

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0001	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5071	5937	General: Cropland management and Grazing land management, just for clarification I suggest to specify in this two sections the references in the same way: Volume, Chapter, Section of the IPCC 2006 Guidelines. In this way it will be easy to go through a to differentiate from the sections from this report. Sometimes it is difficult to understand to which section it refers (specify: section of this report, if applicable).		Accept	
4_0002	Federici, Sandro	2.9	5071	5939	The sections of cropland management and grazing land management should be unified in a single section. Indeed, those are two activities that occur on the same typology of land i.e. agricultural lands, that often alternate on the same piece of land, that have same reporting requirements and that follow same accounting rules under the KP. It is strongly suggested therefore to provide a single section to avoid lengthy repetitions and to avoid inconsistencies (there are some) between the two sections (which have to be fully consistent; even more, identical)		Reject.	CM and GM are institutionally separate activities. As Parties can elect one but not the other, it is practical to keep guidance for each one separate from that for the other.
4_0003	Federici, Sandro	2.9	5071	6152	the treatment of emissions other than stock changes needs to be made consistent in the three activities (CM, GM, RV). Should be clearly explained that liming emissions needs to be reported under agriculture and that this is a change from first commitment period reporting; it should also be said that base year emissions needs therefore to be recalculated (whether the activity was already elected in the first commitment period).		Accept.	Alternative text to lines 6143-6145. Emissions should be reported in the Agriculture sector, not under revegetation as it was directed to do for the first commitment period. Therefore, this change in reporting leads to the recalculation of emissions from the base year for revegetation activities carried out from the first to the second commitment period.
4_0004	Galinski, Wojciech	2.9.1	5077	5079	However, in the FM chapter it was stated that land that meets definition of forest may be also subject to CM. Please make it consistent.		Accept	
4_0005	Galinski, Wojciech	2.9.1	5082	5085	It seems to be inconsistent with statements in the FM chapter.		Accept	
4_0006	Weiss, Peter	2_9_1	5082	5085	This should be in line with the other guidance in this document (e.g. the related chapters of FM and chapter 1). Threshold criteria for forest is one criterion, a further one is definition of both activities and the third criterion is the precedence of FM to CM, due to the obligation to report FM.		Accept	
4_0007	Federici, Sandro	2.9	5087	5089	I guess that should be specified here that if a type of tree that was planted before 1990 has been reported under cropland management, also the new plantations of the same type of tree have to be reported under cropland management		Accept	
4_0008	Weiss, Peter	2_9_1	5087	5089	Any such qualification as AR is depending on the definitions, which should be added to the sentence.		Accept	
4_0009	Federici, Sandro	2.9.1	5111	5111	Ensuring consistency is not a "should", it is a good practice. It is suggested: "It is good practice that Parties ensure consistency in methods applied for estimating emissions and removals from land use and land use change categories across different Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, activities".		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0010	Sturgiss, Rob	2	5116		Box 2.9.1 is very helpful but is called 'steps for estimating emissions and removals from cropland management'. As CM and GM are closely related the same techniques should be clearly available to both. Should this box also apply to grazing land management? Should a similar box be included under grazing land management?		Accept	
4_0011	Weiss, Peter	2_9_1	5116		Box 2.9.1: A stratification into annual and perennial cropland is also needed and lacking here. Both management types lead to rather different biomass stocks and uptake rates, so any such change between annual and perennial cropland may be in addition of relevance for the emissions/removals.		Accept	
4_0012	Penman, Jim	2	5117	5117	Not a big point at this stage, but if we regard these steps as integral to GPG, then they should be part of the main text, not in a box (which I think should be reserved for examples and similar material)		Accept	
4_0013	Federici, Sandro	2.9.1	5118	5122	Consistency has to be ensured also in the classification of new plantation. i.e. if the plantation typology is classified as forest then new plantations are afforestation/reforestation, otherwise they are classified as cropland management		Accept	
4_0014	Weiss, Peter	2_9_1	5119	5120	Box 2.9.1: A stratification into annual and perennial cropland is also needed and lacking here. Both management types lead to rather different biomass stocks and uptake rates, so any such change between annual and perennial cropland may be in addition of relevance for the emissions/removals.		Accept.	Text will be added in section 2.9.3.
4_0015	Federici, Sandro	2.9.1	5148	5176	box 2.9.2. another patch of area (like "d") should be added showing land under cropland management that are reported under forest management because of the "carbon equivalent forest conversion" provision.		Accept with modification.	And "Area under cropland management in base year and forest management in reporting period resulting from the harvest and conversion of forest plantations to non-forest land according the decision 2/CMP.8" was added to the figure.
