertinent information is on one page. Example of a citation: "Lavell, A., M. Oppenheimer, C. Diop, J. Hess, R. Lempert, J. Li, R. Muir-Wood, and S. Myeong, 2012. Climate change: new dimensions in disaster risk, exposure, vulnerability, and resilience. In Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.		Accepted	Yes - the author names will be added in SOD version of the report.
1_0012	Ngarize, Sekai	1	15	15	the wording 'as of the reporting year' is confusing		Accepted with modification	Caption has been edited during the revisions
1_0013	Lund, H. Gyde	1	24	24	Consider providing a site or road map or organization chart to show where this supplement falls in relation to other IPCC/KP documents. Consider doing for every supplement.		Accepted with modification	The context of this document is covered in the background of the overview chapter
1_0014	Lund, H. Gyde	1	24	24	Consider including a list of acronyms before this section as there are quite a few in this document.		Accepted	A list of acronyms will be included as an annex to the document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0015	Lilleskov, Erik	1	25	25	Define "good practices" here or at an appropriate definitions page.		Accepted	A explanation of Good Practice has been added.
1_0016	Lund, H. Gyde	1	25	27	I think what we really are trying to track is simply change in vegetation - amount, location and type. A land use may or may not be associated with a change in cover and vice-versa.		Rejected	This is too simplistic a view and is not consistent with 2006 GL and GPG

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0017	Pulles, Tinus	1	25	27	<p>This opening sentence leads in my view to an essential question that needs to be answered first. This could probably be done in a foreword or so, but would be needed to clearly explain the differences in roles between the Convention and its protocol(s) and IPCC.</p> <p>I write the lines below, before I have read anything more than the first few pages. It might be that this document exactly does what I am saying here. In that case this remark could lead to indeed a explanatory text on these issues ion the foreword.</p> <p>The difference between the UNFCCC/KP and IPCC becomes, I think, a bit problematic when we realize that reporting for the Kyoto Protocol is on accounting, whereas the reporting for the Convention is on establishing emission and removal levels. Accounting processes might need a different breed of rules than scientific understanding can provide. The IPCC Guidance should concentrate on the scientific elements of this.</p> <p>If I apply this for, for instance, the choices made by Parties to the KP in their Initial Reports on the definitions of "Forest", one would expect this IPCC Guidance be developed along lines that would work for any definition of forest in terms of minimum plot size, minimum tree height and minimum tree crown cover. The IPCC text should be implicitly aware of the fact that these choices have an impact on the accounting and not on the real world emissions/removals.</p>		Accepted with modification	This comment covers many different points. The main point, namely to provide more information on which required new information arises from 2,CMP/7 is now covered in the overview chapter.
1_0018	Bernoux, Martial	1	26	26	add the word "antropogenic" : reporting of anthropogenic GHG emissions		Accepted	Inserted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0019	Pan, Xubin	1	26	27	Delete the "forestry" and just "LAND USE and LAND-USE CHANGE"		Rejected	This comment is rejected as the terminology LULUCF is mentioned in Kyoto Protocol Article 3.3
1_0020	Pulles, Tinus	1	28	28	This is already an example of what I mean in the comment above (comment ID 1_0017): Whether or not these activities are selected for the accounting is not relevant for the scientific/technical guidance. It is relevant for the accounting.		Rejected	The sentence refers to which activities and makes no reference to accounting.
1_0021	Pulles, Tinus	1	29	29	apply or "relevant". If a Party is not listed, the IPCC Guidance should still be valid and apply, but probably is not of any use for them in their accounting.		Accepted with modification	Addressed the point by rewording the sentence
1_0022	Lundblad, Mattias	1	32		It is said that information related to article 6 projects is not included in this GPG. However, for instance in section 1.1 and 1.3 and other places article 6 is mentioned.		Rejected	While we make reference to Article 6, we do not provide guidance for Art. 6.
1_0023	Galinski, Wojciech	1	33	34	which are addressed in Section 4.3 of 34 the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (GPG-LULUCF).		Rejected	not sure what is ment by "of 34"- not appropriate.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0024	Pulles, Tinus	1	35	36	Again a text that confuses the estimation of emissions with the accounting under the KP: Parties are to report emissions and removals from LULUCF, both under the Convention and under the KP. The KP deviates when it starts accounting. There are specific issues introduced because of the accounting. These accounting specificities require additional information. Again the emission/removals do not change, but due to the accounting approach, a number of more or less arbitrary (from the scientific point of view) choices must be made. These include * a choice to only include effects of ARD activities that occurred since 1990. * election of activities that are and that are not included in the accounting		Rejected	This text makes no reference to accounting - it merely states the need to estimate and report emissions.
1_0025	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	36	36	insert "mandatory activities" after "include"		Accepted with modification	Changed wording to distinguish between mandatory and elected reporting obligations.
1_0026	Mueller, Christoph	1	39	40	The sentence should start with "Compliance....."		Rejected	Original sentence is OK
1_0027	Ngarize, Sekai	1	39	39	Footnote 1: definition of 'wetland drainage and rewetting': '... where drainage is the direct human-induced lowering of the soil water table...' should be '...where drainage is the direct human-induced lowering of the soil water table...'		Accepted	corrected

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0028	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	41	41	Annual reports for annex I countries are based on the National Inventory Report (NIR) and the Common Reporting Format (CRF), I suggest to include it specifically once at least, if applicable.		Accepted	NIR and CRF are inserted
1_0029	Mueller, Christoph	1	41	41	only mention by sources and sinks; sinks imply removals		Rejected	This is statement is presented in the UNFCCC article 4.1
1_0030	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	41	41	inser at the end of line "under the UNFCCC"		Rejected	this wording is used consistently by UNFCCCC
1_0031	Pulles, Tinus	1	43	44	Probably better as follows: "The rules under the KP require annual reporting, but allow for accounting over the full time period of the commitment period. Any guidance provided by IPCC therefore would need to provide for annual reporting, even when commitment period accounting is selected. Such Parties are expected to develop systems that combine measurements, models and other tools that enable them to report on an annual basis."		Accepted with modification	Added reference to the option to account either annually or over full CP.
1_0032	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	43	44	suggest to insert a reference to the relevant section of the IPCC 2006 GL where this idea is elaborated		Accepted	Relevant reference inserted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0033	Pulles, Tinus	1	45	48	<p>I've always understood that the IPCC 2006 GLs updated and replaced earlier guidance (1996 GLs and GPG). Apparently this is not the case for LULUCF. If it were, citing the GPG2003 would not be needed. Nevertheless, I am getting quite confused by this all. Will users of this document still need to study earlier IPCC guidance documents for LULUCF?</p> <p>Is the need for this document based on in complete or unclear guidance in the 2006 GLs or has the science changed?</p> <p>My guess would be that the policy environment has changed and this change might lead to need for other or additional scientific guidance. I think that the positioning of this document as an IPCC product would gain from a clear explanation in the introduction that not too much science has changed since the 2006 GLs, but that the policy decisions in COP and CMP have lead to the need of additional guidance. If this is correct this paragraph should state that this document does "expand" the guidance as a consequence of these decisions, rather than builds on it.</p>		Accepted with modification	The positioning of and need for the document is now explained clearly in the overview chapter.
1_0034	Vreuls, Harry	1	45	48	<p>The text "it replaces Chapter 4 ... consistency" is not a clear reference. I assume it referring to the GPG-LULUCF2003. Is the planning to change the GPG-LULUCF and only keep section 4.3? I suggest to delete the text from line 46 starting with "and it replaces..</p>		Rejected	2006 GL have replaced much of GPG - but do not address KP reporting needs which are updated here.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0035	Rogiers, Nele	1	46	46	Add 2013 IPCC Wetlands Supplement?		Rejected	Wetlands supplement is being developed in parallel and cannot yet be referenced.
1_0036	Radunsky, Klaus	1	47	48	The intention to maintain the structure and wording of chapter 4 is fully supported. However, for greater clarity it would be helpful to be more specific: chapter 4 of the GPG-LULUCF.		Accepted	added referenc to GPG-LULUFC
1_0037	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	47	47	insert "content, " after "The"		Rejected	Does not add clarity.
1_0038	Hernandez-Tejeda, Tomas	1	49	49	My suggestion is to include the term: "devegetation", which is discussed widely in the IPCC Report on definitions and methodological options to inventory emissions from direct human-induced degradation of forest and devegetation of other vegetation types, to the list of definitions. ISBN 4-88788-004-9 (IPCC, 2003).		Rejected	There is no reference to devegetation in the decisions for CP2.
1_0039	Kim, Raehyun	2	49	50	"Note 1, Reforestation". It is need to insert "on" between "forest" and "31" as follow the original sentence in Decision 16/CMP.1.		Accepted	On was inserted
1_0040	Lilleskov, Erik	1	49	49	Footnote 1, check spelling—"lowing of the soil water table" should be "lowering of the soil water table".		Accepted	corrected

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0041	Lund, H. Gyde	1	49	49	Footnote 1 - May we assume an area is not considered afforested or reforested until the trees on the land meet the minimum criteria for 'forest'? In other words while an area may have been planted with trees, it is not counted as forest land until the cover reaches at least 10 percent.		Rejected	Forest definition includes land that with seedlings that do not yet meet the height or canopy closure thresholds but are expected to reach these.
1_0042	Sato, Atsushi	1	49	49	The web-link of LULUCF rule 16/CMP.1 is FCCC/KP/CMP/2005/8/Add.3 p3. The web-link of Marrakesh Accords seems better to be updated.		Accepted	These were corrected and updated.
1_0043	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	49	footnote 1	LULUCF related decisions include more decisions of CMP.1		Accepted with modification	To be updated
1_0044	Sookun, Anand	1	49	49	Are the footnotes - definitions in line with FAO? Or should it be in line?		Rejected	These are the UNFCCC definitions - not those of the FAO.
1_0045	Balo Akakpo, Olade	1	51	54	This information shall be reviewed as part of the annual compilation and accounting of emissions inventories and assigned amounts according to Article 8, paragraph 1 of the Kyoto Protocol.		Accepted	Revised, a sentence was added in revised text
1_0046	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	51	102	In general, I will suggest to organise better the items which have been addressed in this section, giving them an order according an importance.		Accepted with modification	The section was reorganised by revision the sentence .

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0047	Pulles, Tinus	1	51	51	... supplementary, but consistent, ... (?)		Noted	Comment is not clear
1_0048	Pulles, Tinus	1	52	52	... Countries therefore do not need		Accepted with modification	Country was change to Annex I party according to to 15/CMP.15 and Article 7 of KP
1_0049	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	53	53	Add "annually" after "supplementary information under the KP"		Accepted with modification	Annual was added before inventory
1_0050	Sperow, Mark	1	53	53	Add "(KP)" - KP is used later (Line 87) so should be defined first use.		Rejected	It is not first use
1_0051	Christophersen, Øyvind	1	54	54	Please consider to change "inventory report" to "annual submission".		Rejected	According to 15/CMP.15 and Article 7 of KP, it should be inventory , not annual submission
1_0052	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	54	54	suggest to add a reference to the UNFCCC reporting guidance that includes provisions on what and how to report, and also that the supplementary information has been so far reported as a stand-alone chapter of the NIR		Rejected	This guideline is for KP
1_0053	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	55	59	National systems (art 5. KP) will encourage countries to provide a consistent UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol reporting. I will suggest to underline this paragraph as a good practise rather than examples.		Accepted with modification	" for example" was replaced by" in practice " in revsied Text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0054	Pulles, Tinus	1	56	59	<p>In fact, this text triggered my comment on lines 25 to 27 above (comment ID 1_0017).</p> <p>In my opinion any IPCC text should work from a technical or scientific understanding of the information the Convention and Protocol are needing and then provide good practice on how to generate this information.</p> <p>As long as indeed the additional information required for accounting under the KP is consistent with the scientific understanding of emissions and removals, as laid down in the latest IPCC Guidelines, any consideration of how Parties do what they promised to do now could be presented in a text box as background information, but should not be part of the flow of text in the guidance.</p> <p>Using the term "national circumstances" in this text sounds to me as being too political. The technical guidance itself should not be dependent on such "national circumstances". It could be dependent on national geography, meteorology, orography etc.</p>		Rejected	National circumstances is currently used terminology and it goes beyond topography etc and includes for example what types of forest inventory systems are in place and what approaches have been used in the past.. The first part of the comments is not clear.
1_0055	Radunsky, Klaus	1	59		It is suggested to add: ... And Kyoto Protocol reporting at the same time.		Rejected	Kyoto Protocol is included in original sentence
1_0056	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1	60	60	If in line 37 & 38, all activities have acronym letters, in line 60 "cropland management", as it's 1st cited, acronym (CM) could be added		Accepted	CM was included in revised text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0057	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	60	65	This example could be more useful if placed at the end of this section. There are other relevant things related to UNFCCC and KP reporting relationship which need to be addressed before this example. For instance, where to report non-Co2 emissions.		Rejected	This example explained the sequence of reporting information
1_0058	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	63	63	should also delieate the change of those UNFCCC cropland area that originated from forest since 1990 in the commitment period.		Rejected	The delieate should not be included in this introduction section
1_0059	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1	64	64	replace "deforestation" by D		Accepted with modification	replace "deforestation" by "Deforestation" in the text of SOD
1_0060	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1	65	65	replace "cropland management" by "CM"		Accepted with modification	replace "cropland management" by "Cropland Management"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0061	Pulles, Tinus	1	66	74	<p>In view of the above (comment ID 1_0054) I propose to reformulate this paragraph as follows:</p> <p>"Accounting as agreed by the the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties (CMP) of the Kyoto Protocol (such as caps, annual vs. commitment period accounting and other specific provisions related to accounting), requires additional information on a number of activities within the LULUCF sector. This document covers supplementary guidance needed for reporting and accounting under the Kyoto Protocol.</p> <p>Estimation refers to the way in which inventory estimates are calculated, reporting refers to the presentation of estimates in the tables or other standard formats used to transmit inventory information, and accounting refers to the way the reported information is used to assess compliance with commitments under the Kyoto Protocol."</p>		Accepted with modification	These terms now have been explained more clearly in the document using alternate wording (but consistent with) the reviewer's suggestion.
1_0062	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	67	67	add "for activities taking place after 1st January 2013" after "under the KP", to make sure that these guidelines are not going to be used for 2014 inventory, where the rules for the first commitment period apply.		Accepted	Correct and revisions have been made
1_0063	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	67	69	actually, this supplementary guideline is addressing part of the rules as the agreed in the relevant decision, but not all.		Accepted	Sentence was rephrased in revised Text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0064	Alfredsen, Gry	1	70	71	I am not sure I got the full meaning of this sentence. Would it be possible to rephrase?		Accepted	Sentence was rephrased in revised Text
1_0065	Forbes, Keith	1	70	74	So, could a party follow the estimation and reporting protocols in this document, and still be found non-compliant with KP commitments? This distinction, though clear will cause a lot of confusion, especially in countries where capacity is low.		Accepted	Sentence was rephrased in revised Text
1_0066	Galinski, Wojciech	1	70	70	"Not included" is a better expression		Accepted	Sentence was rephrased in revised Text
1_0067	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	72	72	reporting is not only tables with numbers, rather, it includes a lot of methodological information and other information that is not reported in tables		Accepted	Sentence was rephrased in revised Text
1_0068	Herold, Anke	1.1	75	79	It would be useful to expand the explanation whether and which practical implications the distinction of units of land and land has.		Accepted	Units of land , land were removed from revised text
1_0069	Vreuls, Harry	1	75	79	Is the differentiation between units of land and land still as important as it was? WDR now also include a minimum area, so units of land is more appropriate for this		Accepted	Units of land , land were removed from revised text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0070	Brandon, Andrea	1	76	79	The terms "Units of land" and "land" have not been used consistently throughout the document.		Accepted	Units of land , land were removed from revised text
1_0071	Lundblad, Mattias	1	76	79	Although "units of land " and "land " is used in the relevant decisions it is not clear what is the real difference between the two is.		Accepted	Units of land , land were removed from revised text
1_0072	Pulles, Tinus	1	76	79	<p>My simple understanding here is that some "land"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * was, but no longer is forest (deforestation) * is, but earlier was not forest (afforestation) * is, was not forest shortly ago, but was forest a bit longer ago (reforestation). <p>"units of land" simply are plots of land that fall under the above "lands".</p> <p>Am I wrong? If not there is no reason to be more complicated than the above. The timing (50 years for the distinction between afforestation and reforestation) is a political choice.</p>		Accepted	Units of land , land were removed from revised text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0073	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	76	79	This separation is clear, however, in our opinion this shall be mentioned, but not be maintained in this document. It is more clear that in this document one of the two is chosen. In the case that the authors decide to maintain this separation, this shall be done consistently and the term 'area of land' shall be avoided. An example of lines where this is not consistently being done yet:	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Units of land , land were removed from revised text
1_0074	Burgess, Deborah	1	80	84	At this point it would be good to elaborate which activities are manatory and which are elective using the table from line 424. This needs to be made explicit at the outset to avoid confusion later.in the document.		Rejected	Already mentioned in the text
1_0075	Pulles, Tinus	1	80	84	Again: this distinction could be (in fact is) important for accounting, not for the science behind it! Needs rephrasing		Rejected	Here we only explain terminology
1_0076	Ngarize, Sekai	1	81		as well as' not 'as wells as'		Accepted	changed in revsied text
1_0077	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	81	81	Delete 's' in wells. Include 'Article' before 3.4.		Accepted	changed in revsied text
1_0078	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	82	82	Include 'Article' before 3.4.		Accepted	changed in revsied text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0079	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	82		3.4 activities that can be elected by a country...'. Please explain where this election shall be based on. In our opinion, the election shall have a basis such as the significance of source (see earlier comment)	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	election of 3.4 activities shall based on the decision 2/CMP.7,
1_0080	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1	83	84	Consistence among acronims or not in 3.3 + 3.4 activities; GM, RV, WDR first time cited in lines 83-84, but accronims appear in lines 141-142		Accepted	changed in revsied text
1_0081	Elvidge, Craig	1	85	88	Issue: Decision 2cmp.7 did not revise the definition of reforestation. The definition of reforestation is the same for the first and second commitment period. The definition of reforestation needs to be consistent with decisions 16/CMP1, 2/CMP.6, 2/CMP7 the Doha decision relating to Articles 5,7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol. Action: Please delete reference to the definition of reforestation being revised and review the guidelines accordingly		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0082	Vreuls, Harry	1	85	87	It it stated that 2/CMP.7 "revised the definition of reforestation". It is not clear to my what this revision is, as 2/CMP.7 Annex, para 1, only adds definitions to those in decision 16/CMP.1. In case there is a revision, care should be taken for consistentie between the footnoot 1 holding the definition and the revised definitions (that would be used in the document		Accepted	This section was deleted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0083	Brandon, Andrea	1	86	87	Decision 2/CMP.7 did not revise the definition of reforestation. The decision states absolutely that the definitions contained in decision 16/CMP.1 shall apply.		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0084	Canaveira, Paulo	1	86	87	there is no revised definition of reforestation		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0085	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	86	87	The definition of reforestation has not been revised. Delete "and revised the definition of reforestation". According to decisions 2/CMP.6 and 2/CMP.7, the same definition of reforestation applies to the second commitment period. 1990 is still the cut off date for this activity.		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0086	Herold, Anke	1.1	86	87	The statement that decision 2/CMP.7 revised the definition of reforestation seems incorrect. The decision states in para 1 of the annex that "For land use, land-use change and forestry activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, the following definitions, in addition to those contained in decision 16/CMP.1 and referred to in decision 2/CMP.6, paragraph 2, shall apply, and only new definitions 'natural disturbances' and wetland drainage and rewetting' are defined. For the other definitions, the previous definitions remain in place.		Accepted	This section was deleted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0087	Nagahisa, Akane	1	86	87	I request to delete the phrase "and revised the definition of reforestation" because the definition of reforestation remain the same as in the first commtment period. (Cf. Paragraph 1 of the Annex of decision 2/CMP.7 reads "for land use, land-use change and forestry activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol, the following definitions, in addition to those contained in decision 16/CMP.1 and referred to in paragraph 2 of decision 2/CMP.6, shall apply...", where the paragraph 2 of decision 2/CMP.6 reads "agrees that the defisitons of forest, afforestation, reforestation, deforestation, revegetation, forest management, cropland management and grazing land management shall be tha same as in the first commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol".		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0088	Perugini, Lucia	1	86	87	The definition of reforestation has not been revised. Delete "and revised the definition of reforestation". According to decisions 2/CMP.6 and 2/CMP,7, the same definition of reforestation applies to the second commitment period. 1990 is still the cut off date for this activity.		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0089	Sato, Atsushi	1	86	87	The definition of reforestation itself was not revised based on 2/CMP.6. I do recognize that reforestation definition should be read updated way, so I consider this situation is correctly reflected to the text.		Accepted	This section was deleted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0090	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	86	87	in my understanding, the definition of reforestation is not reivised. Or specifying which decision you are citing.		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0091	Mueller, Christoph	1	87	87	write: This enabled (keep the past tense as from the previous sentence)		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0092	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	87	87	Not clear where and how the reforestation definition was changed. Perhaps include a footnote explaining this.		Accepted	This section was deleted
1_0093	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	89	94	I will shift this paragraph to the begging of the section "Relationship between UNFCCC and KP reporting", since data consistency is a key issue and is linked to the National System. I would suggest to encourage countries not only to apply a forest defition that is consistent with historical data submit to FAO. I suggest, If applicable in this section, to encourage consistency between data coming from national forest inventories and the Global Forest Resource Assessment (FRA), and if there are differences, to justify them.		Accepted with modification	Some edits (e.g. need for justification) were added but paragraph was not shifted to different location.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0094	Pulles, Tinus	1	89	90	please avoid "should" here. The word "should" sounds very policy prescriptive to me and should not be used in this document! The same applies to "shall".		Rejected	We use shall here because we make refer to decision text not an IPCC statement.
1_0095	Rock, Joachim	1	89	92	This can be shortened to "It is good practice to apply a forest definition that is consistent with that used to submit historical information to FAO and other international bodies for UNFCCC and KP requirements, too.". However, I do not see the mandate for this request nor is the forest definition a Party uses with regard to FAO necessarily suited for KP or UNFCCC reporting.		Accepted with modification	We made some edits.
1_0096	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	89	90	please include "consistency" as a requirement. the need to use an appropriate forest definition is a consistency issue, and is actually a detail that could be discussed later		Accepted	consistency was included in revised text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0097	Pulles, Tinus	1	90	92	<p>I am not sure whether it is "good practice" to use the same forest definitions for UNFCCC reporting and KP accounting. It clearly makes things easier to understand, but in my view accounting is use of the reports, applying accounting rules that in principle might deviate from scientific understanding, if the decisions of CMP allow to do so.</p> <p>Something similar applies to the "...parties are requested..." sentence. If it is a requirement of the CMP decisions, Parties should do so. If it is not, it could be allowed for accounting.</p>		Rejected	it is "good practice" or recommend not a requirement to use the same forest definitions for UNFCCC reporting and KP accounting
1_0098	Vreuls, Harry	1	90	91	I disagree that it is good practice to apply the same forest definition. Related to the Koyto tresholds for forest, several countries report different for Convention and KP. Also 2/CMP.7 para 20 oblige Parties to apply the definition selected in the first commitment period. I suggest to delete this text		Accepted with modification	a new sentence "Parties shall apply the definition selected in the first commitment period" was included in revsied text.
1_0099	Vreuls, Harry	1	91	92	2/CMP.7 para 20 oblige Parties to apply the definition selected in the first commitment period. For this I suggest to add follows: For the second commit period Parties apply the definition of forest selected in the first commitment period.		Accepted with modification	Inserted text but used different wording.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0100	Pulles, Tinus	1	93	94	I don't understand this sentence. Please explain		Accepted	Sentence was deleted in revised Text.
1_0101	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	93	94	this text discusses a technical details that is ill-placed here. Also, it is part of the IPCC 2006 GL that is not to be repeated		Accepted	Sentence was deleted in revised Text.
1_0102	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	94	94	what does UNFCCC land-use category means? Please specify.		Accepted	Sentence was deleted in revised Text.
1_0103	Kim, Raehyun	2	95	96	"Note 4". "2/CMP6" may be revised as "2/CMP.6".		Accepted	corrected

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0104	Pulles, Tinus	1	96	102	<p>I wonder whether this sentence can be here. It looks like a sentence that could be in a UNFCCC decision or other document.</p> <p>I do understand that for the guidance in this document a clear understanding of the provisions and peculiarities of the UNFCCC and KP decisions is needed. However, it would be better to use this understanding in this document as policy defined conditions, that link to the way the scientific guidance could be interpreted. To say it bluntly: the CMP decisions do not change the science, but the science can be used to comply with specific requirements laid down in such decisions.</p> <p>I feel that this introduction should be written from the perspective of the science trying to support the policy process (even if some more or less arbitrary and sometimes Party dependent definitions are used ion the policy processes), rather than that the policy process defines the science.</p>		Rejected	The sentence is appropriate here.
1_0105	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	96	102	this text should come earlier (e.g. at line 45-46)		Rejected	Authors decided to keep this as the closing paragraph of the section
1_0106	Brandon, Andrea	1	97	98	It is stated that Article 3.3 and 3.4 reporting be in accordance with relevant decisions relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the KP and should be consistent with 2006 guidelines. In cases where they are not, which takes precedence?		Rejected	Good question but there is no CMP decision to answer it.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0107	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	97	97	could cite the Draft decision -/CMP.8 Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol, which is from Doha climate change conference.		Accepted	Revised
1_0108	Alfredsen, Gry	1	99	104	This sentence is too long. And the last part, line 103-104, the part about the Conference of the Parties is a bit confusing.		Rejected	Comments is not clear
1_0109	Mueller, Christoph	1	99	99	there will be a subtitle to the supplement to explain in more detail the scope of the		Rejected	Comments is not clear
1_0110	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1	101	101	"Conference of the Parties " --> Add (COP) ; "and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties", replace by CMP as acronym already explained in line 68		Accepted	Revised
1_0111	Radunsky, Klaus	1	101	102	It is suggested to insert "under the Kyoto protocol" after "..that methods be applied".		Accepted	Revised
1_0112	Gonzalez, Patrick	1	104	246	For ease of use, add a table that summarizes at a glance the steps identified in the text.		Accepted	made revisions to the formatting and layout to enhance clarity

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0113	Pulles, Tinus	1.1	104	254	<p>I have difficulty in understanding how an IPCC document could follow this line of thinking.</p> <p>What the LULUCF guidance should do, in my view, is provide scientific methods and tools to basically estimate the carbon balance of each plot of land, regardless what it is called by the CMP decisions. There might be trees, buildings, crops, wild animals, cattle, humans etc etc on each plot of land. The decisions have provided some more or less understandable accounting rules that treat loss or gain of carbon in a "forest" differently than the same somewhere else. And the decision include all kind of peculiarities that might occur or will occur if somebody plants or cuts a lot of trees somewhere. The decisions make for this a distinction between deforestation, afforestation and reforestation.</p> <p>In the "real world" the carbon balance does not depend at all from the definitions of "forest" or activities elected for accounting by each Party. So there is nothing "scientific" on whether or not "a treed shelterbelt" is considered a forest (see my comments with lines 963-970 below). It is only relevant for the accounting.</p> <p>So the guidance would better follow the following structure:</p> <p>1) Estimate the carbon balance for each plot of land in the country;</p> <p>2) try to understand the accounting rules by interpreting the resulting carbon balance by plot and allocate all carbon balances to the appropriate source/sink categories and other reporting units as required by the CMP-decisions.</p>		Rejected	The points made here are valid - i.e. if one would start from a clean slate one could describe the approach as suggested here. However, this Supplementary Guidance is supposed to be consistent with existing guidance (2003, 2006) and is not supposed to completely revise the approach (as is suggested here). We therefore rejected this suggestion.
1_0114	Sookun, Anand	1	104	254	Will it be suitable to put the steps in a flow diagram?		Accepted with modification	see comment 1_0112

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0115	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	104	252	Paragraph 1.1 (see earlier comment): 3.4 activities, specifically WDR activities shall be outlined more complete in all STEPS, the focus is now on forest-related activities (AR, D, FM).	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	added in the steps and in the flowchart
1_0116	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	107	107	In chapter 1, lines 31 and 32, it is explained that this document does not provide good practice guidance for LULUCF projects under article 6, nevertheless, the title of section 1.1. includes provisions for article 6. This is a contradiction. Suggestion to delete every mention to article 6, or change the wording refering to the scope of this document		Rejected	We generally do not provide guidance for Article 6 projects but we do have to make reference to them in a couple of places - this is one of them.
1_0117	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	108	109	please be consistent with line 35 on carbon stock changes/CO2 emissions and removals		Accepted	revised
1_0118	Ngarize, Sekai	1	109		Reporting may include emissions of CO2 (unrelated to carbon stock changes) as well, e.g. from liming on deforested land		Accepted	revised
1_0119	Lund, H. Gyde	1	112	127	Consider adding definitions for cropland, grazing lands and wetlands with thresholds similar to that of forest.		Rejected	these definitions are detailed in 2006 GL