4_0016	Sturgiss, Rob	2	5195		Line 5195 mentions that countries 'can establish the 1990 carbon stock...' but shouldn't it be the stock <i>change</i> that countries need to establish – not the actual stock?		Accept	
4_0017	Sturgiss, Rob	2	5195	5198	Line 5195 refers the inventory compiler to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines volume 1 for how to fill any missing data between 1970 and 1990. Therefore, in line 5198, the sentence should begin " <i>For example</i> ", the net carbon stock change for 1990 could be estimated:"...		Accept	
4_0018	Gensior, Andreas	2.9.1.1	5209	5209	Number of cited figure 4.2.12 is wrong. I think figure 2.9.2 should be correct		Accept	
4_0019	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.2	5215		for harmonizing with other chapters text between () could go to a footnote, e.g. Paragraph 6 in the Annex to Decision 15/CMP.1		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0020	Galinski, Wojciech	2.9.2	5215	5215	For CP2 Decision 15/CMP.1, Annex, paragraph 6 is replaced with 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, Annex II, paragraph 6),		Accept	
4_0021	Federici, Sandro	2.9.2	5226	5226	why from 1990? I guess it depends, for instance it is suggested to reconstruct a timeseries since 1971 for a proper estimation of 1990 emissions/removals; so in this case lands should be tracked since 1971.		Accept	
4_0022	Federici, Sandro	2.9.2	5238	5240	Not only current management practices are relevant, but also the rotation cycle of culture and management practices to which the land is subject. Stratification could therefore been done on the basis of different rotation cycles (this is indeed what the ipcc software (attache dto the 2003 IPCC GPG) for cropland and grassland reporting does)		Accept	
4_0023	Bernoux, Martial	2.9.2	5248	5248	"temperorary use for livestock grazing" : How to decide to attibute a land with integated cropland/livestock management to either "cropland" either "grassland"? Is there somme good practices? Might be usefull to give more precisions thus such practices are gaining importance.		Accept	
4_0024	Federici, Sandro	2.9.2	5249	5249	It is unclear what this text means. Lands converted to croplands can be found under the category cropland only. It is suggetsed to delete the sentence.		Accept	
4_0025	Federici, Sandro	2.9.2	5250	5252	something on cropland reported under CECF should be added here.		Accept.	"Area of cropland management in base year which converted to forest management in reporting period due to the harvest and conversion of forest plantations to non-forest land will be reported under carbon equivalent forest conversion according to the decision 2/CMP.8." was added.
4_0026	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5272	5272	As for the Grazing land management section, necessary to include in the list of sources and sinks also for Liming emissions.		Reject.	CO2 emission from liming is reported in Agriculture
4_0027	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.	5287	5288	How can a contribution (of e.g. 60%) be estimated if there are emissions and removals?		Accept.	Alternative text from Chapter 4, volume 1 will be used here.
4_0028	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.3	5293	5294	Footnote with refference could be added: "Paragraph 21 in the Annex to the decision 16/CMP.1 (Land use, land-use change and forestry), contained in document FCCC/KP/CMP/2005/8/Add.3, p.3."		Accept	
4_0029	Sturgiss, Rob	2	5302		Needs to cross reference section 2.3		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0030	Federici, Sandro	2.9.3	5314	5314	emissions from rice cultivation must be reported under the agriculture sector and must not be reported under KP-LULUCF activities in order to avoid double-accounting. Please delete this row		Accept with modification.	The box will be deleted
4_0031	Federici, Sandro	2.9.3	5322	5322	delete the second number "3"		Accept	
4_0032	Gensior, Andreas	2.9.3.1	5322	5322	The second number 3 should be cancelled		Accept	
4_0033	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.1	5322	5322	Delete 3 after "methods".		Accept	
4_0034	Alfredsen, Gry	2	5335	5338	The start point should be indicated in the decision tree. The notes could be included in the Tier boxes since they are short and appears a bit hidden now.		Accept.	The decision tree will be revised.
4_0035	Eve, Marlen	2	5335	5335	Fig 2.9.1. This figure does not have the "start" box or arrow showing the user where to enter the decision tree. This should be added for consistency with other diagrams in the report.		Accept.	The decision tree will be revised.
4_0036	Federici, Sandro	2.9.3	5335	5339	The first question-box should be redrafted as follow: "Are regional or country-specific data available to calculate carbon stock changes associated with changes in management practices?"		Accept.	The decision tree will be revised.
4_0037	Penman, Jim	2	5335	5335	The text above mentions dynamic drivers, but only in passing and I am not sure what is meant by including the term in the lower rhombus on the LH side.		Accept.	The decision tree will be revised.
4_0038	Galinski, Wojciech	2.9.3.1	5337	5337	Decision trees in FM use box "Start". Please apply it consistently.		Accept.	The decision tree will be revised.