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0120	Lund, H. Gyde	1	112	127	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 .		Accepted with modification	In SOD, a new Figure 1.1 will be introduced along with the detailed text for the STEPS of estimation and reporting for 3.3 and 3.4 activities.
1_0121	Pulles, Tinus	1.1	112	113	<p>My view would be that these definitions are not part of the technical guidance to be provided by IPCC. It therefore should probably not be a "step" in the reporting, but more a boundary condition set by specific choices made by the country's national policy.</p> <p>Of course, these definitions are relevant for the reporting, but they should be used here at the stage of interpreting technical/scientific information.</p> <p>In other words: the exact wordings of the definitions do not change the real world. They change the way data, derived from the real world are to be interpreted towards the accounting under the Kyoto Protocol.</p> <p>As an example: a "forest" is an area with a high density of trees. The definition in footnote 6 only instructs the reader of the legal texts of the CMP Decisions when and how to account for carbon under the heading "forest" and when not. Hence, this is more an interpretation of the legal obligations than a real definition that is useful in science.</p>		Rejected	In the context of this guidance document these types of definitions are required and therefore included. We are not talking about "scientific" definitions but about those used in the context of preparing GHG inventories for the LULUCF sector.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0122	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	112	251	STEP 1 (lines 112 onwards) until STEP 3 (line 251): implementing the same steps for WRD (soil component related) activities (not only for forest-related activities), or implement WDR in the existing STEPS that focus now on forest-related activities mainly. E.g. discussion on wetland/peatland/organic soil definition (national/international), add bulletpoint under lines 211-216: units of (peat)land affected by drainage and/or rewetting etc.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Revised
1_0123	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	115	115	Change 'Forest Management (FM) activities' to 'Forest Management (FM) activity'		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0124	Schlesinger, Peter	1	115		In the footnote number 6 which is listed at the bottom of the page without a line number, the text that allows the inclusion of fallow forest leaves a big loophole in the definition of forest and nonforest. Specifically, it says "as are areas normally forming part of the forest area which are temporarily unstocked as a result of human intervention such as harvesting or natural causes but which are expected to revert to forest". This allows countries to not include slash and burn agriculture as a deforestation even if those lands never revert back to natural forest. I acted as the expert remote sensing verifier of the national MRV System of Guyana (MRVS) for the team of Det Norske Veritas in 2011, in this capacity I inspected 20 years of Landsat classifications and determined that none of the slash and burn agriculture pixels that Guyana was permitted to include in its definition of forest ever reverted back to natural forest, thus with this loophole, they are artificially keeping the annual deforestation rate constant by never having to include slash and burn agriculture as deforestation. .		Rejected	It is unfortunate that a country that practices a form of land-use change that prevents forests from reverting back to forest does not report this as deforestation. This is in violation of the rules - as there has to be a clear expectation that land after clearing does revert to forest - once the land-use change has occurred this should be reported as D. But failure to do so is not because of the alleged "loophole" in the IPCC Guidance or CMP decisions.
1_0125	Sperow, Mark	1.1	115	124	Footnote 6 combined with the text in 116-124 is a little confusing - if a definition for forest is provided, countries are still able to generate their own definition?		Rejected	Yes - there is some flexibility and a requirement to be consistent with past practice.
1_0126	Lund, H. Gyde	1	117	119	Is it mandatory that other parties have to choose a figure between the ranges given for area, cover and height. If so, then so state.		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0127	Lund, H. Gyde	1	118	118	Note the definition of 'forest' given in footnote 6 (line 134) does not include the words 'at maturity' after 'tree crown cover'. Defintions should be consistent.		Accepted	Revised
1_0128	Schlesinger, Peter	1	118		Problem starts here with 4 differing terms in Chap 1 & 2 (crown closure, crown cover, crown density, canopy closure), with different meanings, yet used interchangeably		Accepted	the 2006GL give definitions for "crown cover" and "canopy cover" >> HOWEVER" crown density" is used in the legal text then for the definition of forest -> this term should be referenced in the glossary
1_0129	Lund, H. Gyde	1	119	120	So areas where all the trees have been removed but sometime in the future will be forested are counted as forest land are not considered deforested. Is this correct?		Accepted	Yes - this is correct and the decisions and IPCC guidance do provide further information for the conditions under which this is true, e.g. harvest followed by regeneration or planting.
1_0130	Schlesinger, Peter	1	119		there is no problem here, but here would place to add or start to add what are recommended methods of determining tree/forest height		Rejected	Methodological details are provided elsewhere.
1_0131	Burgess, Deborah	1	120	120	For clarity add "at maturity" to "expected to reach these parameter thresholds"		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0132	Lund, H. Gyde	1	121	124	As I recall, the thresholds that FAO uses for the Global Forest Resource Assessment are 0.5 ha for area, 10% crown cover, 5 m tree height at maturity and 20 m wide for strips. If a nation chooses a value less than any of the FAO's, it will have more land classed as forest when reporting for Kyoto and if the values are more than those of the FAO, it will be classifying less land than they would following FAO standards. Note that FAO does not indicate that the threshold for crown closure is at maturity.		Rejected	There is an expectation as explained in the report that countries explain if there are differences in definitions between UNFCCC and FAO.
1_0133	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	121	121	Change 'numerical values of' to 'numerical values selected for'		Accepted	Revised
1_0134	Rock, Joachim	1	121	124	Why should a Party JUSTIFY the choice of differing definitions? A simple explanation should suffice.		Accepted	Revised
1_0135	Rodriguez, Dionisio	1.1	121	124	I underline the importance to use the same terms and definitions for all countries, in particular, I propose to be used TBFRA-2000 terms and definitions as mandatory. The main objective is to make national data comparable at the multinational level and also no to have different values for the same concept. The only trouble is that the countries must make recalculations, that this change could involve, in the next inventory submission, but this is an irrelevant inconvenience. To allow report different data each country, with an explanation of the differences, in my opinion, is to extend the inconsistency.		Rejected	The KP decision does not make this requirement and therefore the IPCC cannot impose it either.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0136	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	122	122	one time justification is enough (there is no need to repeat the same justification in subsequent reports)		Accepted	Revised
1_0137	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	123	123	I suggest, If applicable in this section, to encourage consistency between data coming from national forest inventories and the Global Forest Resource Assessment (FRA), and if there are differences, to justify them.		Rejected	FRA is part of FAO >> no change
1_0138	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	124	124	Change 'why and how' to 'how and why'		Accepted	Revised
1_0139	Pulles, Tinus	1.1	125	127	See my comment at lines 963 - 970 below (comment ID 1_0613)		Rejected	This regards the specification of the minimum width that countries should specify to define forest and lands subject to ARD or FM for practical reasons
1_0140	Mueller, Christoph	1	126	126	ARD, perhaps better AR or D or AR and D, because AR is defined and D is defined but not ARD		Accepted	replaced by "AR and D"
1_0141	Lund, H. Gyde	1	127	127	Consider that nations should also define what is considered a tree. Suggestion - Any woody perennial, including palms and bamboo, capable of attaining a height of X meters at maturity in situ (where X is the threshold value that the nation chose for defining forest land)		Rejected	This is not a requirement of the KP decisions and the IPCC cannot impose this requirement.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0142	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	128	128	term forest plantation is used only in para 37 of the annex to decision 2/CMP.7		Rejected	It still needs to be defined.
1_0143	Matsumoto, Mitsuo	1.1	128	131	What does "(b) define when a transition from natural forest to planted forest occurs" mean? It is obvious at harvested and planted. (b) should be deleted.		Rejected	No - this is more complex - and depends on the definitions selected by the country.
1_0144	Radunsky, Klaus	1	128		It is suggested to stick to the terminology of the CMP decision and to substitute the term "forest plantation" by "planted forest". It might be considered to provide some guidance in the case that the terminology used at the national level does neither define "natural" nor "planted" forests.		Rejected	It is necessary for the countries to define these terms and then use them consistently.
1_0145	Rock, Joachim	1	128	131	Please be careful - "planted forests" are not necessarily "forest plantations". This paragraph should be worded in a way that Parties have to define what they consider "natural forest" (if there already is a definition somewhere in a UNFCCC- or KP-related text, give it here, too), what they consider "planted forest" and that "forest plantations" are included in "planted forests" (as is mentioned in line 130), and mention explicitly that this relation does not work conversely.		Accepted	insert: "(which include forest plantation as defined in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines)"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0146	Iehara, Toshiro	1.1	128	131	Should be deleted "(b) define when a transition from natural forest to planted forest occurs" as this would be not decided at any international conference.		Rejected	It is necessary for the countries to define these terms and then use them consistently.
1_0147	Brandon, Andrea	1	129	131	This paragraph creates a large issue. If the revision of the reforestation definition is going to be allowed, despite no decision to change the definition, parties will be able to reclassify existing FM land into AR land as there is no time limit on non-forest land use between deforestation and reforestation under this new interpretation of reforestation. This would go completely against the intent of the UNFCCC and the KP as the intent was to incentivise additional carbon stock sequestration from new forests since 1990 - this revision of the reforestation definition will no longer meet that objective.		Accepted with modification	The SOD does not change the defintion of reforestation. However, this paragraph is not about reforestation, it is about the transition from natural to planted forests.
1_0148	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	130	131	not consistent with line 128		Accepted	line 128: replaced "forest plantation" with planted forest"
1_0149	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	130	131	term planted forest is used only in para 5 of annex to 2/CMP.7		Accepted	see action on comments 1_0145 & 1_0148
1_0150	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	130	130	Suggest deleting 'which should include forest plantations,'. Seems unnecessary after 'planted forest'. Alternatively provide a footnote or explanation for 'forest plantations'.		Rejected	It is necessary for the countries to define these terms and then use them consistently.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0151	Elvidge, Craig	1	131	131	Issue: Clause (c) requires that definitions to be applied consistently across CPs, which is good, but this also requires that the definitions don't change. Given the change to the definition proposed in the FOD, it would be difficult to follow this requirement. Action: Maintain the original definitions, or allow for changes across CPs.		Rejected	There was no requirement in the first CP to define either natural or planted forests
1_0152	Alfredsen, Gry	1	132	134	I am sure there are some guidance on how to give these definitions? Include references?		Rejected	No internationally agreed upon definition seem to exist.
1_0153	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	132	132	which definitions (from STEP 1.2??)		Accepted	Yes - as is obvious from the context and flow.
1_0154	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	132	132	should not the activities be defined somewhere?		Accepted	yes - these activities are defined in the decision text and which is referenced frequently
1_0155	Lund, H. Gyde	1	134	134	Footnote 6 - Consider adding a footnote to the footnote that the definition of 'forest' refers to tree cover and not land use. If, for example, an orchard meeting the cover and tree height thresholds would be classed as forest.		Rejected	Footnote 6 is paragraph 1a in the Annex of decision 16/CMP.1, this can't be changed

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0156	Lund, H. Gyde	1	134	134	Is the minimum cover threshold at maturity like tree height? If so, then so state. If both thresholds apply to the future, then land with absolutely no trees can considered 'forest' as long as the land is capable of growing trees to meet the national thresholds.		Rejected	This was always unclear in the existing text! I would say that yes - this should apply "at maturity" and yes - but the corralary proposed here (any land that could carry trees should be considered forest) does not follow. And see comment 1_0155
1_0157	Lund, H. Gyde	1	134	134	Footnote 6. Note the tree crown cover does not say 'at maturity' as it does with tree height. However, elsewhere in the document the percent crown cover is stated to be the miniumn at maturity. The definition and use of the definiton should be consistent.		Rejected	see comment 1_0155
1_0158	Schlesinger, Peter	1	134		both crown cover and crown density are used interchangeably in same footnote 6 below line 134; I think the terms are incorrectly used and it should be canopy closure		Accepted	Revised throughout
1_0159	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	138	138	delete "minimize or". The definition should be chosen to avoid overlaps in land uses, not to minimize them.		Accepted	this part has been completely revised
1_0160	Brandon, Andrea	1	140		Hierarchy is already established and therefore does not need to be established here. ARD takes precedence over 3.4 activities, FM, being now mandatory will take precedence over other 3.4 activities. The other elected activities hierarchy will be determined by that chosen for activities elected during CP1, then hierarchy amongst additional elected activities for CP2 should be established.		Accepted	A paragraph about hierarchy was added

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0161	Mueller, Christoph	1	140	140	see previous comment (comment ID 1_0140)		Accepted	see response to comment ID 1_0140
1_0162	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	140	140	Change 'Forest Management (FM) activities' to 'Forest Management (FM) activity'		Rejected	Use here is consistent with decision text.
1_0163	Rogiers, Nele	1.1	140	178	Establishing a hierarchy among ARD activities, FM activities and elected 3.4 activities is an important task. In a lot of passages in following the chapters, reference is given to this hierarchy. Consequently it seems to us that the issue deserves more emphasis, maybe by creating an own sub-chapter that can be cross referenced later on in the document.		Accepted	see comments 1_0160
1_0164	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	140	142	‘establish a hierarchy among all activities’. Lines 144 onwards give ‘guidance on good practice’. E.g. line 144: ‘ARD and FM activities take precedence in reporting hierarchy over any elected article 3.4 activity because they are mandatory activities. That is no guidance! What is the reasoning behind this already chosen hierarchy? Just because it’s mandatory? Why is it mandatory, and why are the other activities selectable activities? Again: why not a hierarchy based on the height of GHG emissions/carbon fluxes from following the different activities? We believe that the bullet list as is given now does not sufficiently give guidance and does not provide a base for countries to make their hierarchy. The bulletlist highly focuses on forest again. There shall be a very clear paragraph on establishment of hierarchy of activities to be accounted for.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Sorry but a lot of those question make it clear that this reviewer does not understand the basic premise of the CMP decisions that make certain reporting and accounting principles mandatory.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0165	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	140	140	at this point of the document, it is not clear why it is necessary to establish hierarchy, and what it means. This could be mitigated by including a definition, and/or including a reference to relevant section(s).		Accepted	We have added paragraph that explains reasoning for the hierarchy.
1_0166	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.1	141	141	put () between RV --> (RV)		Accepted	revised
1_0167	Sperow, Mark	1.1	141	141	Place parentheses around "RV".		Accepted	revised
1_0168	Brandon, Andrea	1	144		ARD activities take precedence over FM activities - state this here, refer to decision		Accepted	see comments 1_0160
1_0169	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	144	144	Reporting hierarchy: I think it should be clearly described why of this hierarchy? Because there are mandatory and elected activities? Like this the word hierarchy for the whole section will be understood.		Accepted	see comments 1_0160
1_0170	Mueller, Christoph	1	144	144	see previous comment (comment ID 1_0140)		Accepted	see comments 1_0160
1_0171	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	144	144	Explain if there will be a hierarchy between ARD and FM activities, and from when this hierarchy applies.		Accepted	see comments 1_0160

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0172	Brandon, Andrea	1	146	149	There has been no decision made by the CMP to report AR on D land for CP2. While the GPG-LULUCF states that D land cannot become A/R land in for first commitment because of the time limits in the definition for reforestation agreed in the Marakesh Accords, these were designed not to credit reforestation on lands that were forest land in 1990. D land reported in CP1 cannot be reassigned to AR in CP2, as that would be counter to the 16/CMP.1 therefore there if this is allowed to proceed there will be an inconsistency with CP 1 reporting. And the intent of the Kyoto Protocol will be severely impacted.		Accepted	We revised the text to make it clear that there are not AR activities reported on D lands.
1_0173	Elvidge, Craig	1	146	149	<p>Issue:</p> <p>1. Units of land that have been deforestation and subsequently replanted can not be reported as Afforestation until after 50 years has elapsed. As per definition of reforestation in the 16CMP.1 and 2CMP.7</p> <p>2. Units of land that have been deforested and subsequently replanted can not be reported as Reforestation as per the definition of Reforestation in 16CMP.1 and 2CMP.7.</p> <p>Action: Please revise this paragraph to reflect the previous Chapter 4 supplementary guidance where units of land deforested and subsequently replanted remain reported under the deforestation activity throughout commitment periods. This ensures consistent reporting of deforestation activities over the first and second commitment periods. It also ensures that only 'additional' forest is classed as A/R, and not replanting of recently deforested land.</p>		Accepted	We revised the text to make it clear that there are not AR activities reported on D lands.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0174	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	146	149	If the land has been accounted for under deforestation it will continue being accounted for under deforestation in that commitment period no matter that the land is being reforested.		Accepted	see comment 1_0173
1_0175	Mueller, Christoph	1	146	146	see previous comment, here AR or D is used, keep consistency (comment ID 1_0140)		Accepted	Revised
1_0176	Ngarize, Sekai	1	146	149	Here, and elsewhere in this chapter, it is unclear how classification of land as AR or D in terms of the current Article 3.3 activity actually translates into accounting for emissions/removals due to D or AR depending on how activities have taken place on the land since 1990. For example, suppose an area of land was forest in 1989, was deforested in 1992 and reforested in 2010. What does this mean for the accounting of emissions and removals due to D between 1992-2009 and AR from 2010? Similarly for areas afforested since 1990, but subsequently deforested.		Accepted	see comment 1_0173
1_0177	Petersson, Hans	1	146	149	That land under D could leave this category is completely new and not in line with former guidelines. If units of land reported under D later on is reforested and should be reported under AR, then a relevant question is how to separate D to AR from natural harvest and regeneration in the forest management cycle. Observe that, a country with a long inventory cycle would report this land as FM but a country with a short inventory cycle may report as D and AR.		Accepted	see comment 1_0173

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0178	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	146	146	replace "each unit of land subject to" with "each unit of land where the current activity was preceded by another mandatory activity (e.g. AR followed by D)", and replace "an AR or D activity (Article 3.3)" is to"		Accepted	Revised
1_0179	Herold, Anke	1.1	147	148	The statement that the reported activity reflects the current land use seems to contradict the guidance on hierarchies of activities and consistency of reporting on activities across commitment periods. These rules seem to lead to situations where the category in which an activity is reported does not longer reflect the current land use.		Accepted	see comment 1_0173
1_0180	Mueller, Christoph	1	147	148	this sentence/paragraph needs clarification, re-worded		Accepted	see comment 1_0173
1_0181	Sperow, Mark	1.1	147	147	Add "should" before "be reported".		Accepted	see comment 1_0173
1_0182	Burgess, Deborah	1	149	149	This appears to be inconsistent with previous guidance where land use changes on D land were reported under D. Requires reference/justification.		Accepted	see comment 1_0173
1_0183	Beets, Peter	1	150	163	General comment regarding lines 150 - 163. Deforested land can be units of land under 3.3 or land under 3.4, and the suggested wording given below accommodates this.		Accepted	see comment 1_0173

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0184	Beets, Peter	1	150	150	"Each unit of land converted..." Suggested rewording "Land converted..."		Accepted	Revised
1_0185	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.1	150	150	replace "deforestation" by D		Rejected	Decision text
1_0186	Mueller, Christoph	1	150	153	suggested rewording:move "under FM" to the end of the sentence		Rejected	Decision text
1_0187	Petersson, Hans	1	150	159	As above, naturally degraded Forest land converted to unmanaged land is not D since it's not human induced. The major problem that such land often constitutes a net removal. So the question is: should it be possible to report a huge removal on D? I don't think this is in line with the intentions of the KP and suggest that D should be connected to a harvest (e.g. at least 33% of the initial stock should be harvested when D). See also Rows 146-149 above, that indicates that land considered to be D but it's later on confirmed that that its was only a temporary harvest followed by plantation. In such case it should be possible to recalculate. So I suggest that D is both connected with a harvest, say 33%, and a certain period without forest cover (say 10 years		Rejected	This comment missed the point of this paragraph - this is the New Zealand clause that was developed to accomodate moving plantations.
1_0188	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	152	153	forest plantation is only a part of forests that do not fall under the natural forest category		Rejected	Unclear

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0189	Myeong, Soojeong	1.6	152	156	Since not every contry has well organized historical forest inventory, it is to unlikely to utilize forest data of 1960s. Even if we try to use remotely sensed imagery, it also has limitations. The earliest Landsat imagery is available since 1972. Therefore, it may be better to set the data later than 1972.		Rejected	While we agree that this may be difficult to implement this text is from a CMP decision and therefore cannot be changed by the IPCC.
1_0190	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	153	156	incorrect quotation of para 37 of annex to 2/CMP.7		Rejected	This is not a quote
1_0191	Mueller, Christoph	1	153	153	write "between 1 January 1960 to 1 January 1990"		Rejected	This is not a quote
1_0192	Beets, Peter	1	154	154	"..equivalent area as the harvested forest plantation..' Suggested rewording "..equivalent area as the deforested plantation.."		Rejected	No - the point is that by definition this is not referred to as deforestation - so we should not call it as such because if we do someone is not going to like this again.
1_0193	Elvidge, Craig	1	156	156	Issue: refer footnote 7. The newly established forest is not "replanted" as the area to plant the CEF must meet the criteria of non forest as at 1989. Action: please delete the term replanted and use planted or established.		Accepted	Revised
1_0194	Mueller, Christoph	1	157	157	insert "of" between "inserted" and "the"		Accepted	Revised
1_0195	Ngarize, Sekai	1	157		missing comma after 'conversion'		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0196	Beets, Peter	1	158	158	"...harvested land and the newly..." Suggested rewording "...deforested land and the newly..."		Rejected	No - the point is that by definition this is not referred to as deforestation - so we should not call it as such because if we do someone is not going to like this again.
1_0197	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	158	158	This is not required by para 39 of annex to 2/CMP.7		Rejected	Yes it is consistent with the decision text - report as FM
1_0198	Beets, Peter	1	160	161	"....(Article 3.3) unless the unit of land is used to compensate..." Suggested rewording "....(Article 3.3) unless the land is used to compensate..."		Accepted	We have replaced all references to units of land
1_0199	Beets, Peter	1	161	161	"....., in which case it is reported under FM...." Suggested rewording "....., in which case land is reported under FM (Article 3.4)...."		Rejected	this is said many times already
1_0200	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	163	163	Add, at the end of the sentence "if it is not reported under 3.3.". There might be 3.3. forests under forest management practices, and they have to be reported under 3.3., and not under forest management.		Rejected	This is wrong - if land is subject to 3.3. it cannot be reported under 3.4 unless it meets the requirements reported here.
1_0201	Lund, H. Gyde	1	164	168	Consider giving an example of a hierarchy.		Accepted	Examples are in the text.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0202	Weiss, Peter	1_1	164	165	According to the sentence there would be freedom in specifying the hierarchy, while in fact certain rules and orders have to be followed.		Accepted	There is indeed some "freedom" and we try to specify here what is required and where flexibility remains.
1_0203	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.1	167	167	cropland management and revegetation --> CM and RV		Rejected	NO - cropland and grassland uses are used here deliberately as land-uses and not as reporting categories - do not replace with GM and CM in this sentence!
1_0204	Alfredsen, Gry	1	169	171	Something strange in the last line.		Rejected	Unclear
1_0205	Mueller, Christoph	1	169	169	re-word: "...and grassland associated with grazing"		Accepted	Revised
1_0206	Elvidge, Craig	1	170	172	<p>Issue: The first order draft suggests that a Party may report all land subject to CM and GM under a single activity, noting in a footnote that the reporting and accounting requirements are the same for both. This is not correct - cropland has higher Efs, due to soil tillage. Only land that is subject to rotation between the two activities should be able to be classed together - not all CM and MG land, otherwise you will get underestimates of emissions if it's all classed as GM.</p> <p>Action: Please specify that only CM and GM land subject to rotation may be reported under a single activity.</p>		Rejected	We need to be very clear about "estimation" and reporting. Here we describe the reporting process - and you are correct that reporting as GM or CM does not imply that the same Efs are used for the estimation - and we do not say this. It correct however that ONLY the lands that are subject to rotation should be reported in one of the two categories and remain there.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0207	Mueller, Christoph	1	170	170	to simplify: "Where a Party has elected both CM and GM" can be deleted,		Accepted	Revised
1_0208	Lund, H. Gyde	1	171	171	Should 'artefacts' be 'artifacts'?		Accepted	Both forms are correct
1_0209	Canaveira, Paulo	1.1	172	172	it is not clear how the aggregated reporting of CM and GM is to be implemented in the reporting tables		Accepted	Hope the revised text and the example reporting tables in the Annex make this clear to the reviewer
1_0210	Mueller, Christoph	1	173	173	delete "only one of"		Accepted	revised
1_0211	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	173	173	replace "the" at the end of line with "all"		Rejected	Either would work and "the" is clearly refering to the appropriate land.
1_0212	Weiss, Peter	1_1	173	174	This is in contradiction to rules in the 2003 IPCC GPG and 2006 IPCC guidelines where such lands should be reported under CM (see for instance first paragraph in chapter 3.3 of the IPCC GPG).		Rejected	Yes - this is a change to the guidelines but the 2003 GPG and 2006 GL do not make rules - and here we provide updates to these guidelines. In part because parties found the requirement to switch between GM and CM not workable.
1_0213	Herold, Anke	1.1	177	178	It is unclear how this good practice guidance requirement "apply same hierarchy among elected activities across commitment period" can always be fulfilled with the changes in mandatory activities and additional activities.		Accepted	The point is that those elected activities for which there have not been any rule changes should remain in the same order in the existing hierarchies. We can make this clearer.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0214	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	179	179	suggest to include a step to define "natural disturbance" and its types by the country for exclusion of emissions from such disturbances		Accepted	step 1.3
1_0215	Woodfield, Michael	1	180		Ed comment - fonts for footntes appear to differ.		Accepted	noted
1_0216	Weiss, Peter	1_1	181	183	The advice in these lines is not very clear and can be interpreted in different ways.		Rejected	Insufficient guidance by reviewer - that line refers to 2006 GL that we are not revising here?
1_0217	Riedel, Thomas	1.1	182	183	not Chapter 3, Volume 3 of GPG 2006, but Chapter 3 Volume 4, because Volume 3 is not for LULUCF but for Industrial Processes and Product Use		Accepted	Revised
1_0218	Brandon, Andrea	1	183		Should read Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the IPCC Guidelines...		Accepted	Revised
1_0219	Burgess, Deborah	1	183	183	Volume 4 not volume 3		Accepted	Revised
1_0220	Rock, Joachim	1	183	183	Please check: you mean Chapter 3 of Volume 4, not Volume 3?		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0221	Lund, H. Gyde	1	185	188	What is reporting method 2? Consider introducing it before this paragraph.		Rejected	No - this terminology is used in GPG and 2006 GL and will be explained again in section 2.2.2. which is referred to in this text).
1_0222	Lundblad, Mattias	1	185	188	It is not always useful to stratify a country when it comes to the accuracy of area estimation for AR or D. Suggest to start the sentence "Wenn relevant stratify...".		Rejected	This stratification is for reporting purposes.
1_0223	Rock, Joachim	1	185	188	Please elaborate why a stratification of a country should be necessary. Especially if high-intensity sampling methods and / or tier 3 models are employed, a stratification is neither necessary nor beneficial and thus no mandatory stratification should be requested.		Rejected	Again - this is stratification for reporting purposes - not necessarily for estimation purposes. And such a stratification is required by CMP decision because we do not the entire country as one entity.
1_0224	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	185		‘ stratification of the country into areas of land for which the geographic....’. Stratification for the purpose of reporting of forest-related activities and their related GHG’s and carbon fluxes (which is based on land cover) is different from stratification for the purpose of reporting of drainage and rewetting activities and their related emissions (which is based on water table). There shall be more guidance/explanation on this in this document. At some places this is mentioned, but not fully explained.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Again - this is stratification for reporting purposes - not necessarily for estimation purposes. And such a stratification is required by CMP decision because we do not the entire country as one entity.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0225	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	186		and/or': is this possible? Can there be only 3.4 activities being reported?	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Revised
1_0226	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	187	187	If possible specificity not only the section where to find further description of Method 2, but useful if briefly described.		Rejected	No - this terminology is used in GPG and 2006 GL and will be explained again in section 2.2.2. which is referred to in this text).
1_0227	Rock, Joachim	1	190	190	Please rework the text. 1990 is a base year for certain purposes, but for other purposes, different base years could be chosen. So the introduction should be worded in a more general way and 1990 only be mentioned as an example.		Accepted with modification	For the activities reported here 1990 is the base year but there are other options and that is explained in other sections of the report.
1_0228	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	191	195	please include some information on non-forest land use/land cover		Accepted	This step 2.2 gives comments on information compilation ... this should be general and not "forest oriented" >> ACTION: delete:1.193: "forest-related"d
1_0229	Singh, Vinay	1	194	200	Statistical sets of data and map should be assessed by third party or Forest Department of Host country Identification units of land since 1990 under ARD and FM may be difficult to obtain the data as in many countries, developing and LDCs the data may not be available.		Accepted	Agreed - but then the countries have to develop such data - if they want to claim compliance with KP rules.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0230	Beets, Peter	1	197	197	Step 2.3: is confusing. Does this steps relate to CP2 but for countries who did not ratify CP1? Those who did ratify will have already completed the step, and will want to know what steps are required after 2012? In this contest "since 1990" doesn't help and should be removed, because FM was not mandatory since 1990 - FM has become mandatory since 2012.		Accepted	Text has been reworted
1_0231	Lund, H. Gyde	1	197	200	What is reporting method 2? Consider introducing it before this paragraph.		Rejected	Sorry but this terminology has been used for the last 10 years in GPG and 2006 GL - and it is again explained in this document and cross referenced earlier in the section.
1_0232	Lundblad, Mattias	1	197		Missing "and land" after "units of land" to reflect the difference between ARD and FM.		Accepted	"Units of land" is replaced by "land"
1_0233	Ngarize, Sekai	1	197	213	the phrase 'units of land and lands' is confusing to read, even though the definitions were given above (in lines 76-79). It would be clearer if a form of words such as 'Article 3.3 units of land and Article 3.4 land areas' was used, if this is what is meant		Accepted	"Units of land" is replaced by "land"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0234	Ngarize, Sekai	1	197	200	does the term 'lands' here refer to the non-Article 3.3 land area? The terminology is confusing- see comment for lines 197-213 (comment ID 1_0233)		Accepted	"Units of land" is replaced by "land"
1_0235	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	197		(STEP 2.3): '...are subject to mandatory activities'...this shall be rephrased: '....are subject to activities that are mandatory for reporting'. The activities are not mandatory (!).	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	revised
1_0236	Vreuls, Harry	1	197	197	ensure right wording unit of land and lands, in case this distinction continues to be used. Now this line is not consistent with line76-77 and with lime 201		Accepted	"Units of land" is replaced by "land"
1_0237	Herold, Anke	1.1	199	200	Similar to a comment above (comment ID 1_0213), it is unclear what the practical implications of the distinction between units of land and land are. In the text it seems somewhat confusing to use both terms while it is not clearly explained what the difference implies.		Accepted	The distinction has been dropped in the SOD.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0238	Beets, Peter	1	201	215	Commitment period - be specific - isn't this meant to apply to CP2?		Rejected	No - the statement is also true for CP1 (for those countries that elected FM, and if there is a CP3 - it would also apply to it (unless the rules change). So perhaps add (in the CP in which FM reporting came into effect (which is CP1 for those who elected it and CP2 for all others.
1_0239	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	202	206	this section should appear in the section on definitions, e.g. under line 132.		Rejected	Decided to keep the text in this location
1_0240	Gensior, Andreas	1.1 ff	203	789	Is there a contradiction between the narrow interpretation in choosing management practices and the demand in Paragraph 19 of the Annex to the Decision 16/CMP.1, that "all anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources from and removals by sinks on this land must be accounted for throughout subsequent and contiguous commitment periods"? The narrow interpretation seems to be cherry picking!		Rejected	Not cherry picking at all - just the narrow definition of FM that only those lands on which FM activities since 1990 were applied as used in 2003 and 2006 documents
1_0241	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	205	205	Include 'undertaken since 1990' after 'forest management,'		Accepted	Revised
1_0242	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.1	207	207	footnote 11; why not COP/MOP or CMP only?		Accepted	revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0243	Forbes, Keith	1	207	210	This para lumps in ARD, FM, and disturbance/forest conversion (to/from). Would suggest separating in the text ARD&FM from disturbance/conversion		Rejected	
1_0244	Mueller, Christoph	1	209	209	should read "units of land" to be consistent		Rejected	
1_0245	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	209	209	should also include reporting the change of areas of unit of lands and lands that fall into categories.		Accepted	Yes - revised
1_0246	Brandon, Andrea	1	211	"lands affected by disturbances: should read "lands affected by natural disturbances.."		Accepted	revised
1_0247	Ngarize, Sekai	1	211		need to complete footnote 12- only a draft version at present		Accepted	revised
1_0248	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	211	216	add bulletpoint under lines 211-216: units of (peat)land affected by drainage and/or rewetting etc.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Section reltive to AR, D and FM
1_0249	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	211	211	include "natural" before "disturbances"		Accepted	revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0250	Lutzenberger, Alexa	1	212	212	Question in Foodnote: When after a disturbance a LUC follows, than the emissions have to be counted in the first CP and not in the following. F.e. forest area will be used for GM or CM after a disturbance. The other case is if f.e. a disturbance of forest occur, and a AF/Rf or RV follows on the disturbance than you change the emission counting in the following CP and not at the end of the first CP.		Rejected	When D occurs after ND then the emissions have to be reported when the ND occurred - not in the first CP (because in the first CP this provision did not exist).
1_0251	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	213		'lands of forest plantation which have been converted to forest to compensate for harvesting of forest plantation'. The discussion was: how can we avoid that low/average carbon rich native forests are being replaced by fast growing, not native, high carbon, commercial tree species. Reading through this document, the steps that have been taken are: countries have to report their area of (commercial) plantation and area of natural forest. However, what is being done with this? What are the steps that will be taken by IPCC to avoid that native forest is being replaced by not-natural, more C-rich forest? Its not clear from this document.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	This document does not deal with what steps have to be taken to achieve a particular ecological outcome - this document outlines how E/R estimates are to be obtained and reported. What is then done with this information is an entirely political decision.
1_0252	Sperow, Mark	1.1	214	214	It seems that, for clarity, a reference for "other conditions are met" or more explanation is required.		Accepted	revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0253	Vreuls, Harry	1	214		please specify or give a reference for "(and other conditions are met)". I should be clear what these other conditions are		Accepted	revised
1_0254	Beets, Peter	1	215	215	is this bullet point meant (?) to say "those lands that have been converted to forest as offsets for deforested FM land".		Accepted	adressed on the 2d bullet point (lines 244-248
1_0255	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	216	216	a new step seems to be necessary for registering movements of lands from one activity to another as appropriate		Accepted with modification	Some of this is already required but not universally - nor is it necessary.
1_0256	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.1	220	220	why re-define acronims again?		Accepted	revised
1_0257	Canaveira, Paulo	1.1	224	225	sentence “either wetland drainage or reweting” should be replaced by “both wetland drainage and reweting”.		Rejected	can't be drained and rewetted at the same time
1_0258	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	224		relocate this tot the bulletpoint list on page 1.7.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Not clear why this would improve things?

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0259	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	224	225	is this mandatory in the case that WDR is elected as activity? Or is this mandatory in any case? Not clear. Why shall countries do this when a country does not elect this activity?	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	WE made it clear that this only applied if elected.
1_0260	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.1	226	226	WDR acronym re-inserted 3 lines before in 224 --> replace "wetland drainage and rewetting" by "WDR"		Accepted	revised
1_0261	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	232	232	See comment above (comment to line number 107) (comment ID 1_0116)		Rejected	See response to comment 1_0116
1_0262	Elvidge, Craig	1	241	242	Issue: Confusing and inconsistent terms for lands. Does 'all areas' refer both to all units of lands, and all lands? Action clarify and make consistent the references to land types.		Accepted	revised
1_0263	Weiss, Peter	1_1	241		For some activities the emissions in 1990 must be also estimated.		Accepted	addition of "including the applicable base year"
1_0264	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	243	243	Ensuring that there are no gaps and no double counting: suggest to insert a small example or refer to Figure 1.1, if applicable		Accepted	addition of " and figure 1.1"
1_0265	Alfredsen, Gry	1	247	248	Do you need to give the name of the Section 2.3.2?		Accepted	revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0266	Rock, Joachim	1	248	253	Please include "1990" as base year where it is appropriate.		Accepted	revised
1_0267	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	250	251	balance to zero may be not a business-as-usual scenario, though zero can be taken as a benchmark.		Accepted	revised
1_0268	Elvidge, Craig	1	252	253	Issue: use of terms in table1.1 Actions: replace terms such as "Benchmark" with previously agreed terms such as "Baseline" Ensure terms such as business as usual are used in the correct context.		Rejected	Benchmark is conserved because more adapted in this context
1_0269	Elvidge, Craig	1	252	253	Issue: This table is more confusing than the one in the previous guidelines, and it is incorrect. The intention seems to be to distinguish between the different accounting treatments applied to A/R and D (gross-net), Forest management (reference level) and all other Article 3.4 activities (net-net). Perhaps it would be better to state this? Otherwise, the table needs to be corrected to specify that, for A/R and D, the benchmark is "zero in the base year", not "zero". Action: Correct the table so that A/R and D are "zero in the base year".		Rejected	We discussed this and made some revisions but not the one requested here because the benchmark is zero.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0270	Galinski, Wojciech	1.1	252	253	(Table 1.1.) according to line 146, Deforestation can not result in credits hence, cap is 'non-applicable'		Rejected	Wrong - a country that stops D and allows forests to regrow on that land can obtain a credit - and there is no cap on that credit (but we agree that it is highly unlikely that any country will have a net C stock increase on their D lands - at least in the short term.
1_0271	Lund, H. Gyde	1	252	252	Table 1.1 Forest Management - second column. Consider changing either to Either		Accepted	revised
1_0272	Ngarize, Sekai	1	252	253	Table 1.1: there are two options for benchmarking for Article 3.4 Forest Management, but one applies to the first commitment period (Base Year) and one to the second commitment period (Business-as-Usual scenario). My understanding was that there is not a choice for the 2nd CP, so this should be clarified in the table		Accepted with modification	Revised after discussion with authors and cluster 3 - changed from FOD but not consistent with this reviewer's comment
1_0273	Radunsky, Klaus	1	252		Table 1.1: It is noted that table 1.1 shows a different set of activities compared to table 4.1.1 of the GPG-LULUCF. The rationale of that change remains unclear as well as its consequences. If no sound justification can be provided it is strongly suggested to avoid any such changes because they would introduce additional uncertainty without any added value.		Rejected	No - we do not need to talk about Article 6 and 12 activities that were covered in 4.1.1 and we do need to demonstrate that FM is now treated differently than all other 3.4 activities. The Table structure will not be changed. Actually the only change that we did make - separating AR and D may not be necessary.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0274	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	252	253	please delete the last column of the table as it is accounting information and has nothing to do with reporting. See also lines 67-68		Rejected	No - it is important that we demonstrate that information obtained through estimation procedures is treated differently in accounting procedures, and therefore needs be reported such that it can be correctly used in the accounting.
1_0275	Mueller, Christoph	1	254	254	in note 13 the bracket should read LULUCF		Accepted	revised
1_0276	Pulles, Tinus	1.2	255	444	As indicated above, this section would better be designed as a help to interpret the results of carbon balance estimates for all plots of land in the country towards the accounting rules under the Kyoto Protocol.		Accepted with modification	The comment was unclear on what improvements to be brought to the section. However, as Fig. 1.1 has been completely revised, the comment has been almost met.
1_0277	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.2	256	256	Insert space; ARTICLES3.3 --> ARTICLES 3.3		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0278	Lund, H. Gyde	1	256	256	Insert space between S and 3		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0279	Sperow, Mark	1.2	256	256	Add space between "Articles" and 3.3.		Accepted	Editorial change made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0280	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	258	258	Where the text says "LULUCF activities" it should read "LULUCF categories", because the text is referring to chapter 3 in 2006 GLs, that addresses land uses, not LULUCF activities.		Accepted	The sentence was revised to make it consistent with what was stated in Chapter 3 of IPCC 2006 GL
1_0281	Brandon, Andrea	1	261		"afforestation and reforestation" should read afforestation/reforestation unless the intent is for parties to distinguish between afforestation and reforestation		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0282	Elvidge, Craig	1	261	261	Issue: the separation of afforestation and reforestation. In most cases the guidance refers these two activities as being on in the same for ease of reporting. Action please replace with afforestation/reforestation		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0283	Elvidge, Craig	1	261	261	Issue: This line current is confusingly written as it seems to require that countries distinguish between 'afforestation and reforestation'. Action: Please replace "afforestation and reforestation" with "afforestation/reforestation" to remove the confusion.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0284	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	261	263	Is there really a need to distinguish between afforestation and reforestation? They are treated as one in the accounting. They are both measured in the same way		Accepted	Editorial change made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0285	Brandon, Andrea	1	264		"Assign lands to a single activity at any given point in time (i.e., for each year of the second commitment...." should read "Assign lands to a single activity at any given point in time (i.e. in the base year and for each year of the second commitment..."		Accepted	The sentence was revised to reflect the statement underlined in the comment
1_0286	Petersson, Hans	1	264		Assign lands to a single activity or none.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0287	Singh, Vinay	1	266	267	Shifting of land should be considered during the verification of the project with geographical co-ordinates, however the forest land should be categorized in 2 ways: 1) the land which can be shifted and the 2) land should have the permanent forest in order to solve the permanance issues		Rejected	The statement is not correct because the purpose here was not on the distinction between permanent and not permanent lands but on how to avoid double counting based on the use of a consistent lands representation and monitoring of shifts in land use over time

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0288	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	268	268	why not request to produce a balance of area on the country level? This would be a final check for occurrence of major overlapping		Rejected	Although the provided comment is highly valuable because it represents the ideal case, it could not be accepted since to produce a balance of area on the country level would require a significant human and financial resource, in particular to get at least 2 different years of satellite data of the national land cover/use, which are not always available or possible to obtain in the country involved.
1_0289	Brandon, Andrea	1	277		The terminology used in the sentence is "countries" rather than "Parties", is there a difference? If not then one term should be used consistently but if there is a difference it should be explained		Accepted	Editorial change made, "Party" all replaced by "Country" in this section.
1_0290	Elvidge, Craig	1	277	277	Issue: the use of term "Parties" versus Countries or Country Action: please be consistent with the use of terms		Accepted	Editorial change made, "Party" all replaced by "Country" in this section.
1_0291	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	277	286	This paragraph is a little bit unclear. When you start reading it, it seems to refer to eligible activities, but then it refers to all 3.4. activities, and later, it mentions only some of them. Please, clarify the paragraph, specifying if it refers only to eligible 3.4. activities, or if forest management is also considered here.		Accepted with modification	The sentence was revised to improve the clarity. The objective of this paragraph is to provide guidance to countries how to categorize land to support the election of Article 3.4 activities.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0292	Herold, Anke	1.2	277	277	editorial: activities instead of activity		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0293	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	280	281	WDR shall be mentioned here	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Editorial change made following the comments presented in the Attachment_1_0073
1_0294	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	280	281	add WDR.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Editorial change made following the comments presented in the Attachment_1_0073
1_0295	Bellassen, Valentin	1	288	294	The "Yes" arrow from "Is the forest cover expected to return within the regeneration period?" should go to "Has the land been subject to an activity, to be reported under Article 3.4, at any time since 1 Jan 1990?" rather than "Has the land been subject to AR activity at any time since 1 Jan 1990?". By definition, if the forest is expected to regrow, the land unit cannot be subject to AR.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0296	Brandon, Andrea	1	288	294	General comments on Figure 1.1. Decision tree is not as helpful as it could be. It is difficult to follow. it also contains errors. For example, the land that has been reforested on D land will not be identified and reported under D. In this flow chart it gets reported under A/R - that is not correct. A box needs to be inserted to ensure reporting of D is in line with CMP decisions. I recommend going back to the original Fig 4.1.1 in the original Ch and editing that to include the mandatory FM, the CEFC provision and WDR activities.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0297	Elvidge, Craig	1	288	292	Issue: The figure 1.1 is inconsistent with the definition of Reforestation, is difficult to understand and work through. Please refer to the original diagram in the previous guidelines, which started with the status of the land at 1990. Action: Please revise Figure 1.1 so that the classification of land is consistent with the definition of reforestation as per decisions 16/CMP.1, 2/CMP.6 and 2/CMP.7 and the ongoing work on Article 5, 7 and 8.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0298	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	288	288	It doesn't seem that the chart reflects how land could be classify in a friendly manner. And it has some assumptions that are not in line with Marrakech accords or decisions on rules for the 2CP, or the previous GPG, for example, areas under FM can't be subject to AR activities, as, by definition, they shall be reported under 3.3. if they comply with AR definitions.The treatment of CEFC in this chart is also confusing. An alternative approach for the chart has been sent with this document.	Attachment_1_0298.pdf	Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0299	Jonckheere, Inge	1	288	297	To avoid confusion in country, a general overview of steps might increase the readability of the decision trees, see attached in mail in Attachmenet_1_0299.pdf	Attachmenet_1_0299.pdf	Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0300	Ngarize, Sekai	1	288	293	Figure 1.1. This seems to work when deciding how to ascribe an activity to an area of land in a particular reporting year. However it is unclear how this relates to reporting for complex switches between AR and D since 1990 (e.g. AR occuring on an area of land in 1992 but D occuring on the same area of land in 2010 and what this means when accounting for area changes and emissions).		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0301	Singh, Vinay	1	288	292	This decision tree can be more simplified by segregating route A and B, so as to make it more clear for the forest developer and investor.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0302	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	288	Figure	The figure is quite good. However, it does not (directly) address two issues. These are both related to the crossroad with the text "Has the land been subject to an activity, to be reported under Article 3.4, at any time since 1 Jan 1990?". One issues is to directly include guidance on how to deal with unmanaged forests becoming managed forests, and another is how to deal with forests that are found in a reporting year (these forests are those that existed previously but were not detected by the land identification system as forests). In other words, the text of this crossroad is not fully understandable.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0303	Weiss, Peter	1_2	288		Box at the start: The starting question should be if the land meets the chosen national forest definition (similar to the type of question below the first box). The next boxes should be adjusted, if needed. Furthermore: The third box right after the start "...subject to an activity, to be reproted ..." is not very clear. I think this box can be deleted and substituted by the box above. Furthermore: The guidance in the boxes starting with letter A is not very clear. I think the first box after the A can be deleted or substituted by the box above. And an arrow from the row of boxes starting with A to the box "Report the area ... "Other" in the NIR..." is needed, where it fits.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0304	Beets, Peter	1	291	292	Figure 1. at box (yes Go to B) replace "harvested" with "deforested".		Rejected	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0305	Burgess, Deborah	1	291	291	Make the starting point of flow chart more obvious graphically		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0306	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	291	292	Figure 1.1, specify or give reference to what Carbon Equivalent Forest Conversion means?		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0307	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	291	292	(Figure 1.1) Entry: This decision tree does not apply the definition of forest as per 16/CMP.1 because according to decision 16/CMP.1 "forest is area of land" hence a statement "land covered by forest" is not correct . Please consider: Is this land forest as per definition contained in 16/CMP.1 in the reporting year?		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0308	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	291	292	(Figure 1.1) "Is this land covered by forest in the reporting year?"if Yes: how to recognize that a piece of land is covered by forest? See my remark on definition of forests above. (comment ID 1_0307)		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0309	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	291	292	(Figure 1.1) "Is this land covered by forest in the reporting year?"if No: what is the difference between the land covered by forest and the land being forest? Legally speaking two distinct categories of land are introduced here but there is no definition for any of them. See my remarks on application of definition of forest above (comment ID 1_0307)		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0310	Larocque, Guy	1.2	291	292	Within each diamond of the decision tree, refer to the relevant subsections in section 1.1. In case there might be some confusion, users will be able to get more precision.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0311	Lund, H. Gyde	1	291	291	Start arrow box - Should this be forest cover or forest use? Part of forest definition is one of use. Need to define covered. What is starting year?		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0312	Lund, H. Gyde	1	291	291	Figure 1.1 - The use of the words "forest cover" or "covered by forest" implies that there are trees present. However, the definition of 'forest' in footnote 6, line 134 suggests that even lands without trees may be considered 'forest' if the land has the potential to produce trees meeting the national thresholds at some point in the future.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0313	Lund, H. Gyde	1	291	291	Figure 1.1 - Start box - Consider using "Is this land presently covered by trees having at least X percent crown cover and are at least Y meters tall (where X and Y = National thresholds)" instead of what is currently there. What is considered 'forest' may be misinterpreted by some. Being more precise reduces that potential problem.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0314	Lund, H. Gyde	1	291	291	Figure 1.1. If the intent is to track changes in tree cover, then consider inserting the national thresholds for cover and height where ever the term 'forest' is used.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0315	Mueller, Christoph	1	291	292	Figure 1.1, instead of the bold arrow write START, remove go to B and instead insert the box there again; date: instead of 31 Dec 1989 it should be 1 January 1990; in the top box Forest Management can also be exchanged by FM; explain abbreviations in the notes to the Figure;		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0316	Perugini, Lucia	1	291	294	The chart is confusing as it is, in some cases is not in line with the Marrakesh accords definitions and rules established in decision 2/CMP7. From the chart it appears that areas under FM can be subject to AR activities..The treatment of CEFC in this chart is also confusing. Furthermore the insertion of the temporaly unstocked principle (i.e. "is the forest cover expected to return within the regeneration period?") is not needed since this concept is already within the forest definition of the Marrakesh Accords, thus a country should identify as forest also land temporary unstocked. An alternative approach for the chart is provided as separate attachment (file name: "Attachment_1_0316.pdf").	Attachment_1_0316.pdf	Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0317	Sperow, Mark	1.2	291	292	Add a "START" box to enhance the clarity of the figure.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0318	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	292	292	Figure 1.1 last box “report the land under the elected 3.4 activity under which it was reported in the previous year” is incorrect and contradicts lines 345/346. It also contradicts the reporting tables in section 2		Rejected	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0319	Petersson, Hans	1	292		Figure 1.1: On rows 35-38 it's conformed that Article 3.3 is accumulated since 1990 but not article 3.4. By reading all former IPCC documents e.g. FM (general for all Art. 3.4 activities) is only accumulated from the beginning of the first commitment period (or why isn't it stated that land under both Art. 3.3 and 3.4 are accumulated from 1990?). So in the decision tree shouldn't it be: Has the land been subject to FM since 2008 and not since 1990.		Rejected	The country must report activity on FM lands from 1990. The comment is more focused on an accounting issue which is beyond the scope of this Supplement Guidance.
1_0320	Rock, Joachim	1	292	292	Figure 1.1, middle: What is meant here by "regeneration period"?		Accepted with modification	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0321	Lund, H. Gyde	1	296	297	Other abbreviations used in the Figure are NIR KP and CRF. Consider defining.		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0322	Mueller, Christoph	1	296	297	these abbreviation should be at the beginning of the chapter, or at least much earlier		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0323	Weiss, Peter	1_2	296		Several of these abbreviations (activities) cannot be found in the figure. Is the figure not complete?		Accepted	Fig. 1.1 was completely revised using Attachment_1_0316 as starting document
1_0324	Brandon, Andrea	1	299	302	The definition in Decision 2/CMP.7 doesn't specify "with the exception of those non-forest areas originating from the conversion of plantations established after Jan 1, 1960 and before Jan 1 1990". The language in the decision is different and it not equivalent to ths statement although that may well have been the original intention.		Accepted	Editorial change made following the paragraph 37 of the Decision 2/CMP.7

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0325	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	299	306	<p>Para 38 of annex to 2/CMP.7 refers to accounting only: 38. All lands and associated carbon pools subject to the provision described in paragraph 37 above shall be accounted for as forest management under Article 3, paragraph 4, and not under Article 3, paragraph 3. A paragraph above, the GPG authors say that they will not deal with accounting but they are not consistent in following their promise.</p> <p>Legally speaking these lands are AR to be accounted as FM.</p>		Accepted with modification	<p>Editorial change made. It should be noted that this Supplement Guidance is a document that provides guidance on reporting which can be useful in subsequent accounting exercises. Also, it should be reminded that the accounting exercise is outside the scope of this Supplementary Guidance.</p>

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0326	Petersson, Hans	1	299	306	<p>In former IPCC GPG 2003 it was stated that after the beginning of the commitment period, land under FM could not leave this category except for D. What happens in the example below?</p> <p>A minor issue (probably only valid for a few countries) is that land under FM cannot leave this reporting category during the commitment period except for D. For example, Sweden has naturally degraded Forest land that is converted to unmanaged land (Wetland or Other land). This land is not considered D since its not human induced and since it constitutes a removal. But according to the guidelines this land should not leave FM. This imply that e.g. a minor area of Wetland under the UNFCCC is reported under FM and areas AR+FM is not exactly the same are as Forest land and land converted to Forest land. Since land once reported under KP cannot leave the reporting the discrepancy will increase in the future... So the rules indicates that the reporting between UNFCCC and KP in not harmonized for forestry.</p>		Rejected	The example corresponds to an accounting exercise, which is outside the scope of this Supplement Guidance. [Note: The author could not fully understand the example. Actually, it is not of good practice to convert a "Degraded Forest Land" into an "Unmanaged Land" which could not even be defined as Wetlands or Other Lands.
1_0327	Petersson, Hans	1	299	306	<p>Rows 299-306 together with rows 326-330 makes no sense E.g. Forest land (FM) degraded and converted to Wetlands in 2009 is not D since the trees remain and grows (removal). It could not be reported under FM since its not Forest land but it could not leave the Article 3.3 and 3.4 reporting...</p>		Rejected	Same answer as that of the Comment ID 1_0326

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0328	Beets, Peter	1	301	301	"...of replanted lands," Suggested wording "...of land converted to new forest to offset specific deforested land,"		Rejected	The used sentence is consistent with the 2/CMP.7 decision. I should be noted that there is no text which describe "new forest" in this context.
1_0329	Hargita, Yvonne	1.2.	302	302	With the addition ("Carbon Equivalent Forest Conversion," See Section 2.7.7 for details) there would be the clear connection to Figure 1.1.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0330	Radunsky, Klaus	1	303		Clearer language would be preferred, e.g.: Can take place on the same lands. However, any land		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0331	Weiss, Peter	1_2	303	304	Guidance should be adjusted to be in line with 2003 IPCC GPG and 2006 IPCC guidelines that foresee a certain hierarchy/preference in such cases, depending on the time and way of management (see for instance first paragraph in chapter 3.3 of the IPCC GPG).		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0332	Wiseman, Michael	1	303	303	Change text to (Grazing land and cropland can BOTH take place-----		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0333	Wiseman, Michael	1	306	306	Change text to (catagories but MUST be reported IF land----		Accepted	Editorial change made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0334	Brandon, Andrea	1	307	317	Confusing paragraph. If forest definition is met in reporting year, how can the land be reported under CM or GM? If the Parties definition of forest specifically excludes orchards, and/or short rotation tree crops then that land won't have been classed as forest in the first place. If not excluded from forest definition then the land in question must be classified as forest.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0335	Hoover, Coeli	1	307	317	This could be confusing and it would be helpful to include guidance as to which option should be chosen given the circumstances or criteria		Rejected	The specific guidance requested in the comment corresponds to an accounting issue, which is outside the scope of this Supplement Guidance.
1_0336	Munthali, Jack	1	307	317	The second option on the definition of forest is better in my view as it gives the country/party flexibility in accordance with their national circumstances		Accepted	It should be noted that the text of this sentence has been revised using that of the Decision 2/CMP.7
1_0337	Lund, H. Gyde	1	308	311	This is confusing to me. I interpret this to mean that if forest land is also used for grazing or crops, the land is considered 'non-forest'.		Rejected	In this sentence, it is clearly indicated that if the 1st approach is applied all lands which fulfill thenational forest defintiion are classified as Forest.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0338	Weiss, Peter	1_2	308	311	The second sentence under 1) seems to be a contradiction to the 1st sentence before. I think if "...or otherwise be accounted under FM" is added at the end of the 2nd sentence, it becomes more clear.		Rejected	There is none contradiction, because when the 1st approach is applied, all grazing and crop lands are classified non-forest.
1_0339	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	311	311	My syggestion is to clarify what does non-forest could mean in this context? It seems it change according to the country? Or interpretation?		Rejected	The countries involved are allowed to have this flexibility in the defintions, the national definitions of land can be applied.
1_0340	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	311	312	delete "other than forest - non-forest"		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0341	Lundblad, Mattias	1	321	325	I cannot see that there is a difference in the requirements for CM, GM, WRD and RV but they are explained differently.		Rejected	The author could not understand the comment. Actually, the comment doesn't seem to be substantive but more editorial.
1_0342	Vreuls, Harry	1	322		footnote 15 is not in line with para 19 Annex 16/CMP.1 (see also footnote 4 on page 2.11 where reference is made to this decision)		Accepted	The Footnote 15 has been replaced with the text from 16/CMP.1 (footnote 4 page 211) para 19 of Annex to decisions 16/CMP.1

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0343	Weiss, Peter	1_2	322		Footnote 15 needs to be adjusted for the new CP		Accepted	The Footnote 15 has been replaced with the text from 16/CMP.1 (footnote 4 page 211) para 19 of Annex to decisions 16/CMP.1
1_0344	Beets, Peter	1	323	324	"...revegetation resulting from direct human-induced activities since 1 January 1990." Does this intended to be applied in CP2 when, during CP1 , a country elected 3.4 but not 3.3? Or is there some other reason?		Rejected	This is probably a misunderstanding of the committments under CP1 where Art 3.3 activities are mandatory in all cases.
1_0345	Ngarize, Sekai	1	324		Remove full stop after 1990		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0346	Ngarize, Sekai	1	324		Footnote 16, third line: modify '...and requires to report all lands...' to 'and requires the Party to report all lands'		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0347	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	328	328	footnote 17: relevant para from annex to 2/CMP.7 should be quoted for CP2		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0348	Sato, Atsushi	1	328	328	Footnote 17, this reference of CMP decision should be updated to 2/CMP.7.		Accepted	Editorial change made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0349	Radunsky, Klaus	1	329	330	The sentence:" That is, the total land area included in the reporting of Article 3.3 and 3.4 activities can never decrease" might be not valid. Forest areas might become part of the ocean due to sea level rise or there might be other natural reasons, e.g. volcanic eruptions, that result in long-term losses of forests.		Accepted with modification	The raised point is accepted, however the sentence remains as it is in the FOD because the scope of this Supplement Guidance is to make a general and not a specific or case-by-case guidance. [Note: the consistency with Cluster 3 (Natural Disturbances) should be checked]
1_0350	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	329	329	please include emissions from natural disturbances that the Party wishes to exclude		Rejected	This is a misunderstanding of the reporting requirement that all pools should be reported. Actually, the carbon losses due to natural disturbances are excluded from the accounting, but are required to be reported, since they represent the result of the impact of the disturbances, from which the involved pool must recover before re-entering the accounting framework.
1_0351	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	331	333	It is possible to clarify this paragraph, maybe an example could be useful.		Accepted	Editorial change made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0352	Munthali, Jack	1	331	333	it is important to emphasise that though a unit of land can be reported under different activities in articles 3.3 & or 3.4, over time during a commitment period, it can only be reported under a single activity.		Rejected	The comment is incorrect - FM (3.4) land that is cleared has to be reported under 3.3. so switches between 3.4 and 3.3 are possible.
1_0353	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	331	333	This paragraph is too vague. It is not explain what certain activities are or what circumstances would apply for a land to be reported under article 3.3 and change to article 3.4 during the commitment period. Further it seems that the activities defined in lines 334-362 are in addition to this paragraph. Suggest removing or linking to the section where more explanation is provided.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0354	Sperow, Mark	1.2	331	333	This paragraph has very vague language ("certain activities" - such as?; "under certain circumstances" - for example?...) Please clarify.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0355	Wiseman, Michael	1	332	332	Change text to (unit of land or LANDS-----		Accepted	Editorial change made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0356	Brandon, Andrea	1	336	338	Reference made to item (ii) in footnote 12, but footnote 12 does not have items listed. I think this possibly refers to notes under the diagram - probably note 2.		Accepted	Editorial change made: Footnote 12 was revised
1_0357	Ngarize, Sekai	1	336	338	Not possible to find Footnote 12 and associated item (ii). The ordering of the description here seems strange. The reasoning behind this guidance note comes later in the chapter.		Accepted	Editorial change made: Footnote 12 was revised
1_0358	Sperow, Mark	1.2	337	337	I did not see "item (ii)" in the referenced footnote.		Accepted	Editorial change made: Footnote 12 was revised
1_0359	Weiss, Peter	1_2	339	340	See related comments above. There is limited freedom for hierarchy for the parties, because FM is obligatory and has therefore precedence in the hierarchy. (comment ID 1_0202)		Accepted	Already answered in the Comment ID 1_0202
1_0360	Alfredsen, Gry	1	348	351	Include a reference to where to find the 'certain conditions'?		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0361	Mueller, Christoph	1	349	349	write "between 1 January 1960 to 1 January 1990"		Rejected	This is the direct quotation of the Decision text
1_0362	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	350	350	Add, at the end of the sentence, "if these certain condicions are not met, it shall be reported as deforestation under article 3.3."		Accepted	Editorial change made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0363	Mueller, Christoph	1	350	350	explain conditions in a footnote		Accepted	Editorial change made: "conditions" are referenced instead of defining in a footnote
1_0364	Sperow, Mark	1.2	350	350	It would be helpful to have a reference or footnote to identify "certain conditions"		Accepted	"certain conditions" are referenced
1_0365	Sperow, Mark	1.2	352	352	The phrase "of course" does not add to the clarity of the statement.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0366	Rock, Joachim	1	354	370	Please decide whether land or units of land can or can not transition from FM to another Art. 3.4 activity.		Rejected	The paragraph was focused on the classification of lands under Article 3.4, and on possible transition from one to another activity under the same Article
1_0367	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	354	357	what is the meaning of these restrictions. A change of the situation (e.g. there was FM (with a peat component), the forest is being removed (D), and now the area is rewetted (WDR) shall be reported accordingly .	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	The conditions are set out and defined in the Decision 2/CMP.7, To explain the meaning of the conditions is outside the scope of the Supplement Guidance. The purpose of the Supplement Guidance is to prevent the country from removing lands previously reported under mandatory or elected under Article 3.3 and 3.4 activities to activities which have not been elected.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0368	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	355	356	We can not stop land from transitioning to a new activity. But we need to continue to report it. Sentence should read “When a land transitions from an elected 3.4 activity to other land or to another non-elected 3.4 activity that land needs to continue to be reported and accounted for, an should be reported under the previous elected 3.4 activity”		Rejected	This is an 1_editorial and not 1_substantive. The sentence was reconsidered and found to be sufficiently clear
1_0369	Beets, Peter	1	357	357	Footnote 18. Why not set a rule that makes this theoretically not possible. The equivalent forest provision applies to land in forest prior to 1990, to which a cap on credits applies. ARD land has no cap an the equivalent forest concept is irrelevant.		Rejected	To set rules which would make the content of Footnote 18, theoretically not possible is out of scope of this Supplement Guidance. It should be noted that Footnote 18 was reconsidered and deleted in the SOD
1_0370	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.2	357		Footnote 18 --> Discussion needs CLEAR MESSAGE because if not, different ERT members can have different interpretations of the text leading to different considerations, e.g., on the issue that if a country has by law, all their forests managed, the "abandonment" of croplands could become, when fulfilling the FL definition, forest land, due to the human-induced action of the regeneration protection.		Accepted	Footnote 18 was deleted since it seemed to misleading and more related to accounting issue

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0371	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	357	357	Footnote 18: ¿¿????		Accepted	Footnote 18 was deleted since it seemed to misleading and more related to accounting issue. [Note: The author had also " ¿¿????" while drafting Footnote 18]
1_0372	Weiss, Peter	1_2	357		For a consistent use of this clause and of similar guidance at other places of the FOD, I would delete the option in footnote 18.		Accepted	Footnote 18 was deleted since it seemed to misleading and more related to accounting issue
1_0373	Brandon, Andrea	1	358	362	After the first commitment period land cannot transition from D to A/R. There is no decision to support this.		Accepted	The paragraph has been rewording for clarity improvement
1_0374	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	358	362	Very confusing paragraph, I suggest to clarify		Accepted	The paragraph was rewording for clarity improvement

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0375	Elvidge, Craig	1	358	362	<p>Issue: Areas of land deforested can not transfer to AR land unless a period of 50 years has elapsed. Areas of land deforested and subsequently replanted, as per commitment period 1, shall be reported and accounted under the D activity. This ensures consistency of reporting over commitment periods and maintains the definition of Afforestation as per decisions 16/CMP.1, 2/CMP6 and 2CMP.7.</p> <p>Action: Please revise accordingly so that the reporting of C stock changes and units of land deforested remain in the D category for commitment period two for Kyoto Protocol reporting regardless of subsequent land cover changes.</p>		Rejected	The comment seemed to result from a mix-up of different Decisions. The proposed Action could not be acceptable since it was resulted from a misunderstanding of the Decision 2/CMP.7
1_0376	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	358	362	Delete. This lands where new forests are established, when the land has been deforested after 1990, don't meet the definition of AR, therefore, can't be clasified as such in reporting. Furthermore, this reclasification of these lands will create problems in time series.		Rejected	The comment seemed to issue from a misunderstanding of Decision 2/CMP.7.
1_0377	Ngarize, Sekai	1	358	362	it should be clarified that such replanting of deforested land would be Reforestation, never Afforestation. The second sentence in the bullet point (358-361)is very confusing (particularly '...the 3.3 category in which carbon stock increases are reported but not the reported amount...') and should be reworded.		Accepted	The paragraph was rewording for clarity improvement

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0378	Ngarize, Sekai	1	358	362	It is not clear what this means in terms of how emissions and removals due to D and then due to AR are accounted for before or within a commitment period.		Accepted	The paragraph was rewording for clarity improvement
1_0379	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	358	362	Does this apply to only to non-forest land that was established in forest since 1990 (AR) that was deforested in CP1? or does it also includes land that was forest at 1990 (potential FM or FM if elected) that was later deforested? Suggest clarifying and also adding a footnote to which decision covers this process.		Accepted	Examples were added in Box 1.1. The paragraph was rewording for clarity improvement
1_0380	Weiss, Peter	1_2	358	362	It is difficult to follow what is meant here.		Accepted	The paragraph was rewording for clarity improvement
1_0381	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	359	359	Specify which conditions are necessary.		Accepted	The paragraph was rewording for clarity improvement
1_0382	Beets, Peter	1	362	362	Footnote 19. Relates to 3.4 land (pre-1990 forest land) becoming 3.3 units of land following deforestation and the footnote suggestions it remain under 3.3 if re-afforested. Do not agree with this. While deforestation liability will have been paid if deforested during CP1, this is not so if deforested prior to CP1! The example (Example 1 in Box 1.1, deforested in 1995) would best follow the equivalent area approach, and if reafforested, should therefore become 3.4 FM land.		Rejected	The text in line 362 aimed at providing guidance in reporting C stock increases under AR during CP1, which reflects the C stock of the land use of the reporting year, while the comment was focused on an accounting rules during CP1, which is outside the scope of this Supplement Guidance

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0383	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	362	362	Footnote 19 is incorrect and should be deleted. If it were to apply ALL reforestation under 3.4FM should be reclassified as 3.3AR. However, there is a case for accepting changes from D to AR, as both share the same level in the activity hierarchy and AR is closest to the actual current land use. From an emissions/removals perspective the same amount of emissions and removals are accounted for under both options, by the suggestion made in this paragraph makes it more transparent.		Rejected	This seems to be a misunderstanding from the reviewer. Actually, there is no reforestation under Article 3.4 activity, FM. Also, the footnote is a quote from the decision and therefore, the discussion on its correctness is beyond the scope of the Supplementary Guidance
1_0384	Rösemann, Claus	1.2.	362	362	two dots		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0385	Burgess, Deborah	1	365	367	This statement contradicts lines 358-362 by implying that all land deforested since 1990 will continue to be classed as D		Accepted	The text in lines 358-362 was revised for clarity improvement and avoiding the inconsistency raised by the comments
1_0386	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	370	370	Deforestation can only be reported as deforestation, i.e., it can not add area to 3.4 activities, even when the conversion from forest to cropland or grassland occurs. The emissions and removals of these activities need to be reported as deforestation. Delete sentence.		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0387	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	370	370	Delete. It is true that D can remove land from FM, but it must be maintained in the D category, it can't be moved to another 3,4, activity. As estated in line 357, land cannot leave article 3,3, reporting. Therefore, even when the forest is converted to cropland under cropland management, and the Party has selected CM for the 2CP, the land shall be maintained in the Deforestation reporting. also in contradiction with lines 415 to 418 (example of assignment of units of land)		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted. [Note: UNFCCC reporting should be distinguished from the KP reporting]
1_0388	Lundblad, Mattias	1	370		Since D has preceedence over art.3.4 it cannot increase the area of an art. 3.4 activity. Delet the last part of the sentence.		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted
1_0389	Ngarize, Sekai	1	370		This is incorrect, deforestation would either add the area to Article 3.3 Deforestation, or it would remain in Article 3.4 Forest management under certain circumstances. It also contradicts the statement in line 354		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted
1_0390	Petersson, Hans	1	370		Something wrong with this sentence		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0391	Sato, Atsushi	1	370	370	I am not quite sure the second sentence that D can add it to an elected Article 3.4 category, because D area is always under Article 3.3 even if D land is converted to cropland ,grassland and so on.		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted
1_0392	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	370	375	add example of WDR	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Not needed - self evident
1_0393	Sturgiss, Rob	2	370		Line 370 – is this correct? How could Deforestation add land to an Article 3.4 activity, wouldn't it have to move from FM to Defor? This also appears in consistent with line 354		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted
1_0394	Weiss, Peter	1_2	370		Delete the second part "...and can add it to an elected Article 3.4 category". This is definitely not possible, because such land becomes D land (except using the CEFC option).		Accepted	The line 370 was revised and incorrect part deleted
1_0395	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	371	371	AR can remove land from CM, GM, RV, WDR or other land		Accepted	The line 371 was revised as per the comment, however "Other Land", which is a UNFCCC category and not Article 3.4 activity, and therefore not relevant and not added here

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0396	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	372	372	All elected 3.4 activities (except FM) can be converted from one into another, without loss of transparency.		Accepted	The line 372 was revised to take into account the comment
1_0397	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	374	375	FM areas can also increase under the narrow approach, as more land becomes “managed” over time.		Accepted	The lines 374-375 were revised to take note of the comment
1_0398	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	374	375	expanding road infrastructure is not enough to make the neighbouring forest a managed forest.		Accepted with modification	The text is edited to make it clear that this is an example of how developing road infrastructure may facilitate an expansion of FM. It is agreed that the existence of new road infrastructure of itself is not proof of Fm activity.
1_0399	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	1.2	378		Box examples along with the text do not harm, as it can make reading a bit more friendly.		Accepted	The reviewer's comment is noted. The Text in the Example Box will be edited to improve clarity
1_0400	Eve, Marlen	1	378	378	I believe the examples should be left in boxes within the body of text. They add to the clarity and understanding of the document.		Accepted	The reviewer's comment is noted. The Text in the Example Box will be edited to provide greater clarity

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0401	Herold, Anke	1.2	378	378	keep examples in the boxes in the text, they are useful and it is more user-friendly to keep them in the main text.		Accepted	Reviewer's recommendation is noted
1_0402	Hoover, Coeli	1	378	378	From a usability standpoint, recommend leaving examples as currently placed and not moving to an annex.		Accepted	Reviewer's recommendation is noted
1_0403	Mueller, Christoph	1	378	444	consider moving the examples, clear simple examples should be given following the flowchart,		Rejected	Reviewer's comment is noted, however, moving the Example Box to a position earlier in the chapter would not substantially improve clarity.
1_0404	Munthali, Jack	1	378	378	it would probably difficult to follow when the examples move to annex		Accepted	Reviewer's recommendation is noted
1_0405	Rock, Joachim	1	378	378	Please do not move examples to an annex. Having to thumb through a text is not very user-friendly and, roughly guessed, more than 90% of the people having to work with the text after ist finalisation will be glad to have examples right at hand.		Accepted	Reviewer's recommendation is noted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0406	Wiseman, Michael	1	378	378	Agree that all examples should be in an annexe.		Rejected	The reviewer's comment is noted, however, the majority of reviewers' feedback on this issue prefer to leave the Box in the main text.
1_0407	Alfredsen, Gry	1	379	379	It is very convenient and reader friendly to keep the examples in the text...		Accepted	Reviewer's recommendation is noted
1_0408	Munthali, Jack	1	385	419	Example clearly explaine and clarified (Box 1.1)		Accepted	The reviewer's comment is noted. The Text in the Example Box will be edited to provide greater clarity
1_0409	Ngarize, Sekai	1	385	442	It is very important to include examples explaining what to do with land that is initially classified as AR but then becomes D either before the commitment period (CP), during the first CP and during the second CP. Similarly with land initially classified as D but that then becomes AR.		Accepted	An example of this scenario is added to the text.
1_0410	Singh, Vinay	1	386	387	Article 3.4 and 3.3 should be hyperlinked with a note/definiton of the article in the report		Accepted with modification	This suggestion will be explored for the electronic version of the final document. However, this may not be possible given that the document must be accepted in a complete form at UNFCCC.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0411	Lambrecht, Jesse	1	390	390	the the Kyoto Protocol		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0412	Ngarize, Sekai	1	390		repetition of 'the' before Kyoto Protocol		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0413	Lundblad, Mattias	1	393		Change "reported" to "described".		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0414	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1	398	401	This paragraph gives an idea of what the term reporting hierarchy means?		Accepted with modification	In answer to the reviewer's question, Yes, the issue of hierarchy is discussed in detail elsewhere. Here the impact of the heirarchy is illustrated.
1_0415	Pulles, Tinus	1.2	401	401	<p>What is a "secondary classification"?</p> <p>Does it in fact mean that information on this plot of land is to be accounted for in two different locations in the KP reporting tables. Or does it mean something else. I surely hope that it is not double counted in the reporting! A clear distinction between estimating emissions/removals, reporting these in predefined tables and accounting would help to avoid this type of inclarities.</p> <p>Is also used in the caption of the decision tree above...</p>		Accepted	The reviewer has identified a possible ambiguity in the text. It is not the intention to indicate "double-counting" is possible. The test has bee edited to remove ambiguity. The use of the term "secondary classification" will be replaced by "sub-division of the KP activity".

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0416	Brandon, Andrea	1	402	405	This is incorrect. Land cannot transition from D to R. There has been no decision to allow land to move out of D to R. These emissions/removals should continue to be reported under D.		Accepted	The reviewer is correct. There has been no change to the reporting requirements for ARD under Art. 3.3, therefore deforestation cannot be reclassified as reforestation. However, the methodologies for estimation for emission and removals appropriate to reforestation may be applied.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0417	Elvidge, Craig	1	402	405	<p>Issue: This example is not correct. Units of land and C stock changes should be reported under D regardless of the subsequent land cover. Deforestation land cannot become afforestation/reforestation as per the definitions. Land deforested cannot become afforestation/reforestation land in the first commitment period and subsequent commitments periods given decisions 16/CMP.1, 2/CMP6 and and 2CMP.7. Also the current work relating to updating Articles 5,7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol has not yet been completed. If a forest is established on land deforested since 1990, the carbon removals cannot be reported as a reforestation activity because of the time limits in the definition for reforestation agreed in the Marrakesh Accords, designed not to credit reforestation on lands that were forest land in 1990. Because there is the need for continuous full reporting of lands subject to Article 3.3 and 3.4 activities, any carbon stock increases later in the commitment period/s on deforestation lands will be reported under the deforestation category.</p> <p>Action: Please delete this example as it is incorrect.</p>		Accepted	The reviewer is correct. There has been no change to the reporting requirements for ARD under Art. 3.3, therefore deforestation cannot be reclassified as reforestation. However, the methodologies for estimation for emission and removals appropriate to reforestation may be applied.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0418	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	402	405	The transition of lands from the activity D to AR is against definitions of A and R, creates problems in time series, and inconsistencies with the reporting of the first CP. Even if a new forest is established, the Party should continue reporting it under D.		Accepted	The reviewer is correct. There has been no change to the reporting requirements for ARD under Art. 3.3, therefore deforestation cannot be reclassified as reforestation. However, the methodologies for estimation for emission and removals appropriate to reforestation may be applied.
1_0419	Lundblad, Mattias	1	413		These emissions are to be reported in the Agricultural sector and not in the AFOLU-sector. AFOLU remains in the 2006 GL but the reporting will still be separated in Agric. and LULUCF.		Accepted	Text has been amended to correct this error.
1_0420	Forbes, Keith	1	415	415	emissions (sp!)		Accepted	Editorial change has been made
1_0421	Lambrecht, Jesse	1	415	415	emissions		Accepted	Editorial change has been made
1_0422	Mueller, Christoph	1	415	415	should be "emissions"		Accepted	Editorial change has been made
1_0423	Ngarize, Sekai	1	415		mis-spelling of emissions		Accepted	Editorial change has been made
1_0424	Wiseman, Michael	1	415	415	Change spelling from emissions to (EMISSIONS-----		Accepted	Editorial change has been made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0425	Forbes, Keith	1	421	444	At least to me, the tabular examples confound more than they clarify. Narrative examples could be more useful.		Accepted with modification	The Example Box received generally positive comments, however the need for revised text to improve clarity is accepted. The tabular structure is retained for the SOD
1_0426	Burgess, Deborah	1	423	423	Replace "land use classification" with "land management activity". Land use classification of a deforested area may be grassland but reporting category is D.		Accepted	Reviewer has identified a possible ambiguity in the text. The text has been revised in line with their suggested wording.
1_0427	Brandon, Andrea	1	424	425	Box 1.1. Status in CP2 row for CM, GM and RV - should be represented as M/[E/NE]		Accepted	Accepted. Correction made
1_0428	Burgess, Deborah	1	424	424	First table is not an example but describes reporting options available to parties based on reporting chosen in CP1. Reposition as suggested in line 80 comment. Suggest subdividing 3.4 columns into E and NE for CP1 row and show CP2 options in next row. eg for 3.4 columns other than FM, CP1=E , CP2 must be E; for CP1=NE, CP = [E/NE]. This is only a formatting change but would add clarity.		Accepted with modification	The need to improve clarity is accepted. In the SOD this will be attempted through revised text. Revision to the structure will be consider following SOD comments.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0429	Elvidge, Craig	1	424	425	Issue: there is a mistake in this table, in the entries for CM and GM corresponding with 'Status in CP2'. This should be 'M/[E/NE]' for both. Also, 'NE' usually means 'not estimated', which is a bit confusing. Action: Please correct table.		Accepted with modification	The first point is correct, and the text is edited accordingly. The comment regarding "NE" notation is noted, however, it is retained for the SOD. In the context of this Supplement, were a person to misread the notation as "not estimated" the basic meaning would still be communicated as "not estimated for purpose of reporting under KP".
1_0430	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	424	424	Square brackets in the table above are not explained		Accepted	The square brackets are unnecessary. Deleted
1_0431	Hargita, Yvonne	1.2.	424	425	Box 1.1: There is no definition of the WDR status "N/A"		Accepted	Omission noted and corrected
1_0432	Kato, Junko	Box 1.1	424	424	The column "E/E[NE]" for "Activity:GM" of "Status in CP2" should be "E[E/NE]".		Accepted with modification	There is an error, it should be M/E/NE
1_0433	Ngarize, Sekai	1	424	425	Too many abbreviations in this table. Some could be replaced by actual words without affecting the size greatly.		Rejected	The purpose is present the information as as concise a form as possible, and also to present a template which users may use in their own analysis.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0434	Weiss, Peter	1_2	424		The first E in the line "Status in CP2" for the columns CM, GM and RV should be changed to M, because after E in CP1 it will be mandatory in CP2.		Accepted	Correct, text ammended accordingly
1_0435	Ngarize, Sekai	1	427	428	This is a statement too open to interpretation. Consider adding 'depending on the nationally-defined heirarchy of elected 3.4 activities established before the start of the commitment period'.		Accepted	Correct, revised following suggested text
1_0436	Burgess, Deborah	1	430	442	These examples are very useful but use confusing terminology. Suggest replacing "Answer" with "Reporting sequence" and remove "X"s in Answer row, replacing with "Report in this category for.."		Accepted	A revised terminology is applied- "Reporting Solution"
1_0437	Galinski, Wojciech	1.2	431	431	There was no question here. Applies also to lines 435, 437, 441		Accepted	A revised terminology is applied- "Reporting Solution"
1_0438	Christophersen, Øyvind	Box 1.1	433	434	Please check if the year 2010 in the GM-colum and in the RV-colum is correct. Should it rather be 2015 and 2013, respectively?		Accepted with modification	The reviwer is partially correct. The year should be 2015 in both cases. Text revised accordingly

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0439	Rivas Palma, Rosa	1	433	435	Change the '2010' year under GM and RV for '2015'.		Accepted	Text revised
1_0440	Rogiers, Nele	1.2	433	435	As we understand it in the columns GM (Grazing Land) and RV (Revegetation) the year should read 2015.		Accepted	Text revised
1_0441	Burgess, Deborah	1	434	434	Answer row, columns 6 and 7 should read 2015 not 2010; also place "or" between columns		Accepted	Text revised
1_0442	Sato, Atsushi	1	434	434	The year must be "2015" not " 2010" in the cells "GM-Answer" and "RV -Answer".		Accepted	Text revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0443	Weiss, Peter	1_2	434		"2010" in last line of column GM should be changed to "2015". Delete the text in last box of column RV and adjust the text in the last line of the table, because this activity is not in line with the definition of revegetation as for instance described in the 2003 IPCC GPG, chapter 4.2.10.1 and in chapter 2.11.1 of this FOD (e.g. you can find there: "... activity to increase C stocks...", "...establishment of vegetation...", "...to replace the previous ... ground cover that had followed a land disturbance" - change from CL to GL is not in line with these definitions).		Accepted with modification	First comment is correct, text has been revised. The second point is more complex. It is possible for a land previously classified as cropland to be reclassified as RV provided the Party has provided clear definitions as to the circumstances as to when this can apply. Typically, this would not be recommended as it would be not very transparent, but it is allowable.
1_0444	Sato, Atsushi	1	443	443	I suggest including one more example that a cropland was turned into a grazing land in 2015, only CM was elected in CP2. In the case the land has to be reported under CM continuously in the years 2015 onward, because the land was once accounted under Article 3.4. I believe this example helps both inventory compilers and reviewers.		Accepted	Inserted
1_0445	Canaveira, Paulo	1.2	444	444	Add example of a CM->GM or CM->other land, but only CM was elected.		Accepted	Inserted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0446	Pulles, Tinus	1.3	445	474	<p>This section seems to explain some complicated issues related to the possibilities Parties have to meet part of their targets by "buying" credits from CDM or JI projects.</p> <p>If this explanation is correct, which I am not sure of, it in any case is a very confusing explanation.</p> <p>Article 6 of the KP says: "For the purpose of meeting its commitments under Article 3, any Party included in Annex I may transfer to, or acquire from, any other such Party emission reduction units resulting from projects aimed at reducing anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancing anthropogenic removals by sinks of greenhouse gases in any sector of the economy, provided that"</p> <p>I cannot read this as an obligation by Parties to include these reductions in their inventories. These reduction units are obviously to be known at the time of the final accounting. It is surely not the case that in the energy sector these projects are implicitly included. The fuel use in foreign CDM or JI projects are not included in national energy statistics.</p> <p>So in my understanding, project accounting is separate from the inventory reporting. The two are combined during the accounting where emission reduction units could either be subtracted from the national total in the inventory, or added to the assigned amounts. This is mathematically equivalent.</p>		Accepted with modification	As described in text, The methods for estimating, measuring, monitoring and reporting greenhouse gas emissions and removals resulting from LULUCF project activities are addressed in Section 4.3 of the GPG-LULUCF (LULUCF Projects) . but the parties need reporting emisison or removed from the Projects under Article 6 according, it is requirement of Decision 15/CMP.5 -- Guidelines for the preparation of the information required under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol, A FOOTNOTE WAS INCLUDED

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0447	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	453	454	I think the report of LULUCF project under article 6 should be seperated with the report of ghg emissions or removals from article 3.3 and 3.4 activities, just like CDM AR activity.		Accepted with modification	As described in text,The methods for estimating, measuring, monitoring and reporting greenhouse gas emissions and removals resulting from LULUCF project activities are addressed in Section 4.3 of the GPG-LULUCF (LULUCF Projects) . but the parties need reporting emisison or removed from the Projects under Article 6 according, it is requirement of Decision 15/CMP.5 -- Guidelines for the preparation of the information required under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol
1_0448	Bellassen, Valentin	1	467	474	This paragraph goes without saying. I would remove it for conciseness sake.		Rejected	the paragraph has function , and text was revsied
1_0449	Munthali, Jack	1	467	474	an important and valid clarification made between project and national accounting. Noting changes in the second commitment period		Accepted with modification	text wad revised
1_0450	Schrrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	467	474	add WRD	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	WDR was add in revsied Text

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0451	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	467	474	the meaning of this paragraph is not clearly expressed. In first commitment period, AR and RM are accounted in gross-net approach, we can take this approach as no baseline scenario, but Cropland management, grazing land management and revegetation are accounted in net-net approach, in this case, emissions or removals from these activities in 1990 should be treated as a kind of baseline or reference level. In general, I think the project-level baseline is different with the reference level for activities of article 3.4, project-level baseline cannot be used for reporting of activities of article 3.4. therefore, I suggest this paragraph may need to be reformulated.		Accepted	revised
1_0452	Paul, Sonja	1.3	469	470	why is wetland drainage and rewetting not included?		Accepted	Revised
1_0453	Galinski, Wojciech	1.3	470	471	FMRL is the correct term here,		Accepted	Revised
1_0454	Rodriguez, Dionisio	1.3	470	470	management and revegetation, I think it should be completed with: management, revegetation and wetland drainage and rewetting		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0455	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	473	473	add "relative to the FM reference level" after "greenhouse gas emissions"?		Accepted	Revised
1_0456	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	477	492	the titles of the subparagraphs do not fully relate to the title of paragraph 2.2: 1) identification 2) stratification 3) reporting.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Noted but we maintain consistency with the structure of the 2003 GPG, as per instructions.
1_0457	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	480	483	methods and good practice guidance for estimation, measurement, monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions and carbon changes following LULUCF activities under articles 3.3 and 3.4 (and 6?). See also earlier comment in Overall comments.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	No we do not address Article 6 in detail to justify its inclusion in the title.
1_0458	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	489		Page 2.2 (line 489): methods for lands subject to article 3.3 and units of land subject to article 3.4	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	in SOD we have removed distinction between units of lands and lands for clarity.
1_0459	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	495	505	re-arrangement of sections makes things more clear. Suggestion: 1) pools 2) spatial issues (stratification, spatial variability etc) 3) temporal issues (inter-annual variability, length of time series, commitment periods etc) 4) measuring 5) uncertainty and quality issues 6) reporting.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	We were instructed to maintain structural consistency with 2003 GPG for clarity.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0460	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	619	624	Table 2.4.1 - the second commitment period - Table 2.4.1 (Continued) - the first commitment period - Which is correct ?		Accepted	Revised
1_0461	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	628	628	Forestunder		Accepted	Revised
1_0462	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	643	643	N2O emissions - use subscript for N2		Accepted	Revised
1_0463	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	651	651	documentationwhen		Accepted	Revised
1_0464	Lund, H. Gyde	2	661	688	Consider adding names of all boxes		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0465	Pulles, Tinus	2	690	693	<p>I believe that this chapter would be greatly improved if it were written from the clear understanding that emissions/removals estimation, reporting and accounting are separate steps in a process related to the Kyoto Protocol commitments.</p> <p>The estimation would be fully independent of the specificities and peculiarities agreed in the CMP decisions for accounting under the different articles and paragraphs of the KP. It would lead to the best estimate of the CO2 emissions as a consequence of the total carbon balance of each plot of land. The only difference for LULUCF as compared to other sectors would be that the method applied here is based on a carbon balance, comparing the total amounts of C stored in the area at the beginning of a year/period with that of the end of the year/period by quantifying the carbon flows between the different pools and the atmosphere.</p> <p>The reporting would then interpret the detailed results of the emissions/removals estimates towards the tables and cells etc. of the reporting formats, taking into account the reporting guidelines and related UNFCCC requirements.</p> <p>Finally the accounting then could be done, based on the data as reported in these tables and cells of the reporting format and following the specificities and peculiarities of the CMP decisions.</p>		Accepted with modification	Some of the these suggestions were implemented (e.g. clearer explanations of the steps estimation, reporting and accounting) but the chapter was not restructured as we have to maintain consistency with 2003 GPG structure.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0466	Alfredsen, Gry	2	698	701	Harvested wood products (HWP) - chapter 2.8 is forgotten in the list. To be included after Forest Management.		Accepted	Revised
1_0467	Munthali, Jack	2	698	701	perharps it would be good to explain further why afforestation and reforestation together in the specific methodology		Accepted with modification	This is already stated in Chapter 1 that there are no methodological differences.
1_0468	Christophers en, Øyvind	2	700	701	Please consider if the Harvested wood products should be mentioned here. It is not an activity, but it is one of the chapters refered to in the bracket - Chapter 2.5 - 2.12,		Accepted	Revised
1_0469	Brandon, Andrea	2	703	706	I recommend the Kyoto Protocol (Articles 3.3 and 3.4) "Land-use categories" to be referred to differently from the UNFCCC land use categories, and suggest they are called "management activities". Therefore this title "RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UNFCCC LAND-USE CATEGORIES AND KYOTO PROTOCOL (ARTICLES 3.3 AND 3.4) LAND-USE CATEGORIES" would read "RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UNFCCC LAND-USE CATEGORIES AND KYOTO PROTOCOL (ARTICLES 3.3 AND 3.4) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES		Accepted with modification	Accept the substantive issue in the comment, however, will not use the word "management" in section title "RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UNFCCC LAND-USE CATEGORIES AND KYOTO PROTOCOL (ARTICLES 3.3 AND 3.4) ACTIVITIES". This is more consistent with Decision terminology than the original text.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0470	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	709	711	Is this sentence really necessary? Should this guidance refer to GPG at all (instead of referring to relevant sections of the 2006 GL?)?		Accepted	Reference to the 2003 GPG LULUCF was unnecessary and has been deleted
1_0471	Lund, H. Gyde	2	715	715	Should 'grassland' be 'grazing land'? They seemed to be interchanged. Grazing lands may include sagebrush and cerrado areas, where as grasslands would not.		Rejected	There is strong distinction made between Grazing Land in the context of Art 3.4 reporting and Grassland within LULUCF reporting. The main point of distinction being the treatment of natural grasslands. But as indicated, a Party may choose a definition of "Grazing Land" which includes non-grassland areas. Therefore LULUCF "Grasslands" are not synonymous with Art 3.4 "Grazing Land"
1_0472	Ngarize, Sekai	2	716		should additional reference to the 2013 Wetlands supplement be made somewhere in this section?		Accepted	Reference to 2013 Wetlands Supplement has been added, noting that the actual document is not accepted at this time.
1_0473	Weiss, Peter	2_1	721	722	add "...except the area of unmanaged land categories for completeness and consistency reasons" after the sentence		Accepted	Revised - the area does need to be reported for consistency
1_0474	Lundblad, Mattias	2.1	724		LUCF --> LULUCF (?)		Accepted	Text corrected

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0475	Ngarize, Sekai	2	724		should LUCF be LULUCF?		Accepted	Text corrected
1_0476	Perugini, Lucia	1	724	724	Replace LUCF with LULUCF for consistency with terminology under the Convention inventory		Accepted	Text corrected
1_0477	Vreuls, Harry	2	724		abrivation LUCF is not correct also the UNFCCC guidelines holds LULUCF. I suggest that LUCF is not used at all		Accepted	Text corrected
1_0478	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	729		729 onwards: In The Wetlands Supplement there is a section on ‘ Good practice and implications for reporting’. Refer to this section?.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Refererence to Wetlands Supplement included in text
1_0479	Gensior, Andreas	2.1	737	738	Table 2.1.1 is not consequential concerning the conversion from land to Other land; the table shows, that only Forest land can convert to Other Land. Why? If we say, land once managed can never be treated as unmanaged then it has to be valid for Forestland too and D can´t be listed in the Table under Other land. Otherwise it has to be possible for all other Land use categories too. If not there must be a rule written in the text, that conversion to Other land from all land-use categories with exception of Forest land is not possible and the corresponding fields in the table has to be marked with colour. But that´s not the solution for the logical Problem.		Accepted with modification	The first point is correct. Other transitions to "Other Land" should be included. Table has been revised. The text of the table is also revised to provide clarity on the point which has confused the reviewer as to the purpose of the table which is to illustrate the relationship between LULUCF and Art 3.3 and 3.4. As such it only represents a sub-set of all possible transitions within LULUCF.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0480	Hargita, Yvonne	2.1.	737	738	Table 2.1.1: Doesn't the footnote (**) belong to the bold "D"?		Accepted	Accepted editorial change
1_0481	Hargita, Yvonne	2.1.	737	738	In Figure 2.1.1 "Unmanaged Wetland" is mentioned but in Table 2.1.1 it's no Initial Land Use Classification		Accepted with modification	The distinction between managed and unmanged wetland is not necessary to this discussion.
1_0482	Paul, Sonja	2.1	737		talbe 2.1.1 layout: I would prefere to distinguish more the difference between normal font and bold font		Accepted with modification	Revisions to format of table to improve clarity will be considered
1_0483	Radunsky, Klaus	2	737		Table 2.1.1, chapeau: in comparison to table 4.2.1 of chapter 4.2.1 GPG-LULUCF table 2.1.1 includes an additional sentence in the chapeau: Managenment activities cannot create "unmanaged land" and therefore unmanaged categoires are not included in the final columns. This additional sentence could have significant implications for accounting, if mis-interpreted. Therefore it is suggested to include the following footnote: This does not exclude the possibility of management decisions that result in a change from a managed forest to an unmanaged forest.		Rejected	The reviewer is incorrect, it is not possile to transition from managed to unmanaged forest under the reporting rules.
1_0484	Rock, Joachim	2	737	738	Table 2.1.1 - Please comment empty cells. Why should it not be possible to transfer land from e.g. "Cropland" to "other land"?		Accepted with modification	The text in the table has been revised to add clarity to its purpose. Not all possibel LULUCF trasnitions have an impact on reproting under KP, and so are not included. However, the specific example given the reviewer is possible, and has been added.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0485	Sato, Atsushi	2	737	737	It seems that Table 2.1.1 does not fully cover the case which referred in page 1.11 line 326 to 330.		Rejected	No land use change is identified which would allow a Party to not report Art 3.3 or 3.4 activities where relevant.
1_0486	Vreuls, Harry	2	737	738	As unmanagement land is not reported, a change to a managed land use will have consequences for the total area of managed land reported. I suggest to moved the two unmanaged land used to the end of the table and provide a note for the change in managed land		Accepted with modification	Representing unmanaged lands is the table is no longer necessary. For example transition of an umanged grassland to a managed grassland is covered under the "transition" Grassland to Grassland. Reportable as GM
1_0487	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	737	738	in the table 2.1.1, it is possible for other land to turn into wetland via WDR, therefore, in the grid from other land to wetland, WDR may be added		Accepted	The reviewer's example is valid

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0488	Petersson, Hans	2	738		Table 2.1.1 Very important issue: All Forest land is assumed managed in Sweden and a natural degeneration to Wetlands that is not human induced should from now on be considered human induced. Thus Sweden has to report such land under D with the consequences that we have to report a substantial removal on D land since no trees have been harvested and these trees grow! Moreover, during the first commitment period such land (if converted after 2008) is reported under FM. Even if IPCC is not involved in the accounting, Sweden would benefit a lot by this new rule because FM is capped. This could not be the intention of the KP. There is also a need for us to separate conversions from unmanaged non forest land to forest land and from managed non forest land to forest land. Here, both seem to be considered AR. This far we consider the former as FM and the latter as AR. (Observe all forests are assumed managed)		Rejected	There is not suggestion that non-human induced forest loss should be considered D. To the contrary - unless here is direct-human induced loss of forest it should NOT be considered D and the transition discussed by the reviewer is not possible.
1_0489	Beets, Peter	2	749	752	Dashed lines to represent areas subject to FM is not particularly clear or useful. Eg. CEFC should be included in dashed area. D should be excluded, but sometimes is and sometimes isn't.		Accepted with modification	The text describing Figures 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 has been revised to provide greater clarity and to correct inconsistencies.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0490	Brandon, Andrea	2	749	752	If recommendation for lines 703-706 is accepted then this figure title needs to change also. Regardless, this figure is very confusing, it needs to be aligned with table 2.1.1. How can FM sit within cropland? How can CM and GM sit within managed forest? If it's forest, it's forest. The party chooses its forest definition.		Accepted with modification	The text describing Figures 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 has been revised to provide greater clarity and to correct inconsistencies.
1_0491	Burgess, Deborah	2	749	752	This figure appears to be inconsistent with Table 2.1.1. Should Settlements have RV added? Should managed Wetland have GM added? Should Other land have D added? Presence of GM and CM in Managed forest requires explanation. AR box in Managed forest should include ND sub-box as explained in text below. FM in cropland seems incorrect.		Accepted	Agreed, these are additional possible scenarios. Figure will be adjusted accordingly.
1_0492	Chidthaisong, Amnat	2	749	752	Although it is a good idea to present in form of figure to highlight the land under UNFCCC vs KP, Figure 2.1.2 is quite complicated and confusing. The description of area delineated by dashline should be included in the figure legend, not in the text as it stands. There may be some questions asked for details; why dashlines is cutting through RV and D but not WDR (Managed grassland)? Is there any meaning about the different shape of dashed area?		Accepted	The text describing Figures 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 has been revised to provide greater clarity and to correct inconsistencies.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0493	Fujiwara, Nobuo	2	749	754	In Figure 2.1.2, "RV" should be added into the frame of "Settlement". Doing so makes clear relations among Table 2.1.1, Figure 2.1.2, and Box 2.11.1.		Accepted	Agreed, this additional possible scenario. Figure will be adjusted accordingly.
1_0494	Ngarize, Sekai	2	749	754	The abbreviations should be defined in a note below the figure		Accepted	Explanation fo abbrvs. provided
1_0495	Weiss, Peter	2_1	749		An additional figure or table on the precedence/hierarchy of the reporting of the single activities would be helpful here		Accepted with modification	Additional text on hirarchy to be added elsewhere
1_0496	Kato, Junko	Figure 2.1.2	751	751	“RV” needs to be added in the area of “Settlements”, in corresponds to the Table 2.1.1.. (See the file “Attachment_1_0496.pdf” attached)	Attachment_1_0496.pdf	Accepted	Agreed, this additional possible scenario. Figure will be adjusted accordingly.
1_0497	Sperow, Mark	2.1	751	752	The red over the green will cause problems with those that are color blind (they won't see the difference). Please select an alternative color combination.		Accepted	The reviewer's comment is noted.
1_0498	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	751	752	I suggest that ND and CEFC in figure 2.1.2 could be added into the Abbreviation used in the Figure in line 296 and 297		Accepted	Noted and also to be added to list of Abbrvs and Glossary

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0499	Alfredsen, Gry	2	755	756	I do not understand this sentence - dashed lines and link to CM and GN boxes.		Accepted	Text has been revised to add clarity to this issue.
1_0500	Lund, H. Gyde	2	758	760	Consider providing a box or table to show how the Kyoto and UNFCCC thresholds for defining forest differ.		Rejected	It is outside the scope of this document to discuss the manner in which Party might generate country specific definitions.
1_0501	Rock, Joachim	2	759	760	FCCC/KP/CMP/2012/L.4/Rev. 1, para 1-f discourages countries from using different criteria for UNFCCC and KP definition of forest and this should be reflected here, too.		Accepted with modification	The text is revised to include this point, however it is acknowledged that it is not always possible.
1_0502	Alfredsen, Gry	2	761	762	Do you need to give the name of the Section 2.7.2?		Accepted	In response to the reviewer's question, the name of the section is added in this instance to provide additional clarity on the topic addressed in the section referred to.
1_0503	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	764	764	Change "should a deforestation event occur in..." by "should human induced deforestation occur in..."		Accepted	The suggested text has been added, however it is noted that in the context of KP reporting Deforestation is by definition human induced. However, the tautology does not change the meaning of the original text and may add clarity.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0504	Vreuls, Harry	2	764	765	I suggest to change the sentence as following: When a human induced deforestation event occurs in a unmanaged forest, this land use in no longer unmanaged, as deforestation is a human interaction. So the associate emissions ..		Accepted with modification	The text "human induced" has been added which addresses the comment
1_0505	Alfredsen, Gry	2	767	771	Have consistency in the document - here Jan vs January. The latter is used previously in the text. Same with 1 vs. 1st.		Accepted	Attempted to ensure consistency throughout
1_0506	Brandon, Andrea	2	767		refer to comment against lines 299-302 (comment ID 1_0324) regarding "plantations established after Jan 1, 1960 and before Jan 1st 1990..."		Rejected	The original text is a quotation from the 2/CMP.7 decisions
1_0507	Weiss, Peter	2_1	767	771	CEFC lands should be also reported separately, so such a statement should be included (as for ND lands in the sentence before)		Accepted	Accept add text "need to be identified separately"
1_0508	Beets, Peter	2	768	768	"harvesting" replace with "deforestation"		Accepted with modification	This has been addressed in the revised text and figure 2.1.2

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0509	Elvidge, Craig	2	770	771	Issue: The use of the term "re-established" when referring to the planting of the CEF area. Action: perhaps consider using a term that ensures that the planting of the CEF is on land that was previously non forest. Perhaps terms like "planted", or "established" are more suitable		Accepted	Accepted the suggestion to use term "establish".
1_0510	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.1	772	773	According to this 2 lines , figure 2.1.1, at the bottom, "Cropland" could be replaced by "Cropland/arable/tillage" as it is Land classification under UNFCCC		Accepted with modification	The original text is largely correct, however, there if flexibility on the definitions related to Woody crop (orchards, vineyards et.) which means the original text is too proscriptive
1_0511	Galinski, Wojciech	2.1	772	773	CM is defined but not described in 16/CMP.1		Accepted	Original text has been revised to avoid reference to the decision
1_0512	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	772	773	the land subject to CM will depend on the rest of activities elected. If CM is converted to GM, and GM has not been elected, the land converted will be reported as grassland in the UNFCCC reporting, but will have to be reported under CM in the KP. On the other hand, some areas reported as cropland under the Convention should be reported as D under the KP, if they come from a forested area. Therefore, it can't be affirm that the sentence in the text is true for all the cases.		Accepted	The reviewers comment is noted

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0513	Galinski, Wojciech	2.1	774	776	IF GM occurs in managed forest (assuming that GM is not elected) then what is a proper way of reporting on it?		Accepted with modification	In response to the reviewer;s question, the situation shown in Figure 2.1.2 covers circumsatnces where the Party has choosen to defined certain land management practices involving animals grazing within "tree covered" areas as a GM activity rather than a FM activity. In the example given in the question, the Party has elected not to report emission and removals under GM under KP. There remains and obligation to report any associated emissions and removals from this activity under LULUCF.
1_0514	Munthali, Jack	2	774	776	An Important clarification that grazing land management can also occur in managed forests and not all grasslands are necessarily grazing lands		Accepted	The reviewers comment affirming the original text is noted
1_0515	Lund, H. Gyde	2	776	776	Why are unmanaged grasslands excluded from the UNFCCC reporting?		Accepted	It was not the intention to gove the emission that the area of unmananged lands are not reported under UNFCCC. However emissions and removals on these lands are not reported because being unmanaged any emissions/removals are by defintion not humaninduced.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0516	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.1	777		"2" subindex		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0517	Galinski, Wojciech	2.1	777	778	This sentence contradicts statements contained in lines 774 - 776 above. A/R land may be subject to "system of practices on land used for livestock production" or "the system of practices on land on which agricultural crops are grown". What about agroforestry?		Rejected	The original text is correct. Article 3.3 activities AR and D, and Article 3.4 FM take precedence over the other elective 3.4 activities, regardless of the land use on the land.
1_0518	Lund, H. Gyde	2	777	777	The 2 in CO2 should be a subscript.		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0519	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	777	777	non-CO2 - use subscript for O2		Accepted	Editorial change made
1_0520	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	777	778	It may be useful to provide guidance on the relationship between FL-FL and land under FM, and L-FL and land under AR.		Accepted with modification	Note: figure 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 attempts to address these relationships, as does table 2.1.1. Text has been revised to provide greater clarity
1_0521	Galinski, Wojciech	2.1	779	779	According to 16/CMP.1 "Deforestation" is the direct human-induced conversion of forested land to non-forested land" hence deforestation does not imply that the deforested land will be managed.		Rejected	Reject act of deforestation is by definition human induced, and the subsequent status of that land is the result of human activity.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0522	Alfredsen, Gry	2	785	786	Footnoote 2 and 4 - would be ok to write LULUCF, not give the full name. Also the case later in the chapter.		Rejected	Reject: this is a direct quotation of the 2/CMP 7.1 text. The authors prefer to maintain the complete text.
1_0523	Galinski, Wojciech	2.2.1	785	786	Annex to Decision 2/CMP.7 has superseded annex to decision 16/CMP.1 with respect to all paras except definitions contained in para 1. Therefore there is no need to mention any other para from the annex to 16/CMP.1 in the context of CP2.		Accepted	reference to 16/CMP.1 removed
1_0524	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	786	786	Footnote 2, the reference needs to be changed to paragraph 25 in 2/CMP.7		Accepted	revised
1_0525	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	786	786	footnote 3, this shall be replaced with: paragraph 2 of annex II to the decision -/CMP.8 (Implication of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Proctocl, including those relating to articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol)		Accepted	Added to existing reference
1_0526	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	786	786	footnote 4, change reference to paragraph 24 in decision 2/CMP.7		Accepted	done, see above

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0527	Radunsky, Klaus	2	788		It is suggested to include a colon after "2006 IPCC Guidelines".		Accepted	revised
1_0528	Petersson, Hans	2	789		Page 2.11 footnotes Need for definitions: A land use category could have a definition and e.g. Forest land a minimum size. However, an activity does not have to have a minimum size (haven't seen any such statement). A spatial assessment unit (is according to me) a tool of estimating an activity or an land use category. In remotes sensing, the area of a spatial assessment unit is pretty much the same area as reported as an activity but this area should be smaller then the area defining e.g. Forest land. These three concepts have to be defined. (Oh, later on, page 2.18, I found amendments that explained most of my issues.)		Accepted with modification	As the reviewer states, the issues are dealt with later in the text.
1_0529	Petersson, Hans	2	792		Reporting method I: Sweden has the position of all AR, D and FM plots respectively and reports a map of the geographical position of expected 250 D plots and 300 AR plots in the end of the commitment period. However, maybe 20 000 sample plots are subject to FM. On request, we can show the position of these plots but showing them on a map makes no sense. Can you, please, state how this should be handled in practice?		Accepted	Added short section that explains that maps while not included in the NIR can be made available to review teams to ensure completeness and coverage.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0530	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	792		Page 2.12 (line 792): ;reporting methods for lands subject toactivities' has to be consequently: "reporting methods for lands subject to article 3.3 and units of land subject to 3.4 activities'.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	we have simplified terminology.
1_0531	Wiseman, Michael	2	792	946	Using two reporting methods does seem complicated and confusing. Is it not possible to make reporting method 2 and aproach method 3 best practice.		Rejected	NO - but RM 1 and RM2 are valid and good practice. National circumstances and existing forest inventory approaches determine the choice of RM.
1_0532	Sookun, Anand	2	792	839	Can it be made clear what to do when for instance a forest occupies two administartive areas - can it be mentioned that using GIS techniques such as polygon intersections, we can obtain areas within the administrative boundary - especially for Method 1.		Rejected	This is obvious and standard GIS practice - no need to elaborate here.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0533	Weiss, Peter	2_2_2 to 2_2_6	792	1142	<p>Already in the 2003 IPCC GPG these different approaches and guidances in the related individual chapter were rather theoretical, confusing and inconsistent, which - as a consequence - led often to misunderstandings and discussions (also during reviews). The same happens in the chapters 2.2.2 to 2.2.6 of this FOD. Therefore, I propose that these chapters are re-written more concise and consistent and in a way that the guidance is simplified substantially in order to better meet what can be and is realised practically by the parties (and meanwhile also accepted in the reviews). For instance, I do not know if there is really a need to introduce - in addition to the three approaches of land representation - two further reporting methods for lands. The crucial issue related to areas on basis of the decisions for Art. 3.3 and Art. 3.4 reporting and accounting is the following: It should be secured that there is no double accounting and completeness in land identification and consistency in areas when reporting. To me, this is also the background for para 6 b of decision 15/CMP1 addressing "the reporting of the geographical location of the boundaries ..." and, therefore, this decision should be interpreted broadly in that sense, namely that avoiding of double accounting and that completeness and consistency is secured by the land and activity assessment system. To me approach 3 is identical to reporting method 2, so there is no need to introduce an additional reporting method 2. And, the description of reporting method 1 is still rather ambiguous and the real method in behind is rather unclear. So, I propose that these reporting methods will be deleted and substituted by a</p>		Accepted with modification	We still think that it is important to distinguish between spatially-referenced (sample based) and spatially explicit approaches, but we have revised the text to better clarify this distinction. Note that this is different from the 3 approaches discussed later.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0534	Galinski, Wojciech	2.2.2	794	797	Draft decision -/CMP.8 Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol has fully replaced decision 15/CMP.1 with respect to LULUCF for CP2		Accepted	Added -/CMP.8
1_0535	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	794	794	Delete reference to 15/CMP.1, as all the issues related to LULUCF in that decision have been incorporated in decision /CMP.8 (Implication of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol)		Accepted	see previous comment
1_0536	Perugini, Lucia	1	794	794	Update the reference to decision 15/CMP.1 with new dec. - /CMP8:" Implication of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol		Accepted	see previous comment

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0537	Bahamondez, Carlos	2	795	796	the paragraph "under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 must include the geographical boundaries of areas encompassing units of land subject to afforestation and reforestation, deforestation, and lands subject to elected activities among forest management,....." given forest management is mandatory although belong to land activities should not be included as "elected" (see line 80- 84) could be "under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 must include the geographical boundaries of areas encompassing units of land subject to afforestation and reforestation, deforestation and forest management, and lands subject to elected activities among cropland management....."		Accepted	revised
1_0538	Brandon, Andrea	2	796	797	the sentence "to afforestation and reforestation, deforestation, and lands subject to elected activities among forest management, cropland management, grazing land management, revegetation and wetland drainage and rewetting activities" should read "to afforestation and reforestation, deforestation, lands subject to forest management, and elected activities among cropland management, grazing land management, revegetation and wetland drainage and rewetting activities"		Accepted	revised
1_0539	Sato, Atsushi	2	796	796	FM is no more elected activity, thus later part is discribed as "lands subject to forest management and elected..."		Accepted with modification	revise the text according to Decision 2/CMP.8

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0540	Pulles, Tinus	2.2.2	799	805	<p>This looks a bit a strange way of providing Guidance.</p> <p>How about the following approach:</p> <p>The best way of "identifying areas encompassing units of land subject to afforestation and reforestation, deforestation, and lands subject to elected activities among forest management, cropland management, grazing land management, revegetation and wetland drainage and rewetting activities" is to use a spatially explicit and complete geographical identification of all units of land subject to art 3.3 and 3.4activities (Method 2). Where this is not available, Method 1 could be applied.</p> <p>One could understand method 2 as an "exact method", whereas method 1 is a statistical approximation of method 2. The next paragraph then could provide some general conditions that would need to be met to ensure that this approximation is "good enough".</p>		Accepted with modification	Change to the explanation were made to improve but the proposed wording was not used.
1_0541	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	799		<p>Page 2.12 (line 799): '....entails delineating areas that include multiple land units subject to article 3.3 and 3.4 activities.....'. Land units has to be replaced by: land and units of land.</p>	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Throughout the document we have removed references to "lands and units of land";

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0542	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	799	803	The original decision text talks about "areas of land" and "boundaries" (i.e., plural), and this text also uses plurals. Yet, some countries are only reporting ONE area, i.e. the entire country. I just wonder if any guidance is needed here how to interpret the plural. The guidance in lines 838-839 does not seem to be sufficient.		Rejected	We provide good practice which suggests more than one boundary, but we cannot be policy prescriptive
1_0543	Woodfield, Michael	2	799		Rephrase as 'Reporting Method 1 entails delineating areas that include land units subject to multiple activity under...' to be consistent with Fig 2.2.1.		Accepted with modification	revised but using different wording
1_0544	Zhang, Guobin	2.2.2	799	799	... "by using legal, administrative, or ecosystem boundaries " is an unjustifiable division boundary method		Rejected	It is common practice in many countries.
1_0545	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	801	801	or grids on images produced by remote sensing techniques. - -- maps produced by remote sensing techniques.		Accepted	revised but using different wording
1_0546	Rock, Joachim	2	806	810	Here, it is not justified why a stratification should be good practice if it was not necessary. This request should be deleted as it only leads to unnecessary work.		Accepted	changed wording to remove reference to stratification, but we do have to maintain multiple reporting areas for which geographic boundaries have to be reported.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0547	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	806	807	it is good practice to stratify the entire country and to define and report the geographic boundaries of these areas of land. Criteria could include.....administrative considerations'. Suggestion: give clear guidance on stratification. Of course there are statistical considerations, consideration on LUC activities and elected activities, however, its not clear how to deal with these: 1) when is it needed to stratify 2) stratification based on what (e.g. land cover for the categories AR, D, FM, CM, GM; water table for the categories WD and WR etc) 3) how to upscale this to larger temporal scales 4) how dealing with overlap between categories 5) how to deal with sudden changes such as natural disturbances .	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	This is more detail than can be provided here because the criteria for stratification will vary with national circumstances.
1_0548	Brandon, Andrea	2	809		the sentence "...change activities (Article 3.3) and elected activities (Articles 3.4), as well as..." should read "...change activities (Article 3.3), forest management and elected activities (Articles 3.4), as well as...."		Accepted	Revised
1_0549	Balo Akakpo, Olade	2	819	820	This summary statistics must be controled by expert review teem.		Accepted	Revised
1_0550	Radunsky, Klaus	2	821	823	Addition of national examples in an annex would be very much appreciated.		Accepted	Added

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0551	Bellassen, Valentin	2	823	823	Another example of approach 2 is Slovakia which uses cadastral information and therefore has wall-to-wall information with only one land use per unit of land. However, they claim they are using approach 1 in their NIR.		Noted	No reference provided to pursue this further
1_0552	Sato, Atsushi	2	825	825	In Figure 2.2.1, the BOX for RM2 may include WDR and CEFC-ar.		Rejected	While correct this would needlessly increase the complexity.
1_0553	Lund, H. Gyde	2	827	834	While I support the notion of remeasuring the same sample plots, it may be tempting to manipulate the vegetation on a particular plot to ensure a certain outcome. In addition critical changes in land cover may be made between sample locations that are not accounted for.		Rejected	Permanent sample plots are common practice in the forest inventories in many countries. The location of these plots is often not disclosed to avoid deliberate manipulation of plot characteristics.
1_0554	Matsumoto, Mitsuo	2.2.2	827	828	I hear that a party will rebuild boundaries for the 2nd CP by grouping old boundaries. It must be acceptable respecting Marrakesh and Durban decision. In the light of the case, the sentence "...it should be traceable for the first and subsequent commitment periods." is very good because it says that rebuilding boundaries is acceptable if they are traceable from 1st CP. I support the concept and sentence. Please keep it.		Accepted	No changes have been made

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0555	Munthali, Jack	2	827	832	Use of same traceable unit of land is necessary for consistency and verification, parties need to take this seriously.		Accepted	No changes have been made
1_0556	Pulles, Tinus	2.2.2	829	830	How about uncertainties here? Since method 1 is a statistical method, based on sampling, it will not be exact or precise, but the estimated areas of AR, D, FM etc will include an uncertainty range.		Accepted with modification	Correct - but this detail is not elaborated here.
1_0557	Brandon, Andrea	2	832		the sentence "country (Reporting Method 2) can be tracked and monitored from 1990 to the end of the commitment period." should read "country (Reporting Method 2) can be tracked and monitored from 1990 to the end of the commitment period and beyond."		Accepted	Revised
1_0558	Bellassen, Valentin	2	835	839	These indications are too vague for practical use by inventory compilers and reviewers. Providing a reference area range for geographic areas would be more useful. For example, a reference 5-year interval is provided as an example of good practice for the frequency of re-sampling in national forest inventories (see l. 1322).		Rejected	This paragraph discusses the size of the reporting units not the frequency of sampling.
1_0559	Rock, Joachim	2	835	839	There are other methods available to reduce heterogeneity than stratification, so there is no need to declare geographical stratification a "good practice". Please delete this paragraph.		Accepted with modification	The reference to stratification has been removed but the core message is maintained that the country has to develop criteria for delineating the geographic boundaries.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0560	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	836	837	The requirements for "good practice" should include accuracy, which is one of the key elements of both estimation and reporting, and compliance.		Accepted	added accuracy
1_0561	Lundblad, Mattias	2.2.2	837	839	Since AR and D events may be rare in some countries differentiating the country into more than one geographic area may severely affect the accuracy of the estimates. Suggest to add a sentence in line with the following: It is also good practice to consider the uncertainty when selecting the number of areas. To reduce uncertainty to a minimum, a single area may be required.		Accepted with modification	Added reference to interaction between number of geographic areas and uncertainty, but rejected the notion that a single area may be required.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0562	Riedel, Thomas	2.2.2	837	839	<p>With the goal to reduce heterogeneity and to increase reporting transparency the text says: Unless the country is small it is good practice to define boundaries of more than one geographic area ... Sure, a stratification make sense in countries with different climate conditions and so on. But in general this is really not a good practice, because the only thing we achieve is higher complexity with a higher need of money and time! In our country we are only able to stratify the country by political boarders (nuts-level) or by biogeographical regions (one big and two very very small areas). But we know and that's really a fact, these units are not able to reduce the heterogeneity in the population. The hole country is relativ homogeneous but very variable on a very small scale/units. Additional with a more on complexity (stratification) you will not attain a more on transparency automatically. The only thing which could help is a better and maybe deeper description of the applied methods, because bad described or wrong implemented methods leads to the same wrong or right results in the hole country and in the subregions. So with a more on complexity you get no gains in transparency!</p>		Accepted	Removed the reference to startification requirements.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0563	Nagahisa, Akane	2.2.2	839		Suggest to insert "and reduce uncertainty" at the end of the sentence; i.e. "...it is good practice to limit the number of geogaphic areas to maintain transparency and reduce uncertainty." If a country's geographic bundaries are defined with an adequate scale, it should reduce uncertainty compared to other definitions.		Accepted	added
1_0564	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	840	840	Include in this section the appropriate references to decision -/CMP.8 (Implication of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Proctocl, including those relating to articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol)		Accepted	Added

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0565	Radunsky, Klaus	2	840	867	section 2.2.3: This section could be misinterpreted such that meeting the reporting requirements requires in general georeferenced reporting, driven by decision2/CMP.7. However, decision 2/CMP.7 limits that need to a specific case (georeferenced information is required only for areas subject to natural disturbances for which emissions and removals are excluded from the accounting or for the locations of forest plantations converted to other land uses for which a carbon equivalent forest was established on non-forest land before. Therefore it is suggested to include the following footnote right after the title: Section 2.2.3 is only relevant if a country chooses to exclude areas from accounting that have been subject to natural disturbances or that include forest plantations converted to other land uses for which a carbon equivalent forest was established on non-forest land before.		Accepted	Added to text, not a footnote.
1_0566	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	840	841	suggest to delete "Special" and add "effective for the 2nd and subsequent CPs" after "Additional Provisions". "Special" is only "special" in this sense.		Accepted	Revised
1_0567	Larocque, Guy	2.2.3	841	867	It would be appropriate to better emphasize advantages and disadvantages of both methods in a summary table.		Rejected	This is not about advantages or disadvantages of methods but about additional requirements to provide georeferenced information.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0568	Munthali, Jack	2	842	856	Very useful and helpful. There is need for standardization of the geo referencing		Noted	Thanks
1_0569	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.2.3	844		FOOTNOTE 5: better reffer to "Paragraph XX of the Annex to the Decision2/CMP.7 ..." as paragraph 34 (a) is contained in the Annex of the Decision.		Accepted	Revised
1_0570	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.2.3	845		FOOTNOTE 6: better transcript full text of the paragraphs to facilitate reading (e.g. footnotes 2,3,4), and reffer to "Paragraph XX of the Annex to the Decision2/CMP.7 ..." as paragraph 37-39 are contained in the Annex of the Decision.		Accepted with modification	Revised reference to Annex but did not include the three paragraphs in footnote.
1_0571	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	845	845	add at the end of the sentence "and the georeferenced locations of these carbon equivalent forests"		Accepted	Added
1_0572	Christophers en, Øyvind	2.2.3	846	847	If the provision of natural disturbance is applied, georeferenced locations of areas affected by natural disturbances are also required to make sure that subsequent removals from these areas are excluded from the accounting		Accepted	Added

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0573	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	846	847	add at the end of sentence: "and to track removals after the disturbance as these have to be excluded from accounting"		Accepted	Added
1_0574	Beets, Peter	2	851	851	include reference to section number that gives methods for emission calculation.		Accepted	Revised
1_0575	Herold, Anke	2.2	853	853	include a definition and explanation of salvage logging		Accepted with modification	Added a reference to where this is dealt with in Section 2.3.9
1_0576	Pulles, Tinus	2.2.3	853	856	<p>This is a good example of what I mean: A more logical approach would be to explain how the emissions/removals or changes in carbon pools due to "salvage logging" (I am afraid I do not know what exactly this is) are estimated and then explain how to ensure that these emissions are included in the CRF/KP tables where they should be included.</p> <p>Then also it could be stated that "It is good practice to explicitly estimate emissions from salvage logging to ensure that these emissions are included"</p>		Accepted with modification	Explained what salvage logging is - but did not add full explanation of methods which are covered in 2006GL.
1_0577	Galinski, Wojciech	2.2.3	856	857	This sentence is somehow difficult to understand without 2/CMP.7 read in parallel		Accepted	Added explanations

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0578	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	862	862	A		Accepted	added
1_0579	Christophersen, Øyvind	2.2.3	865	867	It should be made clearer that these new reporting requirements are not mandatory to apply.		Accepted	Opening sentence of this section now makes that point
1_0580	Pulles, Tinus	2.2.3	865	867	I would expect a remark like this in section 2.2.2		Accepted	Added clearer explanation to 2.2.2 and cross-referenced section 2.2.3
1_0581	Rock, Joachim	2	865	867	This is not true. Reporting Method has nothing to do with inventory design per se. RM 1 can be used with inventory designs which deliver accurate and precise results for C stock changes / emissions and removals if e.g. sampling intensity and density are chosen accordingly. Additional information on geographic boundaries is NOT necessary.		Accepted	Clarified that this only applies to countries that make use of ND or CEFC provisions
1_0582	Pulles, Tinus	2.2.4	870	923	As indicated before, I would expect this contents earlier in the document. It would be best formulated as an overview of what is missing in the IPCC 2006 GLs (and IPCC 2003 GP LULUCF ?) when a Party must report and account under the KP.		Rejected	Authors were instructed to maintain structural consistency with 2003 GPG.
1_0583	Munthali, Jack	2	873	883	High resolution equipment required to give the required detail in land use monitoring could prove to be very expensive for developng countires like Zambia		Rejected	Noted but this is for developing countries

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0584	Forbes, Keith	2	876	877	Three 3		Accepted	Text revised
1_0585	Larocque, Guy	2.2.4	876	877	It is written: "of the three 3 methods. ". Either 3 or three.		Accepted	Text revised
1_0586	Lutzenberger, Alexa	2,2,4	876	877	three or 3		Accepted	Text revised
1_0587	Rösemann, Claus	2.2.4.	876	877	"...which of the three 3 approaches are suitable... "delete the number "3"		Accepted	Text revised
1_0588	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	876	877	the three 3 approaches - Three or 3 ?		Accepted	Text revised
1_0589	Woodfield, Michael	2	877		...three 3 ...delete the numeral 3.		Accepted	Text revised
1_0590	Rock, Joachim	2	878	883	Please explain how you considered statistical sampling approaches here.		Rejected	Guidance on statistical approaches given in 2006 GL

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0591	Canaveira, Paulo	2,2,4	880	881	The grid sampling intensity does not need to be 20 to 100m to deliver information with 0,05 to 1ha. Grids of that intensity become “pixel maps” covering 100% of the territory, i.e., they are not samples anymore. The requirement for sample grids is that the sampling unit (how big is the land use in the plot to give that attribute to the sample plot) is compatible with the minimum area requirements of 0,05 to 1ha. The sampling intensity can then be adjusted to country size and land-use diversity over space and land-use change pattern and speed over time.		Accepted	Replaced "grid" with "pixel" to clarify that 1 km2 pixels will miss LUC events at <= 1ha scales.
1_0592	Lund, H. Gyde	2	881	883	Does this mean that land use mapping must be at the same resolution as the polygon size (between 0.05 to 1 ha) that the country has chosen? Mapping land uses down to 1 ha would be challenge for large countries like Brazil, China, Russia, etc.		Accepted with modification	It means that countries need to have methods to detect these changes at the scale of the sampling units. Thus clearly a well designed sample-based approach at the appropriate resolution is more accurate than a wall-to-wall map at 1 km2 resolution which would miss the LUC events.
1_0593	Woodfield, Michael	2	884		Revise to 'This section describes the three approaches...'		Accepted	Text revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0594	Munthali, Jack	2	893	895	Approach 1 in chapter 3 of the 2006 IPCC, guideline should not be included if it does not meet the requirement for land identification of decision 16/CMP.1 and 2CMP7		Accepted with modification	This has been stated previously - not stated again
1_0595	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	897	897	not clear what "re-compiling" actually means. It may happen that additional information must be collected. Please provide some more guidance.		Accepted	Clarified wording to better explain what is needed.
1_0596	Forbes, Keith	2	920	920	instead of Reporting Methods 1 and 2 "above," mention the section 2.2.2		Accepted	Text revised
1_0597	Radunsky, Klaus	2	922		table 2.2.1:		Rejected	Unclear request
1_0598	Rock, Joachim	2	923	923	Table 2.2.1 - cell "appr. 1 / RM 1": Just re-compiling (existing) inventories might not suffice. In this case, additional work might be required.		Accepted	Reworded text in Table

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0599	Bellassen, Valentin	2	934	934	What is "relevant information"? To me, this would be the georeferenced location, but in any case, it should be explicited.		Accepted	explained more clearly
1_0600	Bellassen, Valentin	2	936	938	the "No" arrow from "Is fine-scale spatial information of units of land or land under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 available?" should go to "Develop additional spatial information by re-compiling detailed inventory database" rather than to "Is spatial information of boundaries encompassing units of land or land under Articles 3.3 and 3.4 available?". If the resolution of approach 3 is too coarse to meet the KP requirements, then another source of information will need to be used.		Rejected	Discussed but maintained structure of figure.
1_0601	Rock, Joachim	2	938	938	Figure 2.2.2 - if you establish or develop boundaries, especially boundaries of units of land, you are automatically using RM 2 and the whole decision tree collapses.		Rejected	No - sample-based approaches can be used to estimate area of 3.3. and 3.4 lands.
1_0602	Alfredsen, Gry	2	939	937	The figure is intuitive, but still it might be user friendly to insert a start arrow as in Fig. 1.1		Rejected	Not needed - all other decision trees start at the top.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0603	Munthali, Jack	2	939	947	Sufficient information has ben given on the choices of approaches the party can adopt		Accepted	Noted
1_0604	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	948		948 onwards: (How to identify lands (units of land) in general). This paragraph does not represent what has been mentioned in the title. It is not 'general', but focused on forest related activities.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted with modification	This is the original structure of the 2003 IPCC GPG. Special emphasis to forest is only in subsection 2.2.6.1 since all forest-related activities are mandatory. We also added a paragraph to summarily refer the detailed guidance for identifying lands to respective sections.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0605	Matsumoto, Mitsuo	2.2.6.1	949	995	ARD and conversion from natural forests to planted forests (CNP) are treated at the same level in this section. However, Durban decision says only "Each Party included in Annex I shall report and account for, in accordance with Article 7, all emissions arising from the conversion of natural forests to planted forests." It does not treat CNP at the same level of ARD but treat an additional element. And it requires to report and account for CNP but it does not require identification of forests and area on which CNP occurred like ARD. The sentences on CNP in this section are beyond Durban decision. Respecting Durban decision, it is enough to illustrate how to include emissions/removals from CNP in accounting and reporting as shown in Line 3463 - 3465 in the section 2.7.2.		Accepted with modification	For reporting emissions from any KP-LULUCF activity, Parties need to identify lands and quantify stock changes and other emissions that occur on those lands. So, to report and account for emissions from conversion of natural forest to planted forest, the land identification is needed (see also para 25 of decision 2/CMP7 which establishes that lands subject to activities (whatever activity) needs to be identified and CNP is part of an activity (FM)).

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0606	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	949		949 onwards : (spatial configuration of forests and afforestation, reforestation or deforestation events). Add either a similar section on 'spatial configuration of drainage and rewetting events or ongoing drainage and rewetting' or amend paragraph 2.2.6.2 accordingly or refer to the Wetlands Supplement is the information in this document is sufficient: how are units of land (article 3.4: CM, GM, RV, WDR) being identified (e.g. how is peat being identified? RS is not a good instrument to do this, but what method is?)? These questions should be answered according the title of 2.2.6.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	This section is about identification of land and unit of land, the comment refers substantially to one carbon pool (soil) for which, where classified as organic, specific equations and factors should be used. informationon how to identify drained and rewetted organic soils could be added in the following section 2.2.6.2. As: "The 2013 IPCC Wetlands supplement contains updated and new methodological guidance for information on data sources for identification of lands subject to drainage and rewetting"
1_0607	Schlesinger, Peter	2	955		crown cover is used, but maybe it is not correct		Accepted with modification	crown cover is used in Decision 16/CMP.1 and Volume 4, 2006 IPCC Guidelines for forest definition, added "(or equivalent stocking level)" after crown cover
1_0608	Rock, Joachim	2	957	959	This request demands complete wall to wall mapping and is not justified by any CMP-decision. It is not necessary to identify all land parcels if you can estimate the total amount of emissions by other means (statitcal sampling approaches).		Rejected	There is no request for Wall-to-wall mapping and the identification of lands can be achieved either by wall-to-wall mapping or by unbiased sampling design

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0609	Lund, H. Gyde	2	961	961	Consider changing 'forest cover' to 'tree cover'		Accepted	replace the word "forest cover" with "tree crown cover"
1_0610	Brandon, Andrea	2	963	995	As comment above (comment ID 1_0618). Also skid sites and forest tracks can be included in the forest definition; a good representative sampling programme will account for these losses.		Accepted	text has been added in row 992 as for example: "Moreover, it is good practice to report the carbon stock changes associated with construction of skid sites and forest tracks even if they do not qualify as deforestation."

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0611	Herold, Anke	2.2.6	963	995	The explanations on the shape of land areas and how subsequently deforestation areas should be defined seem to be beyond what is possible in practice for an entire country. In addition under the Kyoto Protocol, the definition of width among the definition elements in the forest definition is not a mandatory element and this section seems to go beyond Kyoto requirements. This in particular refers to the sentence in line 991 to 995 saying that it is good practice to report the impacts of 'linear deforestation events' narrower than the selected minimum width criterion which seems to go beyond the good practice requirements for the first commitment period. This does not seem to be feasible.		Rejected	This text is from the 2003 IPCC GPG, so it has already been implemented in the first CP reporting. No need to change. Linear clearing of forest (e.g. for seismic lines) is a form of partial cutting and does affect forest C stocks.
1_0612	Munthali, Jack	2	963	995	Clearly outline detail on GPG		Rejected	This part is consistent with 2003 IPCC GPG. The comment is too generic, not clear what is needed

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0613	Pulles, Tinus	2.2.6.1	963	970	<p>I was triggered to read this section by a remark in lines 125 - 127.</p> <p>This paragraph interprets a decision text. I feel that this should not be part of IPCC guidance. It depends on the in my view rather ad hoc and arbitrary numbers in these decisions.</p> <p>The IPCC Guidance should concentrate on providing scientific tools and methods to estimate the carbon balance of each separate plot of land, whether or not the Party calls it "forest" when accounting for the Kyoto Protocol.</p>		Rejected	This text is from the 2003 GPG, so it has already been implemented in the first CP reporting. Moreover, we are not interpreting a decision, we are identifying an information requirement to implement the decision (i.e. area threshold).
1_0614	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	963	995	mention choice of peat definition; for peat areas there shall be criteria on hydrological connectivity, peat depth etc.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	We did not include these definitions here.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0615	Vreuls, Harry	2	963	995	The text on linear deforestation now is in line 963-970 as well as 991-995. I suggest to organise the text in such way that it starts with the choice of criteria (now line 981-990) and then with the area (line 963-967. Then give attention that Parties have to report how they treat shelterbelt as well as (fire)road, pipeline areas etc within the reported forested area. Then two options: shelterbelt are NOT in the forest definition; changes in these are NOT reported under KP forest, but under the land use (Convention) and if applicable under GM. When shelterbelts are in, then normal reporting (as forest and deforestation). Other situation is that linear cleared areas (roads etc) are NOT reported under forest definition, then clearing events for roads etc should be treated as deforested action. In case such areas are included, then the clearing events should be taken care of in the carbon stock changes. One the other hand the linear deforestation should not get over emphasis, especially as smaller linear deforestation events are far within the uncertainties of forest inventories.		Rejected	The first mention of minimum width (line 963+) introduces the concept, the second mention (991+) discusses the implications of decision for reporting of C stock changes and emissions.
1_0616	Woodfield, Michael	2	965		Delete (1 ha)		Accepted	Deleted (1 ha)
1_0617	Beets, Peter	2	971	980	Note however, that provided that plot based inventory includes these areas, the C stocks and changes will nevertheless be unbiased!		Accepted	Noted - does not require revisions.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0618	Brandon, Andrea	2	971	980	Note parties that have systematic plot based inventories to measure and monitor carbon on forest land that includes these areas will have estimates that have already taken this into account.		Accepted	Yes, but countries need to assess whether those changes needs to be reported under either D or FM
1_0619	Schlesinger, Peter	2	973		text uses canopy closure		Accepted	replace "canopy closure" with "tree crown cover"
1_0620	Schlesinger, Peter	2	974		text uses canopy closure		Accepted	replace "canopy closure" with "tree crown cover"
1_0621	Rivas Palma, Rosa	2	991	992	First sentence in the paragraph: Is this even if the total deforestation area is less than the selected forest area? Suggest explaining this.		Accepted with modification	Reworded to indicate that linear clearing below deforestation threshold is still causing C stock change that should be captured in FM. .
1_0622	Ngarize, Sekai	2.2.6.2	996	1031	I think it is important to give clear references to data that is available from remote sensing, and references to approaches that can be used for processing this data. It would be useful for the guidance to state a view on which (publically available) remote sensing data sets could be used to assist with new LULUCF reporting requirements, and how the data should be processed.		Accepted with modification	We agree that it would be useful to expand references to sources of information on methods but not sources of data. We intend to still do this for the final draft but run out of time for the SOD.
1_0623	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	996	998	Page 2.18: (lines 996-997 and 998) Sources of data for identifying lands and other new reporting requirements: lands only? Or also units of land?	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	convention in this report is to stop distinguishing between lands and units of lands.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0624	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	996	998	Sources of data for identifying lands and other new reporting requirements: lands only? Or also units of land? And in line 998: units of land?	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	convention in this report is to stop distinguishing between lands and units of lands.
1_0625	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	997	997	replace "other new" with "additional" and add "effective for the 2nd and subsequent CPs" after "provisions"		Accepted	Replace "other new" with "additional" and add "for the 2nd and subsequent CPs" after "provisions"
1_0626	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	1007	1013	bulletpoint list is too narrow, its not only information on existing land use, forest inventory systems, monitoring and measurement systems. Suggestion: make the list more general, and not specific to forest inventory systems. E.g. add national statistics, (process based) models etc., extra- and interpolation of data.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted with modification	The bullet points are about systems for data collection and it is not limited to forest inventories. Further, model and methods for extrapolating/interpolating data are subsequent to data collection. "national statistics" has been added after "existing".
1_0627	Haruyama, Yukio	2.2.6.2	1011	1012	"that are difficult to detect through remote sensing" is a negative message for remote sensing and should be deleted.		Rejected	Afforestation, in particular in boreal and other slow growing regions are indeed difficult to detect - text is kept.
1_0628	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	1011	1012	that are difficult to detect through remote sensing. --- Remove this part.		Accepted	Afforestation, in particular in boreal and other slow growing regions are indeed difficult to detect - text is kept.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0629	Singh, Vinay	2	1012	1013	verification and auditing procedures should be done by third party certification bodies/accredited institutions/government agency/		Accepted	This concept is implicated in the words "verification" and "auditing" (see 2006 IPCC Guidelines). No changes needed
1_0630	Vreuls, Harry	2	1014	1016	This text has to be revised. Parties are meeting the reporting requirements for KP1. Text should be: It is likely that in most countries the existing forest inventory systems will be combined with additional sources and in-country monitoring and or reporting systems.		Accepted with modification	The text has been modified as follows: " It is likely that in most countries the existing forest inventory systems will be combined with additional sources of information and in-country monitoring activities to meet all the land reporting requirements of the Kyoto Protocol."
1_0631	Singh, Vinay	2	1017	1017	combinations or any of the three options		Rejected	This sentence says that the optimum MAY be a combination. This does not mean that any single option may be the optimum
1_0632	Singh, Vinay	2	1018	1018	remeasurement to be rephrased as re-measurement		Accepted	Replace "remeasurement" with "re-measurement"
1_0633	Haruyama, Yukio	2	1022	1022	"(which are difficult to detect using remote sensing)" should be deleted by the same comment above (comment ID 1_0627).		Rejected	Afforestation, in particular in boreal and other slow growing regions are indeed difficult to detect - text is kept. There is a big difference in the detectability of afforestation and deforestation events.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0634	Canaveira, Paulo	2,2,6,2	1024	1029	Add note that many satellites do not provide data to comply with the minimum area requirements, and that often some land-uses are different to differentiate in satellite images without the use of auxiliary data from other sources.		Rejected	This information is already contained in the land representation chapter of 2006 IPCC Guidelines. No need make change here
1_0635	Forbes, Keith	2	1024	1024	text missing in sentence		Accepted	The sentence has been revised as follows: "With the rapid development of remote sensing technology and the improved availability, for certain sensors free of data, remotely sensed techniques are increasingly contributing to land-use monitoring systems, forest inventories, and activity reporting systems."
1_0636	Haruyama, Yukio	2	1024	1029	This sentences are reasonable.		Accepted	noted
1_0637	Herold, Anke	2.26	1024	1031	The general methodological development of remote sensing technology does not seem to be an issue that should be covered in this volume of IPCC guidance as it refers to general methodologies that are more appropriately treated in the general IPCC documents and not only related to Kyoto LULUCF activities.		Accepted	The general methodological development of remote sensing technology is only generally discussed here and with no detailed elaboration.
1_0638	Ngarize, Sekai	2	1024		missing comma after 'sensors'?		Accepted	see Authors' comment in comment 1_0635

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0639	Ngarize, Sekai	2	1024	1031	any additional discussion should consider whether the sensors have sufficient resolution (depending on the national forest definition) and accuracy for KP reporting		Rejected	see Authors' comment in comment 1_0634
1_0640	Schlesinger, Peter	2	1024	1026	something seems wrong with the sentence, there is an extra word or it is poorly structured or somesuch		Accepted	see Authors' comment in comment 1_0635
1_0641	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	1024	1029	RS is being mentioned throughout the document as being the most promising method for monitoring changes in carbon stocks and GHG emissions. Note that RS not yet can be used for reliable estimates of 1) forest degradation 2) peat degradation (e.g. changes in thickness, changes in peat depth)	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted with modification	We do not state that RS is most promising - but we did add a point that for certain pools RS may not be suitable and additional efforts are required.
1_0642	Sperow, Mark	2.2.6.2	1024	1024	Text is missing from this sentence ("and the," - what?).		Accepted	see Authors' comment in comment 1_0635
1_0643	Haruyama, Yukio	2	1030	1031	GEO-FCT and GFOI are good initiatives and good practices of these initiatives should be introduced.		Accepted with modification	Yes - we still plan to elaborate this for the final draft

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0644	Hoover, Coeli	1	1030	1031	Providing references to resources and tools is helpful (perhaps as a box), but advise framing as a subset of available examples and taking care not to be prescriptive		Accepted	noted
1_0645	Mora, Brice	2	1030	1031	As the GOFC-GOLD Land Cover Project Officer I can provide paragraphs citing the sourcebook, the GFOI MGD and other documents as suggested in the brackets. Feel free to contact me.		Noted	Anonymous review process prevented us from contacting unknown reviewer.
1_0646	Mora, Brice	2	1030	1031	Short paragraphs can discuss following topics : open image and reference data archives freely available (NASA, ESA), new methods (time-series analysis), new global land cover map products (China, ESA) necessity of robust validation and quantification of uncertainty of estimates. Literature cited: GOFC-GOLD Sourcebook, GFOI Method and Guidance Document, mainly.		Accepted with modification	Yes - we still plan to elaborate this for the final draft
1_0647	Rock, Joachim	2	1030	1031	Negative, please just add some sources on remote sensing and other inventory systems.		Rejected	All other comments encouraged us to add more information.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0648	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1030	1031	Also consider the meeting report: Datasets for use in the IPCC Guidelines FAO data and how it can be used in the IPCC Agriculture and Land Use Guidelines IPCC Expert Meeting Report 20-22 October, 2009, IFAD, Rome, ITALY, http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/mtdocs/pdfiles/0910_FAO-IFAD-IPCC-Meetingreport.pdf		Accepted with modification	Noted - will be added when we expand this section.
1_0649	Rock, Joachim	2	1046	1048	This would require a grid size of ≤ 100 m width. This is neither feasible nor necessary, given modern inventory techniques.		Rejected	Remotely sensed data with Grid size of ≤ 100 m is available, and have being used for years, such as Landsat TM series.
1_0650	Vreuls, Harry	2	1046	1070	The example seems me too detailed. Such 5% might be in the overall uncertainty of the source for these events.		Rejected	This text is from the 2003 IPCC GPG, so it has already been implemented in the first CP reporting. Moreover, GHG inventories are supposed to be unbiased and even it this is within the overall uncertainty, failing to account for the 5% introduces bias.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0651	Rock, Joachim	2	1049	1070	This is only about mapping and does not concern other inventory schemes. Too specific, delete.		Rejected	This text is from the 2003 IPCC GPG, so it has already been implemented in the first CP reporting. The example is not specific on mapping but on statistical sampling approach.
1_0652	Bellassen, Valentin	2	1063	1070	This method is sound, but strictly speaking, it seems to contradict the requirement to identify lands affected by Art 3.3 activities. If so, it should be explicitly stated that such a deviation from the letter of the CMP decision is tolerated.		Rejected	In what element is this method contradicting the CMP decision? This text is from the 2003 IPCC GPG, so it has already been implemented in the first CP reporting. Statistical techniques are permissible and there is no requirement for "georeferencing" of all 3.3 activities.
1_0653	Rock, Joachim	2	1083	1090	Too much focus on mapping and remote sensing, too little focus on the information required. Please delete lines 1085 - 1090.		Rejected	This text is from the 2003 IPCC GPG, so it has already been implemented in the first CP reporting. Guidance provided is correct.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0654	Zhang, Guobin	2.2.6	1092	1093	suggest to introduce how to solve the problem with remote sensing, rather than say the advantages of remote sensing		Rejected	The sentence is about potential positive characteristics of remote sensing, not about any problem. Guidance on how to address weakness of remote sensing are provided in other sections of this report.
1_0655	Jonckheere, Inge	2	1094	1094	monitoring is the only option for long-term monitoring on a regular basis instead of "can be useful"		Rejected	remote sensing can be useful, it means that if you have such an instrument it would help in collecting the needed data; however, it is possible to properly monitor KP-activities without using remote sensing (for instance forest inventories were conceived and implemented long before the invention and operationalization of remote sensing.
1_0656	Haruyama, Yukio	2	1095	1096	"remote sensing data and their result need to be validated against in^situ data to reduce uncertainties" is a good statement and should be focused.		Accepted	No action needed.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0657	Jonckheere, Inge	2	1095	1095	RS data needs to be calibrated and its results validated against in-situ data..		Accepted	The text has been amended as follows: "... remote sensing data needs to be calibrated and their results validated against in-situ data."
1_0658	Schlesinger, Peter	2	1095		the text never explains level of uncertainty required as a minimum OR how validation should be undertaken		Rejected	2006 IPCC GLdo not establish a minimum level of uncertainties. Validation of RS data against ground measurements is standard textbook material that does not need to be repeated here.
1_0659	Jonckheere, Inge	2	1101	1102	stratification is a prerequisite for a cost-effective country sampling to reduce uncertainty		Accepted	Agreed - that is why we wrote this.
1_0660	Canaveira, Paulo	2,2,6,2	1102	1111	Same comment (comment ID 1_0634). Focus on remote sensing that may not provide enough detail to meet KP requirements.		Accepted	see Author's comment 1_0634
1_0661	Jonckheere, Inge	2	1102	1102	freely available Landsat archives		Accepted	add "...and freely available..." after "complete" and before "landsat"
1_0662	Jonckheere, Inge	2	1103	1103	enables instead of "may enable"		Rejected	There are constraints, e.g. clouds, limited technical and financial capacity of the country that may be a barrier.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0663	Galinski, Wojciech	2.2.6.2	1107	1107	I am not sure if the GPG should mention need for investments. You could delete the words "investment into"		Accepted	The text has been revised as follow: "However, given that land-use change often occurs on only a small fraction of the areas affected by land-cover change, additional information and/or inferences may be required to ascertain whether a land-cover change represents a land-use change."
1_0664	Sturgiss, Rob	2	1108	1111	Talks about the need for in situ data to determine when natural forests are converted to planted forests – but satellite imagery may also be used, esp if the planted forest is pine. Should this be amended to generalise to include all possible technological approaches.		Accepted	delete "in-situ"
1_0665	Eve, Marlen	2	1126	1126	Editorial note: Delete "the some".		Accepted	delete "the some"
1_0666	Lutzenberger, Alexa	2.2.6.2	1126	1126	some ?		Accepted	delete "the some"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0667	Rock, Joachim	2	1132	1135	This paragraph can be deleted. Identifying areas below the minimum just means to lower the minimum, so this paragraph makes no sense.		Accepted with modification	It could happen that the minimum of the forest inventory definition is larger than the minimum of the forest definition under KP. Therefore, the sentence should be redrafted as follows: "Activity reporting may be necessary for the identification of afforestation, reforestation, deforestation or conversion of natural forests to planted forests in areas of size below the forest inventory minimum unit, when such minimum unit is larger than the minimum area selected for the forest definition under KP"
1_0668	Larocque, Guy	2.3	1147	1224	Provide a summary table that will help users to have a better idea of the whole picture.		Rejected	This is a very short section that is supplementary to the 2006 GL. No need to have a summary table for 2 pages of text.
1_0669	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	1151		Page 2.21 (line 1151): '.....non-CO2 greenhouse gases from all lands subject to the included activities.....'. Shall be: lands and units of land, otherwise article 3.4 activities are excluded.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	replaced "all lands" with "all lands and units of land"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0670	de Ligt, Rob	2.3	1152	1152	Party's do not have discretion in the exclusion of the Harvested Wood Products Pool (Decision 2/CMP.7). Text should be clarified to remove the possibility of Party's excluding the HWP pool.		Accepted	Revised text
1_0671	Woodfield, Michael	2	1152		Insert carbon pools ... (first mention of pools so needs complete term).		Accepted	revised
1_0672	Chidthaisong, Amnat	2	1153	1156	Using the words "emission" and "flux" may confuse those who do not have technical backgrounds on gas exchange process/mechanisms.		Accepted	replaced "fluxes" with "emissions and removals"
1_0673	Rock, Joachim	2	1153	1155	Please use proper vocabulary. Replace "fluxes" by "emissions and removals". There are two methodologies to assess emissions and removals: stock-difference and gain-loss. "Flux" is only concurring with "gain-loss".		Accepted	replaced "fluxes" with "emissions and removals"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0674	Fenton, Nicole	2.3	1154	1157	This sentence seems to apply that natural disturbances apply to all land categories under management (i.e. forest, cropland, grazing land and wetlands following the figure 2.2.1) however the discussion of disturbance for the entire section 2.3.9 is clearly aimed only at forests. This seems to be contradictory, and potentially significantly difficult when natural disturbances affect other land use types, as C loss from burning (naturally or anthropogenically) peatlands can obviously be significant.		Accepted	Revised
1_0675	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3	1155	1155	footnote 8: There is no definition E in para 33 of the annex to 2/CMP.7		Accepted	Revised
1_0676	Herold, Anke	2.3	1157	1159	The accounting of 'carbon equivalent forest conversion' is a may provision and not a mandatory requirement, but the text reads as if it is mandatory. Revise along the lines 'The carbon stock changes of lands for which a Party elected to apply the 'carbon equivalent forest conversion' need to be accounted...."		Accepted	Revised
1_0677	Munthali, Jack	2	1160	1168	Important points that need to be emphasized		Accepted with modification	Further clarified text.
1_0678	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3	1163	1168	Should forest management be mentioned in this context?		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0679	Brandon, Andrea	2	1166	1167	Sentence "If the land use in the current year does not correspond to an Article 3.3 activity or an elected Article 3.4 activity, and..." should read "If the land use in the current year does not correspond to an Article 3.3 activity, FM or an elected Article 3.4 activity, and..."		Accepted	Revised
1_0680	Vreuls, Harry	2	1166	1168	delete this as it is a repetition that is not needed		Rejected	This is a correct statement and there is no harm in emphasizing this point.
1_0681	Rock, Joachim	2	1174	1179	Please reword. Stratification is not mandatory.		Accepted	Revised to indicate that stratification is mandatory.
1_0682	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	1182		'...guidance for estimating GHG emissions and removals...'	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Revised
1_0683	Schwarze, Reimund	2.3.1	1186	1220	De minimis clause must be applied to arrive at "robust accounting rules" considering availability and capacity needed (even in EU-27!), see: Impact Assessment on the role of land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) in the EU's climate change commitments /* SWD/2012/0041 - COD/2012/0042 */ Source: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/		Rejected	There is no reference to "robust accounting rules" in CMP decisions. The comment is unclear and refers to a document that is not yet published.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0684	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	1186		1186 onwards: this section could be combined with the 'choice of hierarchy/electability' in/of activities to be reported on per country. If a pool is significant, there shall be accounted for and this pool shall be reported in the national inventories. This significance of pools shall be outlined: when is a pool significant and when is a pool insignificant: add guidance en criteria.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	All pools have to be reported unless is can be demonstrated that they are not a source. There is no requirement to determine whether a pool is "significant".
1_0685	Ziche, Daniel	2.3.1	1187	1225	For the definition of the pools to be reported the KPSG refers to Table 1.1 in Chapter 1 in Volume 4 in 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The definition of litter and the instructions for separating litter from soil organic matter in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines is inconsistent with the 2003 IPCC Guidelines. In the GPG 2006 (Table 1.1) both pools are separated by a certain particle size, suggested are 2mm. This could have the effect, that large parts of the organic layer of mineral soils are accounted to the mineral soil carbon pool. By the definition of litter in the GPG 2003 (Glossary) litter includes the litter, fomic, and humic layers, and thus the total organic layer of mineral soils. This inconsistency in litter definition cause a significant bias in reporting GHG emissions, e.g. the 0cm line for the default 0-30cm depth for C accounting of mineral soils shift within the organic layer. Countries which adopted their soil inventories to the 2003 IPCC Guidelines could hardly recalculate their litter and mineral soil C –pools according to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.		Rejected	In this report we do not have the mandate to redraft what was agreed in the 2006 IPCC GL which now replace 2003 GPG. Further, the new way to subdivide litter from soil simplifies the identification of litter and is therefore less prone to subjective interpretations.
1_0686	Kim, Raehyun	2	1190	1190	"Section 2.3.8". Section 2.3.8 is not related to HWP. Maybe Section 2.8		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0687	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	1203	1203	Include the sixth pool incorporated in Durban: HWP. Therefore, make reference to "the total carbo stock change of the six pools"		Accepted	Revised
1_0688	Canaveira, Paulo	2,3,1	1204	1204	Replace "Decision 16/CMP.1" with "Decisions 16/CMP.1 and 2/CMP.7"		Accepted	replaced "Decision 16/CMP.1" with "Decision 2/CMP.7" revised note 10.
1_0689	de Ligt, Rob	2.3.1	1204	1207	Text provides broad statement that a pool can be excluded if it is not a source. In addition, this text should also state that this provision does not apply to the HWP pool. The HWP pool cannot be excluded.		Accepted	Revised
1_0690	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.1	1204	1205	Reference to 16/CMP.1 is incorrect in the context of the second commitment period for which para 26 of annex to 2/CMP.7 applies		Accepted	Revised
1_0691	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	1204	1204	Replace 16/CMP,1 with 2/CMP,7. The sentence would read "decision 2/CMP.7 specifies that a Party may choose not to account for a given pool in the second CP, with the exception of HWP pool, if transparent and...."		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0692	Perugini, Lucia	2	1204	1207	The reference to decision 16/CMP1 should be replaced with reference to decision 2/CMP7 (par 26): Each Party included in Annex I shall account for all changes in the following carbon pools: above-ground biomass, below-ground biomass, litter, dead wood, soil organic carbon and harvested wood products. With the exception of harvested wood products, a Party may choose not to account for a given pool in a commitment period, if transparent and verifiable information is provided that demonstrates that the pool is not a source.		Accepted	Revised
1_0693	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.1	1205	1205	footnote 10: for CP2 the reference to 16/CMP.1 should be replaced with reference to para 26 of annex to 2/CMP.7		Accepted	Revised
1_0694	Rock, Joachim	2	1211	1214	Cropland can contain dead wood from a deforestation event, especially in countries with a high rate of deforestation.		Accepted	Revised
1_0695	Forbes, Keith	2	1213	1214	suggest "was neither an orchard nor other agroforestry system"		Accepted	Revised
1_0696	Sperow, Mark	2.3.1	1213	1213	Should "no" be "not" at the end of the sentence?		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0697	Lehtonen, Aleksi	2	1215	1217	The GPG says "Surveys of peer-reviewed literature for the activity". And this means that by selecting suitable papers one can easily say that a pool is a sink....Instead of Surveys it should be "Systematic review of peer-reviewed literature ... " indicating that also papers that do support not-source should be analysed		Accepted	add "suitable" after word "literature"
1_0698	Alfredsen, Gry	2	1219	1220	Do you need to give the name of the Section 2.4.3?		Rejected	We typically to not add name to section references.
1_0699	Ngarize, Sekai	2.3.1	1221	1222	Can a pool be 'insignificant' in the context of reporting under the UNFCCC and KP? The IPCC reporting rules are quite clear, and provide a choice of associated Notation Keys (NKs) to be used in the CRF tables and NIRs. There is no real option for a source or sink to be 'insignificant' - if emissions or removals occur in a country, the estimate of emissions or removals must be reported, or, a NK used such as NE, NO, or IE.		Accepted	We deleted that sentence
1_0700	Vreuls, Harry	2	1222		I support that a section should be included of accounting each pools, but reporting combined pools (and so using IE for a pool)		Accepted	We added statement on the treatment of combined pools.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0701	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1223	1223	"insignificance" could also apply to carbon stock changes of pools. It may happen that a pool is large, however, carbon stock changes are small=insignificant. Some ideas would be nice to see which small emissions could be regarded as "insignificant" so that the "not source" provisions may still apply. Such a guidance could significantly help countries apply these provisions.		Accepted with modification	We have removed refernces to insignificance. Discussion of significance is confounded with uncertainty, and the choice of Tiers.
1_0702	Zhang, Guobin	2.3.2	1227	1227	which are "CMP decisions"?		Accepted	Revised
1_0703	Christophersen, Øyvind	2.3.2	1229	1229	Please consider to replace the word "other" with "any". The use of the word "other" gives the impression that its also voluntary to elect Forest mangement for the second commitment period.		Accepted	Revised
1_0704	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.2	1230	1230	footnote 11: For CP1 the reference should be to paragraph 5 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and for CP2 the reference should be annex II of decision: Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol "		Accepted	Revised
1_0705	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1234	1234	add "e.g." after "started"		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0706	Kim, Raehyun	2	1240	1240	"2.4.1.1". I couldn't find 2.4.1.1. of the GPG-LULUCF.		Accepted	Sentence deleted as it had other problems as well.
1_0707	Sato, Atsushi	2	1243	1244	RV activity is also defined by "narrow" approach. RV should be add here.		Accepted	Added
1_0708	Bellassen, Valentin	2	1244	1267	Explain or cross-reference what is meant by "narrow approach" and "broad approach".		Accepted	Revised
1_0709	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.2	1246	1246	There are two "and" after each other. Delete one of them		Rejected	Incorrect
1_0710	Forbes, Keith	2	1249	1264	no change, just to reaffirm that these narrative examples are much more informative than the tabular ones with too many acronyms		Accepted	Noted
1_0711	Burgess, Deborah	2	1254	1254	replace "large" with "in size"		Accepted	Revised
1_0712	Burgess, Deborah	2	1255	1255	replace "large" with "in size"		Accepted	Revised
1_0713	Burgess, Deborah	2	1256	1256	replace "large" with "in size"		Accepted	Revised
1_0714	Kim, Raehyun	2	1259	1259	"CO2". If the number is after a letter, then it has to be subscript.		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0715	Kim, Raehyun	2	1262	1262	"CO2". If the number is after a letter, then it has to be subscript.		Accepted	Revised
1_0716	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.2	1264	1264	(Box 2.3.1) Why not use a simple graph to show the same in a simpler way?		Rejected	This would not be efficient as it would require additional explanations
1_0717	Kim, Raehyun	2	1264	1264	"CO2". If the number is after a letter, then it has to be subscript.		Accepted	Revised
1_0718	Radunsky, Klaus	2	1272	1296	Box 2.3.2: It is suggested to link this example/the explanation also to figure 1.1. because this figure explains when it is appropriate to report additional forest land under 3.3 or article 3.4.		Rejected	the example is not about on how to classify lands but is about reporting emissions and removals from classified lands
1_0719	Burgess, Deborah	2	1276	1276	replace "adding annually 1,000 ha year -1" with "adding 1,000 ha annually"		Accepted	Revised
1_0720	Kim, Raehyun	2	1276	1276	"year-1". where -1 is superscript		Accepted	Revised
1_0721	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1276	1276	the increase of area "due to natural expansion" may require some guidance as "natural expansion" is not necessarily a "human induced activity". The issue may be linked to the definitio of Forest Management		Rejected	Natural expansion with subsequent management is eligible for FM.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0722	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.2	1283	1285	It seems the mathematics is wrong 1001000+1500 is not 1002000		Accepted	Revised
1_0723	Burgess, Deborah	2	1284	1284	replace 1,500 with 1,000		Accepted	Revised
1_0724	Chidthaisong, Amnat	2	1284	1284	the area 1500 ha should be 1000 ha? Please check.		Accepted	Revised
1_0725	Kim, Raehyun	2	1284	1284	"1,500ha". The annual additional area subject to FM is 1,000ha as explained in your assumption (line 1279).		Accepted	Revised
1_0726	Rogiers, Nele	2.3.2.	1284	1284	Shouldn't the number read 1,000 instead of 1,500?		Accepted	Revised
1_0727	Sperow, Mark	2.3.2	1284	1284	Should "1500 ha" be "1000 ha"?		Accepted	Revised
1_0728	Weiss, Peter	2_3_2	1284		"...1,500 ha..." should be changed to "...1,000 ha...."		Accepted	Revised
1_0729	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.2	1298	1303	This is not hierarchical order that forces countries to avoid double counting. The hierarchical order is a tool to facilitate avoidance of double counting		Accepted	Revised
1_0730	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.2	1311	1311	Why "suite of the operations"- suite of practices was mentioned in line 1305		Accepted	Revised in 1308 and 1311

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0731	Radunsky, Klaus	2	1317	1368	This new chapter could be helpful. However, more work seems to be necessary in order to provide guidance that is clear and meaningful. Just a few examples where both criteria are not met: Box 2.3.3.: There is the underlying assumption that countries know the area for land under forest management by 1 January (at the start of the year) and per 31 December (at the end of the year). Such data are not available in reality but could only be calculated by a modelling approach. Do the figures under "total area subject to FM" refer to the areas in the year n and those under "area of forest lands that was subject to FM in the previous year" to the year n-1? Another example where there is need for improvement is the text. Line 1323 informs that there are several approaches to address the issue. The rest of the text is not clear about the various options, it is not clear to which option the example refers. It is suggested to return to the text of 4.2.3.2 of the GPG-LULUCF and include the old example.		Rejected	The example in the GPG section referred to here deals with the issues that we included in section 2.3.2. Section 2.3.3 deals with issues related to transition of land among categories.
1_0732	Chidthaisong, Amnat	2	1324	1324	misspelling " artefacts"		Accepted	revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0733	Weiss, Peter	2_3_3	1324	1340	While I agree methodological with the issue, I find that a redrafting of these paragraphs could make them more clear. Enclosed in doc "Attachment_1_0733.pdf" is my proposal (deleted and new text indicated in different colours). Despite my proposal for a redrafting, I have a general problem with this chapter. It represents a precision improvement of the 2006 guidelines, but formulated in a more strict manner. While in the 2006 guidelines the use of identical areas is mentioned, this use of identical areas is defined in the FOD (also in my redrafting) as "good practice". On basis of that, countries who have not the related detailed information systems to be able to follow this instruction may get troubles in fulfilling such a "good practice" obligation and (later on) in the reviews, even when they give evidence that they underestimate the accounted removals with their incorrect approach (see for instance the results of the example in Box 2.3.3). My question therefore, if it was adequate to formulate it that strict as "good practice" or keep the way it is treated in the 2006 guidelines where it is mentioned of something to take care of, but not as "good practice". (please compare it with the simplification that is allowed with respect to the reporting of no source statements). We should also keep in mind that the example in Box 2.2.3 represents a simplification because it assumes that the remaining 990,000 ha FM land and the deforested 10,000 ha had the same initial average C stock as the 1,000,000 ha FM land at the start of the year, which is likely not the case. So, to be fully correct the approach will be more complicated than the example. Forest inventory types may exist that do not allow	Attachment_1_0733.pdf	Accepted with modification	Some of the proposed edits were used in the revised text but not all.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0734	Zhang, Guobin	2.3.3	1325	1325	in the "for each unit of land or land" sentence, the last "land" should changed to "lands"		Accepted	revised
1_0735	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.3.3	1330		Insert "." among "identical If"		Accepted	revised
1_0736	Woodfield, Michael	2	1330		Full stop missing.		Accepted	revised
1_0737	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	1332	1332	similary (instead of similarly)		Accepted	revised
1_0738	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	1332	1332	Similary - change to similarly		Accepted	revised
1_0739	Alfredsen, Gry	2	1341	1358	Nice example, just minor lay out comments: Would be nice with bold headings within the tables. Consider inserting capital initial letter in left columns in top two tables? Since the example goes over two pages the last sentence page 2.27, line 1357-1358 looks like it is unfinished. Consider moving it to the next page.		Accepted	revised
1_0740	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1346	1346	the example in the box is very nice and clear. However, it would be more realistic to apply a mean carbon stock of 101 tha-1 instead of the value of 105. Also, the value of 20 tha-1 after deforestation is too large, could be 10 or even 0 (for biomass)		Rejected	it is just an example to keep the numbers simple.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0741	Kim, Raehyun	2	1354	1355	"80,000 tC". There is an error in calculation of total stock-change in deforested areas and Stock change reported in FLCL under UNFCCC and in D under Article 3.3 (C). The right answer is 800,000 tC.		Accepted	Ooops, thanks for catching this!
1_0742	Chidthaisong, Amnat	2	1355	1355	please spell out FLCL in full.		Accepted	Revised
1_0743	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.3.3	1357	1358	Add "for instance" among "incorrect to" --> [...] incorrect, for instance, to...[...] --> And remove e.g. at the end of line 1358		Accepted	Revised
1_0744	Weiss, Peter	2_3_3	1364	1368	The meaning of this sentence is difficult to follow.		Accepted	Revised
1_0745	Chidthaisong, Amnat	2	1370	1387	I don't find this section useful. I feel that the section does not give any specific guidance. Although there are many possible ways with different time intervals, I think some suggestions/conclusion to reader on the topic should be given.		Accepted with modification	Revised the text and added stronger guidance.
1_0746	Alfredsen, Gry	2	1371	1372	Probably lack a word in the end of the sentence, before 'be' - like 'needs to' or 'should'.		Rejected	This is gramatically correct.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0747	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.4	1372	1372	footnote 13: For CP1 the reference should be to para. 8(d) of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. The regulations relating to accounting and reporting in CP2 are contained in para 1(h) of annex I and para 1 of annex II to decision Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol		Accepted	Revised
1_0748	Christophersen, Øyvind	2.3.4	1376	1376	Please check if the reference to Section 2.3.9 is correct. The current section 2.3.9 is about disturbances, not interannual variability.		Accepted	Revised
1_0749	Kim, Raehyun	2	1376	1376	"2.3.9". 'Interannual variability was explain Section 2.3.10.		Accepted	Revised
1_0750	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1376	1376	the correct section id is 2.3.10		Accepted	Revised
1_0751	Canaveira, Paulo	2,3,4	1381	1382	?? don't understand the sentence. Why shouldn't the inventories reflect real emissions and removals (in cases where the reporting system has the capacity to do so)?		Accepted with modification	Clarified the working
1_0752	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1381	1381	the correct section id is 2.3.10		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0753	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1384	1385	Suggested referenes: According to Saby et al. (2008), carbon stock changes in soils cannot be detected in a period shorter than 5-10 years. Detectability obviously depends on the intensity of the disturbance leading to carbon stock change, and other factors such as the rate of change over time, which depends on the land use change, and about which very limited evidence is available (Jandl et al., 2011).		Accepted with modification	Added Saby et al (primary reference) but not the secondary citaton.
1_0754	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1384	1385	Saby,N.P.A.; Bellamy,P.H.; Morvan,X.; Arrouays,D.; Jones,R.J.A.; Verheijen,F.G.A.; Kibblewhite,M.G.; Verdoort,A.; Üveges,J.B.; Freudenschuß,A.; Simota,C. 2008. Will European soil monitoring networks be able to detect changes in topsoil? Global Change Biology 14.10: 2432-2442.		Accepted	Thanks for the useful reference
1_0755	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1384	1385	Jandl, R., Rodeghiero, M., Olsson, M. 2011. Soil Carbon in Sensitive European Ecosystems: From Science to Land Management. Wiley-Blackwell.		Rejected	Only added the primary reference to Saby et al
1_0756	Lutzenberger, Alexa	2,3,5	1387		minimum		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0757	Schwarze, Reimund	2.3.5	1389	1451	Inconsistent with FMRLs (Chap. 2.3.8, 2.7.5)		Noted	Since the determination of FMRLs may involve the component of the impacts originated from human activities, particularly taking into the account of business as usual scenario.
1_0758	Rock, Joachim	2	1390	1395	Please reword, because there are two natural causes and one non-natural cause given instead of two primary sources.		Accepted	Revised
1_0759	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1390	1392	The interannual variability of harvests due to economic reasons can also substantially contribute to the net emissions/removals!		Accepted	Yes - and that is already stated in the text (FOD line 1395)
1_0760	Christophersen, Øyvind	2.3.5	1394	1394	Please replace the word "second" with "third".		Accepted with modification	Revised wording
1_0761	Kim, Raehyun	2	1395	1395	I guess that there is double space between sentences.		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0762	Petersson, Hans	2	1401	1406	Natural disturbance will be separated but what is the point in separating interannual variation (due to climate)? Isn't it enough that it's a possibility (5 or 10 year inventory cycle) to average out data? (And why isn't annual variation in the Energy sector considered – a cold winter certainly would influence on emissions).		Rejected	The text is not aimed at justifying a choice. The text provides guidance to address a real issue i.e. inter-annual variability of emissions caused by natural disturbances and climate variability. The comparison with the energy sector is not appropriate because emissions are always caused by the human activity even if in response to environmental constraints (this does not mean that those emissions cannot be avoided/reduced by implementing proper mitigation actions)
1_0763	Woodfield, Michael	2	1401		Higher Teir methods are the most strongly affected...		Accepted	Revised to indicate that this is compared to lower Tiers.
1_0764	Kim, Raehyun	2	1409	1409	"stock gain and loss". The original language is 'gain-loss method'.		Accepted	Revised
1_0765	Ziche, Daniel	2.3.5	1411	1414	In the 2006 IPCC Guidelines the “stock – change method” is named “stock – difference – method (e.g. litter 4.2.2.)”.		Accepted	Revised
1_0766	Kim, Raehyun	2	1412	1412	"stock change method". The original language is 'stock difference method'.		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0767	Lehtonen, Aleksi	2	1414	1416	"This approach averages interannual variability and also without additional information is not able to attribute observed emissions and removals to the drivers such as natural disturbances, environmental change or human activities." This is not true. If inventories do have annual cycle then also disturbances are mapped in time. It may be that sampling error is large, but NFIs do map these disturbances		Accepted	Revised the text referring to continuous inventories.
1_0768	Weiss, Peter	2_3_5	1417	1420	Having in mind the IPCC findings that factoring out is not feasible, the good practice guidance in these lines goes clearly beyond what is achievable in a sound manner with respect to assessing non-human factors. Furthermore, there is a major difficulty in defining "non-human factors", but any such definition would be needed as a prerequisite before fulfilling this request. Therefore, I propose to delete this paragraph.		Accepted with modification	Reworded and provided additional references but did not delete the paragraph.
1_0769	Ziche, Daniel	2.3.5	1418	1420	It is not clear, how the time-averaging of weather data should reduce the reported impacts of natural variability. At which step should the averaging be done? I suggest to delete this sentence or to provide additional information.		Accepted	Provided additional information
1_0770	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	1419	1419	environmental variability is a very broad concept, maybe should focus on climate variability		Accepted with modification	Explained that env. Variability includes CO2 and N deposition in addition to climate

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0771	Woodfield, Michael	2	1421	1423	Delete first sentence. Begin next sentence 'LULUCF inventories...'		Rejected	No justification provided for request to delete the sentence.
1_0772	Weiss, Peter	2_3_5	1423		Use "...LULUCF GHG emission/removal estimates..." instead of "...LULUCF inventories...", because area statistics must be reported complete		Accepted	Revised
1_0773	Sturgiss, Rob	2	1426	1428	'Reducing interannual variability of natural and indirect factors ...' The variability of natural factors (i.e. the weather) can't be reduced. It should refer to reducing the variability of emissions estimates caused by variability of natural and indirect factors.		Accepted	Revised
1_0774	Woodfield, Michael	2	1426		Moving the final sentence to the beginning of the paragraph would improve the argument.		Rejected	Authors decided that it serves better in the current location

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0775	Weiss, Peter	2_3_5	1429	1438	The statement in this paragraph would request multiple parallel trends under multiple influences to be true - for instance, that the same management changes have the same impact on the C stock changes under the same temperature changes. This little example shows that this assumption is doubtful. Likely, the same change of management leads to different stock change outcomes which depend also on the change of other factors, like climate change impacts, and not on the simulated management change alone. Therefore, the reduction to the change of one impact parameter in two modelling runs does not necessarily give the range of changes due to this parameter alone, even when the climate change scenario is kept constant for both scenarios.		Rejected	The proposed text is aimed at separating the contribution of changes in human activities from that of other factors in determining the GHG balance of a land. The method gives the correct amount of emissions and removals generated from the land (the actual emissions/removals) and subtract from those the expected emissions/removals that would have occurred under a BAU scenario of management practices projected with the actual climate conditions. So, the only variable that changes from the baseline and the actual values is the management; While there may be some interaction terms that are not considered here, this is beyond the scope of this discussion.
1_0776	Bellassen, Valentin	2	1433	1433	"Business-as-usual" should be replaced by "constant" or "unchanged". As a reviewer, getting a sense of the impact of human activities will be much easier if the "reference" time-series has them unchanged. Having them as "business-as-usual" requires 1) a description by the Party of what is considered "business-as-usual" and 2) an additional effort by the reviewer to understand what is bau and how it should impact the emissions.		Accepted	Added that constant or historic averages could be expressions of the BAU scenario.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0777	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	1435	1436	Is forestry data a right wording compared to the forest manangement data in the line 1434? In my view, to use this approach to reduce the interannual vairability, the input data type should be same. another issue is BAU human land use and land use change and forest manangment data is hard to define, sometimes, to define BAU or no-BAU scenario is quite subjective, maybe, should give guidance on how to define BAU and no-BAU secnario.		Accepted	Revised forestry data to forest manmagement data and explained what BAU data could mean.
1_0778	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1438	1438	Suggest to add: "The pre-requisite of the correct cancelling out of the interannual variabilities is the accurate modelling of both natural and human induced effects on emissions and removals."		Rejected	All modelling is supposed to be accurate - this is a very general statement that adds little in the context of this paragraph

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0779	Beets, Peter	2	1441	1442	"Countries that elect to exclude emissions from natural disturbances will reduce the interannual variability in reported emissions". It's unclear what this is saying. At line 1155 it says that fluxes due to natural disturbances need to be estimated and reported (even if electing to exclude natural disturbance effects from the accounting), so is it the impact of modelling that is being referred to here presumably? If so, when models are used to calculate emissions and the reference level that already average out interannual variability (eg NZ's 300 Index growth model) then interannual variability will not be reduced. Either delete the sentence or clarify what is meant. (I see that lines 1447-1448 acknowledge that consistent methods need to be used when calculating emissions and reference level.		Accepted	replaced "reported" with "accounted"
1_0780	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	1443	1443	caluclate		Accepted	revised
1_0781	Rösemann, Claus	2.3.5.	1443	1443	last word "caluclate" should be "calculate"		Accepted	revised
1_0782	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	1443	1443	used to caluclate ---- calculate		Accepted	revised
1_0783	Weiss, Peter	2_3_5	1443	1444	Reference levels should not have any impact on interannual variability, so I would reformulate the sentence.		Accepted	revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0784	Weiss, Peter	2_3_5	1443	1451	It is hard to follow the advice/meaning in this paragraph. What is recommended here - e.g. to adjust the reference levels ex-post on basis of the real measured meteorological data for the commitment period instead of the predicted ones?		Accepted	Revised
1_0785	Wiseman, Michael	2	1443	1443	Last word misspelt CALCULATE		Accepted	Revised
1_0786	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	1447	1447	... parameters,.		Accepted	Revised
1_0787	Rösemann, Claus	2.3.5.	1447	1447	the comma after the word "parameters" should be deleted		Accepted	Revised
1_0788	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1448	1448	Due to the potential bias mentioned, I just wonder if there is a need for Parties to justify their RL even after they have been adopted if such a bias is absent. If not, a technical correction might be required.		Accepted	The text makes it clear that such a technical adjustment may be required to ensure consistency of climate data.
1_0789	Beets, Peter	2	1452	1453	Section 2.3.5 and 2.3.10 are repetitive, and would best be merged into one section. I suggest that the existing 3.3.10 is incorporated into 2.3.5		Accepted	The two sections have been merged and duplication eliminated

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0790	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.5	1452	1453	Wouldn't it be better to explain what could be reasons for applying technical adjustment resulting from interannual variability as mentioned in line 1449 and move the entire considerations to the FM section?		Rejected	For SOD we will keep a new, consolidated version of the discussion of interannual variability in this section and await feedback from SOD review.
1_0791	Lutzenberger, Alexa	2	1452		Question: it is consistent and comprehensible		Accepted with modification	This is a reviewer's response to an internal comment outlining the need for additional action
1_0792	Petersson, Hans	2	1455		If Tier 3 is used for all categories under the KP, why is there a need for a key-category analysis (to rank efforts)?		Rejected	Because Tier 3 is not used for all categories under the KP.
1_0793	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1455	1468	Within FM (and AR in case of natural disturbance), different methodologies may be needed to be used for natural disturbances and the equivalent forests to estimate emissions and removals. Is a guidance needed if their methodology should at least be of the Tier that is used for FM and AR, respectively?		Rejected	The tiers are applied at the level of activities not the scale of ND or CEFC. However, it is correct that those two may require additional spatial information to be reported, but that has been said repeatedly in earlier sections of the report.
1_0794	Beets, Peter	2	1462	1463	Revise (delete?) " the associated activity under the Kyoto Protocol" - sentence structure is not correct.		Accepted	Revised the wording to correct sentence structure.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0795	Christophersen, Øyvind	2.3.6	1462	1466	Please make it clear if this text is to be considered as Approach 2.		Accepted	Revised
1_0796	Lutzenberger, Alexa	2,3,6	1462	1463	Syntax		Accepted	Revised
1_0797	Rock, Joachim	2	1462	1463	There are rules to identify categories that are key, so this approach is not needed.		Rejected	No harm in repeating this here and pointing the reader to where these rules can be found.
1_0798	Woodfield, Michael	2	1462		Not clear. Might this sentence be written. "Whenever a category is identified as key in the UNFCCC inventory, it is good practice to consider the associated (corresponding?) Kyoto Protocol activities as also being key..."		Accepted	Revised
1_0799	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.6	1472	1472	(table 2.3.1, row "Forest land remaining forest land (managed)", column 2): Earlier was mentioned that land meeting definition of forest may be managed as cropland - hence, shouldn't CM be allowed here as well? There exist forests managed for fodder for animals.		Rejected	If the country defines land with trees as CM in KP reporting it should also be treated as cropland in UNFCCC reporting
1_0800	Lund, H. Gyde	2	1472	1472	Table 2.3.1 - Where do unmanaged lands fall?		Accepted	Unmanaged lands are under other in UNFCCC and are not reported under KP - hence they are not in the table.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0801	Lund, H. Gyde	2	1472	1472	Table 2.3.1 - Should the first row under Other Land be 'managed'?		Rejected	No - because there is no "managed" other land.
1_0802	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1472	1472	It is not entirely clear if the table should be filled in by the Parties. Please provide guidance on how to use this table.		Accepted	Revised - we deleted the 3rd column because this is not a reporting table.
1_0803	Sperow, Mark	2.3.6	1472	1773	Is it correct that "Settlements remaining settlements" is identified as "RV"?		Accepted	Yes - RV is a KP activity that could occur on Settlements remaining Settlements.
1_0804	Sturgiss, Rob	2	1472		relationship between column 1 and 2 - Forest land remaining forest land - should this be able to be translated into not only FM but also CM and GM?		Rejected	If managed forest in UNFCCC it should not be CM or GM in KP reporting.
1_0805	Alfredsen, Gry	2	1474	1475	For new users key category can be explained better. Can be done by a reference or foot note.		Rejected	Key category analysis is extensively described in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines to which this report is a supplement. No need to add repetition text here

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0806	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	1476	1476	replace "should" with "could": "the corresponding right column COULD be initially considered as key". In my view, if for example land converted to grassland is a Key category under the Convention, it doesn't mean that grassland management would be a key category under the KP, because all the contribution of emissions to this category could come only from D. Therefore, a direct association would be more appropriate with a COULD than with a WOULD.		Accepted	Revised to could
1_0807	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	1477		1477 onwards: here is stated that it is good practice to examine qualitatively which of the possible activities actually are key. There is no description on how to determine 'what is key'.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	qualitative analysis is explained in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. No need to repeat here
1_0808	Weiss, Peter	2_3_6	1507		add "...or pools" after "...significant subcategories"		Accepted	Revised
1_0809	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.3.6	1509		Add "of Annex" --> Paragraph 26 of Annex of 2/CMP.7 --> OR ADD FOOTNOTE SIMILAR TO Footnote 18		Accepted	Revised
1_0810	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.6	1509	1509	Add: annex to		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0811	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.6	1513	1515	In line 1514 add after "applied" : separately to any of the pools (litter, dead wood or soil organic carbon pools) if for some or all of the pool in question can be shown not to be a source using the methods outlined in Section 2.3.1. The language here should allow inferring that each pool should be analyzed separately.		Rejected	The text is clear on this point.
1_0812	Ngarize, Sekai	2.3.7	1518	1528	I suggest a definition of net-net and gross-net should be provided. It does not appear to be included anywhere. The terms net-net and gross-net cause a lot of confusion, and a simple numerical example would be useful to illustrate exactly what the definitions mean and how they are applied.		Rejected	This is explained in the remainder of the paragraph.
1_0813	Woodfield, Michael	2	1519	1522	The sentence is too long and unclear. Does it mean 'CMP decisions specify that information should be provided on whether or not anthropogenic.... emissions ... factor out removals ...etc?		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0814	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.7	1522	1522	footnote 17: Reference to -/CMP.1 is wrong. The correct reference for CP1 should be: 15/CMP.7. Guidance for the preparation of the information required under Article 7 of the Kyoto Protocol. For CP2 the correct reference is: annex I and II to decision -/CMP.8 Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol		Accepted	Revised for CP2
1_0815	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	1524	1524	is this statement true to all Tier 3 methods?		Accepted	This text does not refer to the tier applied for estimating emissions and removals; it refers to the accounting rules so it is "true" for any tier
1_0816	Blain, Dominique	2	1530	1551	It is unclear why a section on Reference Levels is needed in the generic guidance, since RLs only apply to forest management.		Rejected	The general chapter contains general information on all the main elements discussed in the specific sections. FMRL is a very important element, that's why it is introduced in the general section.
1_0817	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.8	1530	1530	It seems that this chapter does not fit here. It should be moved to the proper section.		Rejected	The general chapter contains general information on all the main elements discussed in the specific sections. FMRL is a very important element, that's why it is introduced in the general section.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0818	Ngarize, Sekai	2.3.8	1530	1551	It would be useful to include a chart that shows the change in a hypothetical time series of carbon stocks, and then to visualise on this how net-net, gross-net and 'reference level' accounting work. You could use Forest Management as an example.		Rejected	This supplement is not evaluating the impact of different accounting options. The suggestion is thus outside the scope and mandate of this document
1_0819	Federici, Sandro	2.3.8	1531	1532	use the singular: each Annex I Party is requested to submit information on a single FMRL (one and only one for each country)		Accepted	Revised
1_0820	Woodfield, Michael	2	1531	1532	Delete 'from'. 'Decision ...requests each Annex 1 party to...		Accepted	Revised
1_0821	Federici, Sandro	2.3.8	1533	1533	the word net is not needed (emissions and removals have been listed both)		Accepted	Revised
1_0822	Federici, Sandro	2.3.8	1535	1535	use the singular: the FMRL		Accepted	Revised
1_0823	Federici, Sandro	2.3.8	1535	1535	use the acronym GHGI; indeed the GHG acronym is already used and explained in another part of the Guidelines. So: greenhouse gas inventory (GHGI)		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0824	Weiss, Peter	2_3_8	1535	1541	I think a cross-check of this paragraph with the text in the decision 2/CMP.7 and with chapter 2.7.5 and a related harmonisation is needed. Please add, "...or DBH-structure" after "...age-class structure..." in line 1536. Please add "... with the historic reporting" after "...consistently ..." in line 1540. A general comment to the whole guidance that comes to my mind when reading this chapter. Wouldn't it be more clear and user-friendly if "good practice" advices would be only in the specific chapters, for instance in chapter 2.7.5 instead of 2.3.8 with respect to the reference level issue?		Accepted with modification	We agree that it is useful to harmonize and will compare with 2.7.5. However, the suggested 'DBH' text is not consistent with the decision text. We accept the second suggestion to add 'with historic years'.
1_0825	Federici, Sandro	2.3.8	1539	1540	consistently with what? I guess with what has been reported so far by the country under the UNFCCC and KP. So if a pool/gas was reported under the KP in the first commitment period it should be reported also in the second; similarly if a pool/gas is reported under the convention at a tier 2 it should be then reported also under the KP.		Rejected	consistency is extensively discussed and explained in section 2.7.6. as clearly reported in this paragraph
1_0826	Federici, Sandro	2.3.8	1539	1540	Also consistency in the treatment of natural disturbances should be quoted here		Accepted	Revised
1_0827	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.3.8	1542		Add "Annex of" --> Annex of Decision 2/CMP.7 paragraph 14...		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0828	Munthali, Jack	2	1542	1551	important point that country parties need to note		Noted	
1_0829	Radunsky, Klaus	2	1542		A correction is required because the reference should be to para 14 of the Annex of decision 2/CMP.7		Accepted	Revised
1_0830	Radunsky, Klaus	2	1544		A correction is required because the reference should be to the Annex of decision 2/CMP.7 but not to the decision.		Accepted	Revised
1_0831	Weiss, Peter	2_3_8	1548		Delete "...and data". Rationale: If same data for reporting and reference level are used, you'll get same figures - the reference level would loose its meaning.		Rejected	It seems clear that "same data" here means same source of data and/or same data type, not same values
1_0832	Canaveira, Paulo	2,3,10	2288	2346	This text seams to go beyond the requirements from 2/CMP.7		Accepted with modification	Text has been shortened and consolidated with 2.3.5
1_0833	Lehtonen, Aleksi	2	2288	2288	also chp 2.3.5 deals with interannual variation, please combine these chapters, now it is repeating issues and confusing. Just one location for interannual variation is enough. Also seedling material should be equally good and there should be evidence given for these issues. Otherwise this just a way increase deforestation.		Accepted	Done

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0834	Rock, Joachim	2	2294	2296	This depends on the inventory and reporting scheme employed by a country. If e.g. emissions are estimated from field measurements, including harvest statistics can introduce an additional source of variation and error instead of reducing variation. So it is wrong to declare the inclusion of additional sources good practice if it is not shown that they always increase the accuracy and precision of the estimation of emissions and removals.		Accepted with modification	Text has been revised
1_0835	Forbes, Keith	2	2300	2300	"extrapolation of from" - needs editing		Accepted	Revised
1_0836	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2305	2305	add "to reduce interannual variability" after "good practice". This addition is needed, otherwise the text could be read as a general support for growth functions, which may not be the case e.g. if they have proved to be incorrect or outdated.		Accepted	Revised
1_0837	Galinski, Wojciech	2.3.10	2306	2306	Annual average growth rates?		Accepted	Revised
1_0838	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	2310	2315	first, should consider how to judge the periodic increment is consistently under or over-predicted? And what method may be used to adjust; second, what the new data come from?. How to verify the process-based model and ensure the model is reasonable and transparent?		Rejected	The text already states that the assesment should be made relative to the performance of regionally distributed permanent sample plots.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0839	Sturgiss, Rob	2	2312		Care needs to be taken in utilising averaged data with process based models. Perhaps replace existing sentence with a more general one which simply cross reference outcomes of the Sydney 2010 workshop as in line 3840		Accepted with modification	Text has been revised
1_0840	Lundblad, Mattias	2.3.10	2316		15/CP.17 --> 16/CMP.1 (?)		Accepted	Revised
1_0841	Searson, Matt Searson	2	2323	2326	The sentence "Where environmental conditions in the base year..." must be clarified to remove confusion. It would not be appropriate to use longer-term climatic averages in a process based model to estimate the base year because climatic effects often do not have linear effects in process based models. It is therefore not appropriate to average the inputs (environmental conditions) rather it is more appropriate to average the outputs (emissions). It might be better therefore to rephrase the sentence to state "... it is good practice to use longer-term averages of emissions to represent the base year."		Accepted	Revised as suggested
1_0842	Weiss, Peter	2_3_10	2323	2326	I have doubts that this good practice guidance is in line with the related decision. Furthermore, the advice is rather ambiguous (for instance, "...from their longer-term (e.g., 5 year) averages,...") and may lead to selection of that time period that leads to higher net removals or less net emissions in the CP.		Accepted	Revised as suggested in comment 1_0841

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0843	Rock, Joachim	2	2331	2339	Trends will lead to different means in the CP than in the calibration or reference period. This can not be helped with interpolation or sampling with replacement, but needs to be assessed independently.		Rejected	this text is not about comparing trends in the CP and the FMRL. It is about internannual variability and trends, since a solution for the interannual variability, i.e. the averaging, can mask trends in data. A solution for this problem is sampling with replacement
1_0844	Alfredsen, Gry	2	2348	2349	A short intro to 2.4 would have been reader friendly.		Accepted	Added a short introduction
1_0845	Weiss, Peter	2_4_1	2351	2360	What is meant by "continuosly"? Each forest inventory has gaps of years between the assessment cycles and/or between the revisiting of assessment plots. Therefore, the paragraph and the good practice guidance in this paragraph (lines 2358,2359) should be re-written to avoid any misinterpretation of "continuosly" and to better meet the feasible periodicity of assessment systems.		Accepted	Clarification will improve understanding
1_0846	Alfredsen, Gry	2	2355	2356	Might be obvious for those this is relevant for, but what does 'no-till' mean?		Rejected	No-till is a tecnical term that is very common in the LULUCF field and is used frequently in 2006 Guidelines
1_0847	Brandon, Andrea	2	2364		The wording "land subject to Article 3.3 or elected 3.4 activities" should read "land subject to Article 3.3, FM or elected 3.4 activities..."		Accepted	Include FM as mandatory activity.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0848	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2364	2364	can (all) references to GPG be eliminated by referencing to the IPCC 2006 GL and/or providing text in this GL?		Accepted	Change was made
1_0849	Burgess, Deborah	2	2371	2371	Consider adding guidance on maintaining time series consistency in activity data derived from remotely sensed data as in attached file : Attachment_1_0849.pdf	Attachment_1_0849.pdf	Rejected	This issue is addressed in section 2.2 Chapter 2
1_0850	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2405	2405	Consider changing 'forest cover' to 'tree cover'		Rejected	This is related to the definition of Forest and should not be changed.
1_0851	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.2	2407	2407	footnote 37: Decision mentioned in this footnote was adopted by the CMP as: Decision 19/CMP.1, Guidelines for national systems under Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Kyoto Protocol. On the other hand please note that the work by the CMP on the entire body of legislation on issues relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 is not completed yet.		Accepted	Decision 19/CMP.1 was mentioned in the footnote 37.
1_0852	Sato, Atsushi	2	2416	2416	I suggest including additional text that a party does not necessary recalculate emissions and removals during the CP1 because these will be accounted (=fixed) at the end of CP1. This issue is often asked from policymakers.		Rejected	For the CP2, emissiopns should be calculated or recalculated for the CP1.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0853	Munthali, Jack	2	2418	2432	Least Developed countries have serious challenges regarding uncertainty assessment arising mainly for generation of activity data		Noted	Activities data is essential for NIR.
1_0854	Bellassen, Valentin	2	2420	2420	To my knowledge, no existing GPG provides requirements in terms of level of confidence. If so, say it. If those requirements exist somewhere, cross-reference the relevant section(s) of GPG.		Accepted	Reworded to indicate need to report uncertainty but not to meet a specific uncertainty target (which was never defined by IPCC).
1_0855	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.3	2420	2420	footnote 38: please note that the work by the CMP on the entire body of legislation on issues relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 is not completed yet. Annual reporting under KP-LULUCF has been finalized, see http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815.php#decisions , "Addressing the implications..."		Accepted	Decision 2/CMP.8 is included as reference, although it does not address Uncertainties issues
1_0856	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2434		2.4.3.1 IDENTIFYING UNCERTAINTIES, the list does not include positional errors as found in comparisons of remotely sensed data/images of varying dates, which is critical for REDD for example.		Accepted	Included in the text estimates errors due to positional errors.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0857	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2434	2434	Uncertainties may arise, in addition to what has been discussed, from using expert judgment, choice of emission factors, miscalculations, lack of completeness, double counting. Uncertainties can be systematic or random (in a statistical sense). These issues should at least be mentioned		Rejected	Uncertainties are related to the method chosen to estimate the emissions and removals.
1_0858	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2437	2437	the countries themselves have to define many things, such as forest, the various activities etc. Therefore, uncertainties may also arise from the application of these definitions, too.		Rejected	This issue is addressed in the text.
1_0859	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2443	2444	Omission and Comission only relate to mapped data, or data that may have been classified from remotely sensed images		Rejected	The text is clear on this point.
1_0860	Petersson, Hans	2	2450	2454	Comment: Two forthcoming independent research articles (Ståhl et al and Breidenbach) indicate that the model errors from empirical models are quite insignificant. The results are valid for estimates of changes in living biomass using traditional sample bases national forest inventories. Thus most of the error originates from sampling		Accepted	No need for changing the text. It is a comment by the reviewer. Would have been useful to get the reference?
1_0861	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2455	2460	I would move this section before the one at 2441-2442 to allow for logic from definitions ... final estimates		Accepted	The text was changed.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0862	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2470	2470	Tate et al.... Consider being consistant in listing references. Not all references listed in the back are cited in the text.		Rejected	Tate et al is listed in the references
1_0863	Beets, Peter	2	2474	2474	"Section 2.3.9 above" change to correct section number (2.3.10)		Accepted	revised
1_0864	Haruyama, Yukio	2.4.3.1	2487	2504	Sentences are reasonable, but "In order to capture changes in areas as small as one hectare, the resolution of imagery must be finer than one hectare." could be reconsidered. Resolution of imagery could be much less than one hectare		Rejected	It is a matter of interpretation.
1_0865	Jonckheere, Inge	2	2487	2487	Spatial resolution		Accepted	Revised
1_0866	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	2487	2487	Suggestion: Characteristics of remote sensing data and ground truth		Rejected	It is clear in the text.
1_0867	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2488	2490	What is the main thing we are trying to track - changes in land cover or changes in land use? (see 2496 - land cover or land use (see 2496). A piece of land may have no trees, but still classed as forest (i.e. a clearcut that is to be replanted) or an area may be covered with trees and not be classed as a forest (i.e. an orchard). Consider being consistent in what we are trying to track.		Accepted	Text was changed.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0868	Forbes, Keith	2	2490	2490	suggest changing "produce a complete identification" to "completely identify"		Accepted	Text was changed.
1_0869	Mora, Brice	2	2490	2490	and useful for land cover change detection through time-series analysis notably		Accepted	Text was changed.
1_0870	Jonckheere, Inge	2	2491	2491	inadequate spatial resolution		Rejected	It is clear in the text.
1_0871	Mora, Brice	2	2491	2491	two other major sources of uncertainty are signal saturation for a given sensor and inaccurate in situ data for model calibration.		Rejected	It is too specific to be included as a guidance.
1_0872	Mora, Brice	2	2493	2493	suggest generalising the comment using modelling errors rather classification. Classification is ok for land cover mapping (categorical variable), not for biomass (numerical variable)		Rejected	But, the text is referring to remote sensing (land cover mapping) not to biomass estimation.
1_0873	Mora, Brice	2	2494	2499	another type of positional error is: co-registration error, i.e., spatial shift between the imagery and in situ data		Rejected	The suggestion given by the Reviewer is covered in the 2501-2504.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0874	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2494		text is correct, but this should be added to the list in 2.4.3.1 on line 2434		Rejected	The list include area estimates that is related to remote sensing and imagery selection.
1_0875	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2500	2500	Are we trying to identify the 'real' land cover or land use. The former is easier than the latter in many cases. If the emphasis is on land use - then so state.		Accepted	Text was changed.
1_0876	Mora, Brice	2	2500	2502	Classification errors arise from the use of an improper choice and use of statistical models.		Rejected	Classification errors are related to remote sensing data analysis.
1_0877	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2500	2502	In addition to land cover classification, uncertainties might arise from using land cover as a proxy for land use. It is land use, i.e. activities, that are of interest under the KP.		Accepted	Text was changed.
1_0878	Larocque, Guy	2.4.3.2	2506	2588	Suggest methodologies to compute uncertainties, such as Monte Carlo or bootstrapping methods.		Rejected	Details are given in the 2006 Guidelines (Chapter 4).

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0879	Gonzalez, Patrick	2	2508	2508	It would be good here to give an actual example of quantifying the combination of uncertainties from different sources, by citing the analysis of uncertainties of field measurements, remote sensing accuracy, biomass regression equations, and spatial autocorrelation in Gonzalez, P., G.P. Asner, J.J. Battles, M.A. Lefsky, K.M. Waring, and M. Palace. 2010. Forest carbon densities and uncertainties from Lidar, QuickBird, and field measurements in California. Remote Sensing of Environment 114: 1561–1575.		Accepted	The suggested paper was included in the text as an example.
1_0880	Gonzalez, Patrick	2	2509	2509	The text only says "confidence intervals". It should restate that the measure of uncertainty for national greenhouse gas inventories is the 95% confidence interval (CI). This is from the 1996 and 2006 IPCC Guidelines.		Accepted	The text was changed.
1_0881	Sperow, Mark	2.4.3.2	2519	2519	"use" may be more appropriate than "using".		Accepted	The text was changed.
1_0882	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.3.2	2527	2530	In my opinion, verification will be extremely difficult if not impossible. On the other hand it will be possible to justify that the applied methodology allows for avoiding expectation of over- or underestimation of emissions/removals in the base year		Accepted	The text was changed.
1_0883	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	2542	2542	or higher resolution imagery - higher spatial/temporal resolution ?		Accepted	The text was changed.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0884	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.3.2	2545	2555	What is "relative probability"? Pls explain the term.		Accepted	The text was changed.
1_0885	Jonckheere, Inge	2	2553	2553	add reference Coppin et al. 2004: Coppin, P., I. Jonckheere, E. Lambin, K. Nackaerts, and B. Muys, 2004. Methods in Natural Ecosystem Monitoring: A Review. Int. J. Rem. Sens., 25 (9): 1565-1596.		Accepted	The text was changed.
1_0886	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.3.2	2557	2557	2.4.4 is the correct reference		Accepted	Revised
1_0887	Gonzalez, Patrick	2	2561	2561	To give users a detailed scientific reference, it would be good here to cite Olofsson, P., G.M. Foody, S.V. Stehman, and C.E. Woodcock. 2013. Making better use of accuracy data in land change studies: Estimating accuracy and area and quantifying uncertainty using stratified estimation. Remote Sensing of Environment 129: 122-131.		Accepted	The reference was included in the text.
1_0888	Federici, Sandro	2.4.3	2566	2566	Could an example be put here to clarify?		Accepted	Tables included in section 2.4.3. clarify this issue.
1_0889	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	2575	2575	... For revegetation and wetland drainage and rewetting, default uncertainty ranges cannot be specified at present. I suppose that the 2013 IPCC Wetlands Supplement cover this information.		Accepted	General uncertainties limits addressed in this Guidance is valid for revegetation and wetlands drainage and rewetting

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0890	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	2611	2611	footnote 39: add -/CMP.8 (Implication of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol), to the list of relevant decisions for LULUCF in the second CP.		Accepted	Reference to additional decisions have been included
1_0891	Christophersen, Øyvind	2.4.4.1	2612	2613	The sentence says that "definitions and elected activities must be reported once by the end of 20XX". Please indicate if you mean the requirement to submit a "report to facilitate the calculation of assigned amount", as described in Decision X/CMP8 annex I. The report shall be submitted to the secretariat by 15 April 2015.		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"
1_0892	Sato, Atsushi	2	2612	2613	Decision CMP8 about "Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol" decided that the timing of reporting LULUCF definitions is "by 15 April 2015".		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"
1_0893	Bellassen, Valentin	2	2613	2613	20XX is 2015, right?		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0894	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	2613	2613	... once by the end of 20XX (?), whereas supplementary information must be reported annually...		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"
1_0895	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	2613	2613	... once by the end of 21XX (?), whereas supplementary information must be reported annually...		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"
1_0896	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	2613	2614	the definitions and elected activities must be reported "as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount, as established in Annex I of decision -/CMP.8 (Implication of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol). Replace "once by the end of 20xx" with this sentence.		Accepted with modification	Comment accepted and is addressed with following amendment to text: replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"
1_0897	Munthali, Jack	2	2613	2613	which year is 20XX, now that we are in the second commitment period to post COP18 /CMP8 could it be 2020?		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0898	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2613		date says 20XX, needs to be edited?		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"
1_0899	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	2613	2613	the end of 20XX, ?		Accepted	replaced 20XX with "15th April 2015, as part of the report to facilitate the calculation of the assigned amount,"
1_0900	Blain, Dominique	2	2622	2626	Table 4.1 does not specify whether and where emissions and subsequent removals from natural disturbances are to be reported: as part of FM and AR? Part of FM and AR but separated from emissions and removals that enter the accounting?		Accepted with modification	The table does contain this requirement, but format and text will be revised for clarity
1_0901	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2622	2626	Update references to decisions in CMP.9 on supplementary information for KP		Accepted with modification	Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 2/CMP.8 are now cited, as the more relevant for CP2
1_0902	Christophersen, Øyvind	Table 2.4.1	2622	2623	Please give a reference to Decision X/CMP8 annex II. The content of the table need to be consistent with this decision from Doha.		Accepted with modification	Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 2/CMP.8 are now cited, as the more relevant for CP2

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0903	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.4.1	2622	2622	(Table 2.4.1, ad 6(b)): Please attribute all references to the relevant CMP decisions. For CP1 this is decision 15/CMP.1. For CP2 see http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815.php#decisions , "Addressing the implications..."		Accepted with modification	Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 2/CMP.8 are now cited, as the more relevant for CP2
1_0904	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.4.1	2622	2622	footnote 40: please note that the work by the CMP on the entire body of legislation on issues relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 is not completed yet. For CP2 see http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815.php#decisions , "Addressing the implications..."		Accepted with modification	Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 2/CMP.8 are now cited, as the more relevant for CP2
1_0905	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.4.1	2622	2622	(Table 2.4.1, ad 6(a)): Please attribute this (and all other) reference using pattern applied in the line below. For CP1 this is decision 15/CMP.1. For CP2 see http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815.php#decisions , "Addressing the implications..."		Accepted with modification	Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 2/CMP.8 are now cited, as the more relevant for CP2

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0906	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	2622	2622	<p>All the references in table 2,4,1, should refer to decision - /CMP.8 (Implication of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol). And if the table contains supplementary info to be presented according to CMP decisions, the text should follow the CMP decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "approaches for geographical location and identification...": Delete "approaches for", the decision requires "information on the geographical locations" and not the approaches for them - replace all the references. It is difficult to comment them all in this format (6(c) to be replaced by 2(c) of annex II to dec -/CMP.8, 6(b) to be replaced by 2(b) of annex II to dec - /CMP.8,...) - in ARDand FM: delete "area of natural forest that have been converted to forest plantation" to be replaced with "information on how all emissions arising from the conversion...." in line with decisions 2/CMP.7 and -/CMP.8 - CM, GM, RV, WDR: delete "excluding emissions reported under the Agriculture sector of the IPCC", in line with CMP decisions. - uncertainty of emissions and removal estimates: delete. the footnote referred to here does not exist as requirement for information for the second CP <p>In addition to this, in the first cell of page 2,60, it still says first CP.</p> <p>And footnotes 40 and 41 should refer to decisions relevant to</p>		Accepted	Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 2/CMP.8 are now cited, as the more relevant for CP2

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0907	Lundblad, Mattias	2.4.4	2622	2626	Table 2.4.1 needs to be carefully checked: Suggest to use the same wordings as in 15/CMP.1. For instance "Changes in data and methods" could be changed to "recalculations". Further some information may not be reported each year but only in the initial report (see the decision from Doha on the updating of decision 13 and 15/CMP.1 on reporting of LULUCF). For instance information on calculation of FMRL is already reported in the Submissions in 2011. Natural disturbances should be reported also for AR. Key categories is missing. Etc.		Accepted	Text revised accordingly to reflect language in recent decisions.
1_0908	Sato, Atsushi	2	2622	2622	Decision CMP8 about "Implications of the implementation of decisions 2/CMP.7 to 5/CMP.7 on the previous decisions on methodological issues related to the Kyoto Protocol, including those relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 of the Kyoto Protocol" updated the information on Table 2.4.1.		Accepted	Decisions 2/CMP.7 and 2/CMP.8 are now cited, as the more relevant for CP2
1_0909	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2622		Table 2.4.1: I wonder if case (v) is really needed because Art.3.3 has always precedence against forest management. On the other hand, some cases are missing like carbon-equivalent forests		Rejected	The text is quotation from Decision, the authors prefer to quote without amendment

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0910	Petersson, Hans	2	2623		Change in data and methods: I assume that this refers only from the second year of the second commitment period. This because it quite obvious that new gases and methodologies have been introduced since the first commitment period.		Rejected	Comment noted, no action required
1_0911	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2623		Table 2.4.1: comment to line "Justification...": On basis of which decision can the above-ground biomass pool not excluded from the reporting?		Accepted	Text has been revised to reflect wording og 2/CMP.8
1_0912	Brandon, Andrea	2	2625	Table 2.4.1 (pg 2.60)	In Detailed Information column "Information that demonstrates that activities under Article 3, paragraph 3, and forest management began on or after 1 January 1990 and before 31 December of the last year of the commitment period, and are directly human-induced;" should read "Information that demonstrates that activities under Article 3, paragraph 3 began on or after 1 January 1990 and before 31 December of the last year of the commitment period, and are directly human-induced;" still referenced to 8(a) in Reference to CMP decisions column and then add this paragraph to detailed information column immediately below " Information that demonstrates that activities under forest management have occurred since 1 January 1990 and are directly human-induced;" and add 9(a) to Reference to CMP decisions column.		Accepted	References have been updated to the 2/CMP.8 decision

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0913	Fearnside, Philip	2	2625	2625	Table 2.4.1, page 61, section on “forest management”: No mention is made here of carbon uptake by managed forests that are recovering from disturbance (either human or natural) for which the emissions have not been explicitly excluded. This needs to be mentioned here, as it represents the “elephant in the room” with respect to preventing forest management from being used to claim credit for business-as-usual uptake of carbon by forests. Most forests are recovering from some form of past disturbance, and detailed procedures for excluding the consequent uptake are a key point in the guidelines that appears to have received little attention. This is also not mentioned in the discussions of exclusion of natural disturbance occurring within the current commitment period (lines 1955, 2232) and “legacy effects” from previous commitment periods (lines 2282-2286). Allusion to this effect (lines 3743-3745) is very brief and vague (see comment: lines 3743-3745).		Rejected	The information indicated is required by default and does not need to be repeated here in the Supplement
1_0914	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.4.1	2625	2625	footnote 41: please note that the work by the CMP on the entire body of legislation on issues relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 is not completed yet. For CP2 see http://unfccc.int/meetings/doha_nov_2012/meeting/6815.php#decisions , "Addressing the implications..."		Accepted	References have been updated to the 2/CMP.8 decision

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0915	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2625	2626	Table 2.4.1 - In row Afforestation/reforestation, etc. second column I think this should read "Area formerly natural forests..." Area formerly forest plantations..." and "Carbon stocks of former forest plantations..."		Rejected	The wording in the text follows the terminology of the CMP texts
1_0916	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2625	2626	Table 2.4.1 continued. 2nd Column - Consider changing 'forest cover' to 'tree cover'		Rejected	Use of the term "tree cover" is ambiguous and could refer to lands which have been defined by the Party as Cm or GM. This section of the table is explicitly referring to Forest land as defined by the Party.
1_0917	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2625		"xxx" in the Table 2.4.1 needs to be replace with value or reference, for line items AR, FM, and HWP, on page 2.61		Accepted	Reference to 2/CMP.8 added

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0918	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2625		Table 2.4.1: comment to line "Specific information....", last bullet point: The good practice advice in the last bullet point goes beyond the related decision in 8 b of Decision 15/CMP.1. The decision text does not request "size and geographical location of forest areas ..." but only "Information on how harvesting or forest disturbance that is followed by the re-establishment of a forest is distinguished from deforestation". So, even though this guidance was also included in chapter 4 of the 2003 IPCC GPG it should be corrected now in line with the decision,		Accepted	Wording has been revised to recommended this action
1_0919	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2625		Table 2.4.1: comment to line "Article 3.3 activities....": Please check the whole text thoroughly for precision with respect to the related decisions. For instance, "natural" should be added to each "disturbance". "...in the commitment period" should be added after "subsequent removals".		Rejected	the wording in the decision text is followed in the table. When read in context there should be no confusion as to the meaning, i.e. natural disturbance.
1_0920	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2626		table 2.4.1. delete xxx or replace by CMP decision if adopted		Accepted	Reference to 2/CMP.8 added

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0921	Petersson, Hans	2	2626		estimates for ghg emissions...:As before, how should the geographical position of more than 20000 plots under FM be reported. A long list as appendix? Or is it enough to explain how the sample grid works?		Accepted with modification	Additional citation of sampling methodologies will be presented in relevant section. No need to elaborate in this section of the document
1_0922	Petersson, Hans	2	2626		If a country would not claim “equivalent forest”, is still the reporting of such mandatory? Are background levels for natural disturbances mandatory to report? If mandatory, is there a list of what is accepted as natural disturbances?		Accepted with modification	The reviewer's comment is noted. Additional text has been added to address ND and CEFC
1_0923	Petersson, Hans	2	2626		Uncertainty of emissions and removal estimates: If estimates of uncertainty are relative to size of emission/ removal any country with a zero net removal would fail the reporting requirements. Even with a quite correct inventory the uncertainty would be infinite... So why is uncertainty expressed in relative terms, a removal could be close to zero? Sweden usually estimates the accuracy of the estimates of changes in living biomass to 3 Mton CO2 per year. If the net removal is 30 Mton CO2 per year the relative error is 10 %. But what happens if the net removal is 0 or -30 Mton CO2 per year? My suggestion is to i) use absolute values of uncertainty and ii) skip the 2*SE that someone invented and instead use MSE or MSE2. These measures are supported by statistical theory.		Accepted with modification	General comment on how to address uncertainty. To be addressed in section 2.4.3. Keep in mind we are addressing uncertainty consistently with 2006 GL.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0924	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2626		Table 2.4.1: comment to line "Afforestation/reforestation...": I assume the text should deal with the provision of "Carbon equivalent forests"? The text should be written more precisely based on the decision and should be indicated as "carbon equivalent forest" in the related box of the first column. The nature of an option like "if provision is used" should be added.		Accepted	The reviewer's comment is noted. Additional text has been added to address ND and CEFC
1_0925	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2626		Table 2.4.1: comment to line "forest management...": Please indicate more clearly what issues are addressed here and describe these issues more detailed ("forest management" is too broad, because it deals with natural disturbances. And, the text in the single bullet points is too ambiguous and does not indicate what is meant or what is to do). Please be in line with the decisions, for instance: 2nd bullet point "background level" is only needed if the provision of non-accounting of natural disturbances is used. The same for the 3rd to last bullet points.		Accepted with modification	Detailed decision of these issues is provided in Section 2.3.9

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0926	Herold, Anke	2.4.4	2627	2630	the good practice requirement says that coordinates should be reported. However this makes the information not transparent as it is too complex for any review or any reader to allocate all coordinates to a map. Thus the visual presentation in maps is more what makes the information transparent than the provision of long lists of coordinates.		Accepted	We revised the text to clarify further.
1_0927	Petersson, Hans	2	2627	2634	A map with >20 000 sample plots of FM doesn't say much. How do we do in practice? Is it enough by giving an example (map for a smaller area) or a list of sample plots with position?		Accepted	We revised the text to clarify further.
1_0928	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2627	2629	Please reformulate this guidance more towards the option that is given in the next sentence starting in line 2629. It is completely unrealistic if countries would need to report all their 3.3 and 3.4 lands together with the related coordinates. The related decision (6b of 15/CMP1) cannot be executed in detail (and was not executed in detail in the first CP by any country), but only in a general (this is the first word of para 6 in 15/CMP1) and rough way (as for instance indicated by the sentence starting in line 2629). The crucial issue is that evidence is given that the assessment system is geographically explicit with respect to the identification of lands.		Accepted	This was made clearer in the text - the information has to be accessible to the ERT without expectation that all details are presented in the GHG reporting.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0929	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2635	2636	Is total area referring to country area or to KP accounted area? If it is the later, the sentence should read "...is constant or increasing and that..."		Accepted	Revised to clarify
1_0930	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	2635	2636	the total area reported in consecutive inventory can't be constant, this is true in UNFCCC inventory, but not under the KP reporting, where areas enter every year, for example, due to afforestation of Other Lands. Delete the first part of the sentence. Leave the rest, it is true that any change in area reported needs to be explained.		Accepted	Revised to clarify
1_0931	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	2638	2638	replace "data must be provided" with "it is good practice to provide data by geographical locations"		Noted	MISSED THIS ONE! Since no wording "data must be provided" in Line 2368-2369.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0932	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2638	2639	"... data must be provided by geographical locations". Please change this part towards an allowing of a pragmatic way of reporting, in a way as it is done and accepted in the first CP (there are various forms, categories and aggregations of reporting the 3.3 and 3.4 emissions/removals in the 1st CP that are accepted by the reviews and which are not giving the exact geographic locations of the 3.3 and 3.4 lands, but - for instance - divided into geographic regions or even aggregated on a nationwide basis according to the availability of nationwide input data only). Maybe it would be helpful to exchange in this context "geographical location" by "geographical regions", also in the tables later-on in this chapter.		Noted	see the explanation above.
1_0933	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2642	2642	Add at the end “or for other lands in that country”.		Rejected	That is stated repeatedly earlier in the text.
1_0934	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2662		Interesting to see whole tables in SOD and the additional text describing them		Accepted	All table now in the appendix
1_0935	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2663	2663	monitoring is also needed to assess removals on land that was disturbed previously		Accepted with modification	Correct this is implicit in the methods described elsewhere.
1_0936	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2673		Interesting to see whole tables in SOD and the additional text describing them		Accepted	All table now in the appendix

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0937	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	2	2683	2683	General comment to tables: for the rest of the sectors, from 2013 on, the information will be presented in Kt of CO ₂ , instead of Gg. The use of Kt of C as unit to report carbon stock changes, and Kt of CO ₂ eq for emissions and removals could be considered		Accepted	Considered but not yet implemented
1_0938	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	2683	2684	Table 2.4.2a --- 2.4.2A		Accepted	The tables shall be deleted in SOD.
1_0939	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir	2	2683	2684	Net CO ₂ - use subscript for O ₂		Accepted	Revised
1_0940	Sperow, Mark	2.4.4.1	2683	2684	Table 2.4.2a: Lower half third column, "managemen" should be "management"; do the units for columns need to be included? (end is Gg, so that may be all that is needed)		Rejected	As written in footnotes 1 and 2, this table is meant to check whether a pool/gas has been reported. Only the last columns with totals are for reporting emissions/removals and contain the unit
1_0941	Kabo-bah, Amos Tiereyangn	2	2684	2685	Some texts appear hidden from the tables e.g. "activities"		Accepted	Revised
1_0942	Kim, Raehyun	2	2684	2685	For the clarification, insert "(if elected)" after "Cropland Management", "Grazing Land Management", "Wetland Drainage and Rewetting", and "Revegetation" "CO ₂ ". If the number is after a letter, then it has to be subscript in last row.		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0943	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	2684	2684	forest managemen		Accepted	Revised
1_0944	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2684	2689	None of the 2.4.2 tables are referenced in the text.		Accepted	all tables will be moved in an annex/appendix
1_0945	Sato, Atsushi	2	2684	2684	In table 2.4.2a, Liming CO2 column is not needed here. 15/CP.17 AFOLU tables classified CO2 from lime application under Agricluture sector, in other word, in the Annex A of KP.		Accepted	Correct, delete reference to liming
1_0946	Weiss, Peter	2_4_4_1	2684	2757	I did not read the tables, because I assume that the reporting tables will be developed and decided extra. An idea, with respect to these table and the related chapter is that guidance is provided 1) in how to introduce the new decisions in the reporting tables in order to meet the requirements (e.g. reporting according to the decisions and securing transparency) and 2) in how to improve the existing reporting tables for CP1 in order to improve transparency on basis of the experiences so far (for intsance, the filling in of the area tables related to 3.3 activites is not very clear - Table 2.4.3A; meaning and as a consequence comparison of IEF in the existing 3.3 tables is rather in-transparent). If IPCC has within this task a mandate towards such a guidance and time and ressources for that within this task it would be helpful for the later drafting of the reporting tables.		Rejected	tables will be moved to an annex. There is not mandate for suggesting how to modify CRF tables currently used

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0947	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2686	2687	Table 2.4.2B - is the 'Range' column necessary?		Accepted	Revised
1_0948	Sato, Atsushi	2	2686	2686	Table 2.4.2b may have information on forest width.		Accepted	Revised
1_0949	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2686		crown cover is used, but maybe it is not correct		Rejected	It is the language of the forest definition as contained in decision 16/CMP.1
1_0950	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2687	2687	Why is minimum height needed?		Rejected	Because it is in the forest definition as contained in decision 16/CMP.1
1_0951	Kim, Raehyun	2	2687	2688	Check the spell of 'Management', delete "t". For the clarification, insert "(if needed)" after Margin.		Accepted	Editorial, delete minimum heigh
1_0952	wang, chunfeng	chapter 1	2687	2688	in the table2.4.2c, if the Minimum height in the activity column is correct or not?		Accepted	Editorial, delete minimum heigh
1_0953	Alfredsen, Gry	2	2688	2688	Note 9 lacking in the list on the next page		Accepted	Revised
1_0954	Brandon, Andrea	2	2688	Table 2.4.2C	"Minimum height" row in table - what is to be reported here?		Accepted	Editorial, delete minimum heigh

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0955	Kim, Raehyun	2	2688	2689	"Note 1". It is better to maintain consistent use of notation key as follow Decision 15/CP.17 (Revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention). In that sense, it is needed to add "NE(not estimated)". And I suggest deletion of the 'NR(not reported)' because NR could be replaced by other notation keys (e.g. NO, NA, NE, and IE). "Note 3". It is better to use of original langue "Wetland Drainage and Rewetting".		Accepted	Revise tables
1_0956	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	2688	2688	Forest Managment		Accepted	Editorial
1_0957	Schwendenmann, Luitgard	2.4.4.1	2688	2689	How is organic soils defined? In parts of the guidelines organic soils is associated with wetlands (see 1181-1184 and chapter 2.9.3.2). However, later in the document (line 2695 and following tables) organic soils is used it is used for forest and grassland systems too.		Accepted	Add reference to 2006 GL in foonote 6, if necessary while revising the tables
1_0958	Sperow, Mark	2.4.4.1	2688	2689	Please expand box to include missing notes. Should units be defined in footnotes 5-9?		Accepted	Editorial
1_0959	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2689		FOOTNOTE 7 from table 2.4.2.A --> convert "4" of "Any other CH4 emissions from [...]" in a subindex		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0960	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2689		text of FOOTNOTE 9 from table 2.4.2.D is not visible in page 2.65, expand frame of notes.		Accepted	Editorial
1_0961	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2692	2692	Following suggestion on row 362 cell D->AR should be open. Where both activities are elected by a Party, cells CM->WDR, GM->WDR and RV->WDR should be open, as areas may be converted from those activities into wetlands and it is more correct to report them as WDR than their previous activity. Consider opening cells CM->Other, GM->Other, etc. Where such conversions occur land needs to continue to be accounted for, but there is no place (that is already a problem in CP1) to report them. The only way to keep them on the system is to keep reporting them as CM or GM, which is not very transparent, given that their current land-use is no longer CL or GL.		Accepted	however, CM, GM to Other it is not possible since "Other" include all lands of the country for which emissions and removals from LULUCF are not reported
1_0962	Kim, Raehyun	2	2692	2693	For the clarification, insert "(if elected) after "Wetland Drainage and Rewetting".		Accepted	Noted
1_0963	Paul, Sonja	2.4.4.1	2692		in the table "Article 3 vities" does it mean Article 3.3 activities?		Accepted	Editorial
1_0964	Kim, Raehyun	2	2695	2696	I couldn't read Note 7.		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0965	Sperow, Mark	2.4.4.1	2695	2696	Please expand box to include missing notes. Please verify that footnote 3 (by "Geographic Location") is the correct footnote - it does not seem to be.		Accepted	Revise tables
1_0966	Alfredsen, Gry	2	2696	2696	Note 7 lacking in the list		Accepted	Editorial
1_0967	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2696		text of FOOTNOTE 7 from table 2.4.3.B is not visible in page 2.67, expand frame of notes.		Accepted	Editorial
1_0968	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2697		"xxx" in footnote of Table 2.4.4 need to be replaced with reference		Accepted	Revise references
1_0969	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2700	2734	Comment on all tables. Delete column on “Area of Drained Organic Soils”. Where this is relevant, it can be included in the NOR as part of the explanations on the calculation of emissions and removals from organic soils.		Accepted	If the activity is elected the column is needed (may be clarify only if the WRD is elected)
1_0970	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2700	2734	Table 2.4.5; 2.4.6 and 2.4.7 Why do we need “year of conversion” for AR and D? Before we reported accumulated area 1990-reporting year.		Rejected	It is good practice to stratify converted lands by year of conversion (see for instance page 4.51 of IPCC GPG for LULUCF)
1_0971	Sperow, Mark	2.4.4.1	2700	2728	The ordering of the footnotes is very confusing.		Accepted	Revised tables

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0972	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2706	2706	Delete table. ALL forest areas if not 3.3 AR would otherwise be subject to FM.		Accepted with modification	I do agree however this information should be reported somewhere.
1_0973	Kim, Raehyun	2	2708	2709	"Note 9 and 18". "CO2" where 2 is subscript.		Accepted	Editorial
1_0974	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2709		Page 2.72 --> convert "2" of "CO2" in a subindex; three times in footnote 9 and once in footnote 18		Accepted	Editorial
1_0975	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2714	2714	Table should be renamed “Units of land otherwise subject to CM, GM, RV, WDR”, to allow for reporting of areas under D that would qualify for these activities. A footnote should clarify that the emissions and removals of these activities taking place in areas classified as D are to be included in the totals for D and not the total of the respective 3.4 activity.		Accepted	Decision call for this info, for transparency reasons in the case of overlaps between FM and AR
1_0976	Kim, Raehyun	2	2716	2717	"Note 8". "CO2" where 2 is subscript.		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0977	Elvidge, Craig	2	2719	2720	<p>Issue: The use of terms such as afforestation/reforestation and deforestation when referring to forest management activities under the CEF provision.</p> <p>Action: Perhaps again consider other terms that do not refer to Article 3.3 activates but refer to CEF under forest management. Options to consider could be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the newly planted area/s - planting or forest establishment of CEF area 2. For the clear felled CEF area - pre-1990 planted forest conversion to non forest (or non forest cover) of CEF area <p>Can the terms used also be consistent throughout the document. An example of the terms used in Para 2719 are inconsistent with those used in Table ? Para 2724</p>		Accepted	General issue CEF - Two components of CEF will be reported under FM as per the CMP decision

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0978	Elvidge, Craig	2	2724	2725	<p>Issue: The exclusion of some carbon changes from both land use changes for the CEF activities. Why are the losses excluded from the CEF converted to forest?. And why are the gains excluded from the forest plantation converted to no forest?. As both these lands (the cleared and the planted) remain in the forest management category all the carbon changes resulting from the CEF activity should be reported For example an area of pre-1990 planted forest is converted to grassland, while an area of post-1989 eligible non forest land which is grassland at 1990 is converted to forest. Report the carbon gains from the grassland that was previously forest. also report the carbon losses from the grassland that is now forest.</p> <p>Action: Report all carbon stock gains and losses resulting from CEF activities.</p>		Accepted with modification	the scope of this table was to check whether the equivalent forest is carbon equivalent. We will redraft it accordingly with suggestions received
1_0979	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2724	2725	Consider changing 'non-forest cover' to either 'no tree cover' or 'non-forest'		Accepted	Revised
1_0980	Kim, Raehyun	2	2725	2726	delete a spacing line		Accepted	Editorial
1_0981	Kim, Raehyun	2	2727	2728	"Note 11-14". Why don't you insert "Conversion" after "Forest"?		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0982	Sato, Atsushi	2	2727	2727	HWP data is sometimes difficult linking geographical location. Thus, it should be allowed to report national total and Footnote 10 of Table 2.4.7 should include this point.		Accepted with modification	This will be revised when the HWP table will be available
1_0983	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	2728	2728	Manageemnt		Accepted	Editorial
1_0984	Lund, H. Gyde	2	2728	2728	Notes 13, 14 and 20 - Consider changing 'forest cover' to 'tree cover'		Accepted	Revised tables and these footnotes were dropped
1_0985	Sato, Atsushi	2	2729	2729	Generally HWP reporting under the KP CP2 is from forest only. HWP section in this FOD indicates some part of HWP may come from non forest categories and may use non-forest category volunrally. This information should be included in the footnote 15. I prefer delition of HWP column from Table 2.4.8		Accepted	See revised HWP tables now in Annex
1_0986	Kim, Raehyun	2	2734	2735	"N ₂ O". Where 2 is subscript.		Accepted	Editorial
1_0987	Alfredsen, Gry	2	2735	2735	Note 5 and 6 not in the table, only in note list.		Accepted	Revise tables
1_0988	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2735		Table 2.4.9. title --> convert twice "2" of "N ₂ O" in a subindex		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0989	Kabo-bah, Amos Tiereyangn	2	2735	2736	"Direct N2O emissions..." should be well formatted to reflect its chemical formulae. Box on "note" needs to be expanded enough to allow for all text.		Accepted	Editorial
1_0990	Kim, Raehyun	2	2735	2736	"Note 4". I couldn't find "table 9".		Accepted	Revise tables
1_0991	Kabo-bah, Amos Tiereyangn	2	2741	2741	The "note" on "Methodologies for estimating CH4 and N2O emissions from drainage and rewetting of soils are addressed in XXX...". I think that the XXX is supposed to depict a certain chapter or section or some reference.		Accepted	Revise references
1_0992	Kim, Raehyun	2	2741	2742	"Note 4". It is better use of original language "Wetland Drainage and Rewetting".		Rejected	this table is not limited to the reporting of the activity wetland drainage and rewetting. It is aimed at being used for reporting N2O emissions of drainage and rewetting of organic soils under any KP activity
1_0993	Schlesinger, Peter	2	2741		"xxx" of Documentation Box table of footnote 1 needs two references		Accepted	Revise references
1_0994	Singh, Vinay	2	2741	2742	Note 1 reference XXX to be rephrased as XXX of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines		Accepted	Revise references

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_0995	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.4.1.	2742		Footnote 1 page 2.84 (table 2.4.10) replace XXX by correct reference		Accepted	Revise references
1_0996	Sato, Atsushi	2	2744	2750	Table 2.4.11 should be deleted. 15/CP.17 AFOLU tables classified CO2 from lime application under Agriculture sector, in other word, in the Annex A of KP.		Accepted	YES, it is in the AG
1_0997	Canaveira, Paulo	2,4,4,1	2753	2753	To avoid double counting, if nat dist provision is applied in that year due to fires, the emissions reported in this table should be only those that are accounted for (mostly controlled burning). This clarification should be added as a footnote to fire emissions in AR and FM.		Rejected	This table is for reporting. Therefore all emissions need to be included; also those that will be excluded according with the natural disturbances provision in the accounting
1_0998	Kim, Raehyun	2	2756	2757	"Note 3". FM is not elective activitiy. Delete ", if elected". "Note 9". "CO2" and "CH4", where the number is subscript.		Accepted	Revised
1_0999	Sperow, Mark	2.4.4.1	2756	2757	The Tables listed in footnote 9 do not reference the correct numbers (should 4, 5, 6, and 7 be 2.4.4, 2.4.5, etc.?).		Accepted	Revised
1_1000	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.4.2	2761	2761	footnote 62: delete "draft"		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1001	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.4.2	2761	2761	footnote 62: please note that the work by the CMP on the entire body of legislation on issues relating to Articles 5, 7 and 8 is not completed yet.		Accepted	Noted that is why we have tables in Appendix and refer to ongoing work.
1_1002	Federici, Sandro	2.4.4	2821	2821	modify the text as follows: "...QA/QC procedures adopted, including verification of model-outputs with independent data,...". This is consistet with IPCC 2006 Guidelines chapter on QA and verification		Accepted	Text was generally revised and expanded.
1_1003	Galinski, Wojciech	2.4.4.2	2829	2829	What is "fluctuation" in this context"? The term "interannual variability" was used earlier in this document.		Accepted	Revised to interannual variability
1_1004	Federici, Sandro	2.5.1	2832	2835	because forest management has a higher hierarchical order on any elected activity, an afforested/reforested land may only have forest management as secondary classification. Therefore the text in brackets should be: (including those units of land subject to activities under Article 3.3, of the Kyoto Protocol which would otherwise be included in land subject to forest management).		Rejected	unclear - wrong line numbers?

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1005	Gonzalez, Patrick	2	2849	2849	It would be good to add another bullet with a relevant example: If extensive field data is not available for validation, compare results from two different methods such as the comparison of two different remote sensing sources in New Zealand (Dymond, J.R., J.D. Shepherd, P.F. Newsome, N. Gapare, D.W. Burgess, and P. Watt. 2012. Remote sensing of land-use change for Kyoto Protocol reporting: the New Zealand case. Environmental Science and Policy 16: 1-8.)		Accepted with modification	A new bullet of a comparison on the total area of land subject to one of all Art. 3.3. and 3.4 activities by two methods with different data sources has been added to reflect the adaptation on the main idea in the comment.
1_1006	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	2854	2854	Please consider only referring to the IPCC 2006GL		Accepted with modification	Some guidance specifying to LULUCF inventory in GPG-LULUCF did be included into 2006 GLs. Guidance also need to be consistent with the CMP decisions.
1_1007	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.4.6	2857		Example for specific LULUCF would be very interesting as always clarify		Noted	Although the example for LULUCF inventory varification would be interesting, but not necessary in the context of this KPSG.
1_1008	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6415	6419	Consider adding URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037811270900615X		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1009	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6420	6420	Should there be () around the year as with the previous referenece. Consider being consistent with all refernces.		Accepted	Revised
1_1010	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6424	6426	Consider adding URL http://www.usu.edu/beetle/documents/Bentzetal_2010.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1011	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6427	6427	Should the co-authors last names come before their initials? Consider being consistent throughout the references.		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1012	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6429	6434	Consider providing the URL in lieu of [electronic resource].		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1013	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6429	6430	Consider adding URL http://cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/pubwarehouse/pdfs/33986.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1014	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6431	6432	Consider adding URL http://cfs.nrcan.gc.ca/pubwarehouse/pdfs/33988.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1015	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6433	6434	Consider adding URL http://www.ccfm.org/pdf/NFIDtools_2012_en.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1016	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6435	6435	The correct authors names are Congalton, R.G., Green, K. 2009 etc.		Accepted	Revised
1_1017	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6437	6439	Consider adding URL http://www.sysecol2.ethz.ch/Refs/EntClim/D/Dy001iw.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1018	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6440	6441	Are the quotation marks around the article title necessary. Previous citations did not include the quotes. Should be consistent.		Accepted	Editorial
1_1019	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6440	6441	Consider adding URL http://www.sysecol2.ethz.ch/Refs/EntClim/F/FI027.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1020	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6445	6446	Consider adding URL http://www.publish.csiro.au/view/journals/dsp_journal_fulltext.cfm?nid=114&f=WFv19n8_FO		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1021	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6450	6452	Consider adding URL http://oldsmokeys.org/Bulletin%20Board/wellread%20120130.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1022	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6453	6455	Consider adding URL http://www.ccfm.org/pdf/cwfs_analysis_en_web.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1023	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6456	6459	Shouldn't the editors (Penman J et al...) be listed as the authors instead of the IPCC?		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1024	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6460	6461	Shouldn't the editors (Eggleston HS et al...) be listed as the authors instead of the IPCC?		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1025	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6461	6461	Should the editors names be all in caps? Consider being consistent.		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1026	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6462	6464	Consider adding URL http://www.airies.or.jp/publication/ger/pdf/07-01-07.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1027	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6465	6465	Cryptomeria japonica should be in italics.		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1028	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6474	6476	Consider adding URL http://www.sefs.washington.edu/classes.esc.401/MtnPineBee tleClimChangeNature08.pdf		Noted	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1029	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6481	6484	Delete this reference. Previously listed at 6470		Accepted	Editorial
1_1030	Schlesinger, Peter	2	6487		"Lilles and" should be "Lillesand"		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1031	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6489	6492	Consider adding URL http://dspace.unitus.it/dspace/bitstream/2067/2067/1/FOREC_O_lindner.pdf		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1032	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6496	6496	Choristoneura pinus pinus should be in italics		Accepted	It will be revised
1_1033	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6497	6499	Consider adding URL http://andrewsforest.oregonstate.edu/pubs/pdf/pub4664.pdf		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1034	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6500	6508	Consider adding URL http://www.saber.ula.ve/dspace/bitstream/123456789/27334/1/drought_sensitivity.pdf		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1035	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6509	6511	Consider adding URL http://www.montana.edu/hansen/documents/labreadings2011/raffa%20et%20al.%202008.pdf		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1036	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6512	6516	Consider adding URL http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/meeting/pdfiles/0905_MLP_Report.pdf		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1037	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6517	6519	Consider adding URL http://lubies.ulb.ac.be/offprint/2006Rouault.pdf		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1038	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6522	6524	Consdier adding URL http://journals.sfu.ca/coaction/index.php/tellusb/article/download/16762/18704		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1039	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6522	6524	This is also listed at 6552 - 6554.		Rejected	The list of references are listed by section, so it is duplicated.
1_1040	Schlesinger, Peter	2	6525		Tomppo et al is in refs but is not used in the document,		Accepted	It will be checked and revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1041	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6527	6528	Consider adding URL http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/2/4/044003/pdf/1748-9326_2_4_044003.pdf		Accepted with modification	The format will be decided and reference list will be made consistent throughout the KP Supplement.
1_1042	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6530	6530	Fagus crenata should be in italics		Accepted	It will be revised
1_1043	Bernoux, Martial	1.2	Box 1.1		In the notes under the first table it is written "If an activity was elected in CP1 it is automatically also elected in CP2": Actaivities elected in CP1 are already known, please provide (in an Annex?) the list of the country whith there decisions. Also would be usefull to precise that if a country (e.g. canada) decide to withdrawn from the KP.;this decision will not apply anylonguer (or I am wrong?)		Rejected	This is not relevant for the guidance - UNFCCC secreteriat has this information
1_1044	Bernoux, Martial	1.2	Box 1.1		Examples can be easily merged into one table using areas X1, X2, X3 and X4 in an unique table		Rejected	Rejected. Current examples provided a good demonstration on reporting of 4 land-use conversions.
1_1045	Herold, Anke	1	Box 1.1		In the examples the first row has a column: 'answer' but not question was specified, replace by something along the lines 'correct reporting in land use category is'		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1046	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	Box 1.1 (pages 13-15)		add examples of WDR as activity	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	accepted, change "FM, GM" as "GM, WRD" in the title, and "NE" as "E" in the corresponding cell of the last example table,add "X for peroid 2015 onwards" in the below cell.
1_1047	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	Fig 1.1		This Fig. has not been adapted to WDR activities yet. There is no way of classifying a land under article 3.4, WDR, or at least it is not clear.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Revised in figure
1_1048	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	Fig 2.1.1 and Fig 2.1.2		As suggested earlier: in the case that accounting/reporting for WDR is mandatory, make Wetlands a separate category that overlaps with Managed Grassland, Cropland and Managed and Unmanaged Forest. Perhaps better to also split WDR in WD and WR like ARD is splitted in AR and D.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Rejected. Since WDR is one of the elected activities in D.2/CMP.7, the WDR is not mandatory for accounting and reporting.
1_1049	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	Fig 2.2.1		WDR is not included	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted	Revised
1_1050	Bernoux, Martial	1	Figure 1.1	p1.10	In the flow chart it is refered to "carbon equivalent forest conversion": it needs further explanation and definition here (footnote?), refering to parag. 37 of 2/CMP.7 is not enough		Accepted	Accepted. A further explanation on CEFC has been provided in Section 2.3 and 2.7.7.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1051	Brandon, Andrea	1	Footnote 1		"Reforestation" definition needs to be edited to add "For the second commitment period reforestation activities will be limited to reforestation occurring on those lands that did not contain forest 31 December 1989". In decision 2/CMP.7, paragraph 2, the CMP agreed that the definitions of reforestation shall be the same as in the first commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.		Accepted	Revised throughout the text
1_1052	Bernoux, Martial	1	Footnote 11		Footnote 11: "by decisions": wich ones, please specify		Accepted	Revised
1_1053	Beets, Peter	1	Footnote 12	?	Footnote 12 - if forest is affected by disturbance (eg blown down in storm) then a reasonable rule might be that land not can not be excluded from accounting unless it is maintained as forest land or alternatively an equivalent forest area established elsewhere.		Rejected	This is not consistent with CMP decisions and the IPCC does not make such rules.
1_1054	Hoover, Coeli	1	footnote 12		With regard to this footnote, I agree that this is an issue and that it would be helpful to include a decision tree		Rejected	No additional decision tree required
1_1055	Brandon, Andrea	1	Footnote 18		It is not theoretically possible for D land to be replanted under CEFC - as land cannot leave Article 3.3 reporting. Decision 2/CMP.7 states that the new forest has to be planted on land that was non-forest on 31 Dec 1989, if it had been planted earlier and then deforested, it would already have been classified as D land. This land cannot be used to meet the CEFC provision as it cannot subsequently leave 3.3 (16/CMP.1 Para 1(c) of Annex).		Accepted	Revised

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1056	Brandon, Andrea	1	Footnote 19		Decision 16 has not been updated yet. This does not mean that the constraint no longer applies. Considering the CP1-CP2 boundary, is important to maintain consistency of approaches. Methods and definitions should not be changed. This will impact on time series consistency.		Accepted	Noted
1_1057	Beets, Peter	1	Footnote 7		Footnote 7. "area of harvested plantation..." Suggested rewording "...area of deforested plantation...". And next line as well "...harvested.." change to "deforested.." What about type of deforestation method - stumps removed, residues chipped left on site v removed. And if site is replanted and then deforested a few years later, is equivalent carbon stock at harvest age acceptable? Better to specify that an equivalent area be established.		Rejected	Rejected. In P. 37, decision 2?CMP.7, the "harvested forest plantation" is formal term.
1_1058	Brandon, Andrea	1	Footnote 7	Pg 1.6	"The area replanted..." should read "The new area planted.."		Accepted	Accepted
1_1059	Brandon, Andrea	1	Footnote 8	Pg 1.6	reporting and accounting rules for CM and GM are not identical.		Accepted	Correct.
1_1060	Bernoux, Martial	1	Footnotes 1		I suggest adding a box in the main text dedicated to the definitions corresponding to footnote 1.		Rejected	Authors decided to maintain established format.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1061	Chidthaisong, Amnat	1	general		Somewhere in Chapter 1, the exact dates of starting and ending of each commitment period should be give as this will help ease both reporting and reviewing processes		Accepted with modification	This is established and implicit in the text in various places.
1_1062	Bernoux, Martial	1.2	p 1.12		footnote 18: needs further explanation!		Accepted	completed
1_1063	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	p. 76	p. 76	classified		Accepted	Editorial
1_1064	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1	Table 1.1		Write not just forest-related activities, but all activities, including CM, GM and WD en WR. This shall consistently be done throughout the entire document, also in Chapter 2.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Unclear and WD and WR are not separated to remain consistent with CMP decisions.
1_1065	Fenton, Nicole	2,4,4,1	Table 2,4,8		Where would carbon loss from organic soil not associated with draining be placed within the tables? Including both on site and off site losses.		Accepted	Such carbon losses are reported under the appropriate activities.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1066	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	Table 2.1.1		this table could be used for the explanation on the difference between LUC (going from initial to final) and LU (going from a LU category, to the same LU category; e.g. going from a drained Wetland to a drained Wetland), including the explanation of how is dealt with ongoing emissions following an activity such as peat drainage.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Noted	Yes - that would be an option but was not implemented.
1_1067	Zhang, Guobin	2.1	Table 2.1.1		From the “initial” to the “final” land in "settlements" of the final land should be not "RV".		Rejected	Rejected, from "initial" settlement to "final" settlement, RV may occur.
1_1068	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	Table 2.2.1		Approach 3, Reporting method 1: ‘if resolution is fine enough to represent minimum forest area’. Why focusing on forest area only?	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Noted	Because it is in the context of forests that these minimum areas are defined.
1_1069	Herold, Anke	2.4.4	table 2.4.1		The decisions from Doha (decision 2/CMP.8 on the implications of Durban decisions on methodological decisions under Articles 5,7,8) specified the annual reporting requirements for the second commitment period. This should be recognized in this table and this section.		Accepted	Reference to 2/CMP.8 added
1_1070	Bernoux, Martial	2	Table 2.4.2a	page 2.63	in the second part of the table add a "t" to "managemen"		Accepted	Editorial

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1071	Bernoux, Martial	2	Table 2.4.3A	page 2.66	mispelling "article 3.vities", please correct		Accepted	Editorial
1_1072	Bernoux, Martial	1.2.			Even if it seems evident, it would be usefull to state somewhere in this section that total area should remain constant.		Accepted	This was added to the text in a couple of places.
1_1073	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	1			General for the Introduction: If applicable, I will suggest that from the introduction it should be clearly stated that non-CO2 emissions are not reported for the KP inventory but only under the UNFCCC inventory for both elected and non elected activities. This is possible to understand, only after going through the specific sections on cropland management and grazing management.		Rejected	The CO2 and non-CO2 emission and removal should be reported in the KP inventory and UNFCCC inventory.
1_1074	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1			There shall be an introduction to activities under article 6 and their role in this document in 'Introduction'.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	not the subject of this report
1_1075	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1			There shall be made reference to the Wetland Supplement more frequently.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Accepted with modification	References to Wetland supplement have been added where appropriate.
1_1076	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1			How to deal with 'off-site' impacts in the case of peat related activities such as drainage. Due to disruption of the hydrological system, emissions and carbon losses can occur outside the area where the activity takes place.	Attachment_1_0073.pdf	Rejected	Such methodological issues are addressed in the Wetland Supplement

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1077	Wiseman, Michael	1			Bottom of page 12 Reference 18 (remove fifth word TO----- ---		Accepted	Editorial
1_1078	Wiseman, Michael	2			The map on page 825 re: reporting method two is a lot clearer. I realise this would entail a lot more data collection and perhaps some countries are not geared for this.		Noted	Noted
1_1079	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	1			Page 1.3, 1: Suggestion for specific definitions of wetland drainage and wetlands rewetting: Wetland Drainage: Lowering of the water table to lower than the natural average annual water level in a wetland due to accelerated water loss or decreased water supply resulting from human activities and constructions, both on and off site. Wetland Rewetting: The change of elevation of the average annual water table in a drained wetland by partially or entirely reversing the existing drainage state.		Rejected	This is not necessary here.
1_1080	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	2651		Table 2.4.9. not addresses this issue (carbon).		Rejected	Table addresses the N2O emission from fertilization and disturbance associated with land-use conversion to cropland.

<Review comments on Section 1.1 - 2.4 (except Section 2.3.9) of the First Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
1_1081	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	2684	2757	Page 2.63 until 2.88 (tables). The tables could quote the equations/calculations included in the IPCC volume 4 (2006) and others basic references, in order to aid the estimations the emissions and removals.		Rejected	Already in 2006 GL and not repeated in this supplement.
1_1082	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	2821		Line 2821: ... evaluation, uncertainty and sensitivity analysis, QA/QC procedures adopted and... (QA/QC is already defined?)		Accepted with modification	This entire section was revised.
1_1083	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	2	2854		line 2854: it is incomplete.		Accepted	Editorial