4_0039	Larocque, Guy	2.9.3.1	5337	5338	Within each diamond of the decision tree, refer to the relevant subsections in case users need more precision. Good example is Figure 2.8.1		Accept.	The decision tree will be revised.
4_0040	Lund, H. Gyde	2	5337	5337	Figure 2.9.1 - Consider defining 'key category'		Accept.	The decision tree will be revised.
4_0041	Penman, Jim	2	5340	5342	Is this just a Tier 1 requirement? I think the corresponding GPG Ch 4 text was clearer at this point.		Accept	
4_0042	Ngarize, Sekai	2	5380	5383	Figure title is too long and has been cut off		Accept	
4_0043	Larocque, Guy	2.9.3.1	5380	5384	The figure caption is not completed. What comes after "(for definitions of...)" ? Also, not everybody in the literature on the form of the model. In many cases, the changes are not significant. This figure should be associated with a more in-depth literature review on this.		Accept	
4_0044	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.1	5383	5383	sentence not finished: "for definitions of....?"		Accept	
4_0045	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		5383	5083	(for definitions of ?		Accept	
4_0046	Somogyi, Zoltan	2	5383	5383	text of the heading is incomplete		Accept	
4_0047	Sperow, Mark	2.9.3.1	5383	5383	The last part of the figure title is not visible.		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0048	Schlesinger, Peter	2	5388		Smith 2000 is not in refs		Accept.	The Reference will be added
4_0049	Schlesinger, Peter	2	5390		Smith 1997 is not in refs		Accept.	The Reference will be added
4_0050	Schlesinger, Peter	2	5392		Coleman and Jenkinson 1996 not in refs		Accept.	The Reference will be added
4_0051	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	5404	5404	modeling		Accept	
4_0052	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	5406	5406	Secion		Accept	
4_0053	Federici, Sandro	2.9.3	5408	5410	The concept of tiers seems to have mixed with that of approaches in land representation; indeed, tier 1 can be applied to multiple land use changes that occur on the same land and that are tracked with approach 3		Accept	
4_0054	Penman, Jim	2	5409	5410	after "multiple changes in management practices over time" add "including rotational changes in land use." Also, comment: This could I suppose cover rotational changes in land use, but I had understood that we were going to give it greater coverage. I propose inserting a phrase.		Accept	
4_0055	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.3.1	5427		Delete ", respectively" as it is duplicated in the text		Accept	
4_0056	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.1	5427	5427	Delete one "respectively"		Accept	
4_0057	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.3.1	5452		convert "2" of "CO2" in a subindex		Accept	
4_0058	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5454	5454	I will just provide briefly information on what does Approach 2 or Approach 3 means.		Accept.	Some new text will be added.
4_0059	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.3.1	5460		Delete "-" from "base-year" for harmonization within the whole document		Accept	
4_0060	Penman, Jim	2	5464	5465	delete sentence - comment: I have deleted this sentence not because I disapprove of the sentiment, but because without specifying what the rigorous criteria are, I don't think it has any operational value.		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0061	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.3.4	5473		e.g. --> e.g.,		Accept	
4_0062	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	5473	5473	e.g		Accept	
4_0063	Eve, Marlen	2	5496	5496	Fig 2.9.3. This figure does not have the "start" box or arrow showing the user where to enter the decision tree. This should be added for consistency with other diagrams in the report.		Accept.	Modified differently. The start of the decision tree is clear.
4_0064	Penman, Jim	2	5496	5497	This also has the dynamic drivers reference, but I am still unsure what point we are making, in addition to the mention of management practice, in the rhombus above		Accept.	Dynamic drivers have been deleted.
4_0065	Alfredsen, Gry	2	5497	5498	The start point should be indicated in the decision tree. The notes could be included in the Tier boxes since they are short and appears a bit hidden now.		Accept.	Modified differently. The start of the decision tree is clear.
4_0066	Larocque, Guy	2.9.3.2	5497	5498	Within each diamond of the decision tree, refer to the relevant subsections in case users need more precision. Good example is Figure 2.8.1		Accept.	Decision tree has been modified and linked to guidance in 2006 GL.
4_0067	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.2.	5500	5539	Tier 1 methods are not mentioned explicitly.		Accept.	Either tier 1 is mentioned explicitly, or there is a link to guidance in 2006 GL
4_0068	Penman, Jim	2	5513	5513	Would be good to include a brief characterization of Tier 1		see 4_0068	see 4_0068
4_0069	Penman, Jim	2	5528	5528	Would be good to include a brief characterization of Tier 1		see 4_0068	see 4_0068
4_0070	Penman, Jim	2	5550	5551	The reference to land use changes doesn't add anything, and the reference to management practices tends to imply that we could treat management practices in the same way for inventory purposes, which I think is not so.		Accept.	Clarified.
4_0071	Sato, Atsushi	2	5566	5621	Section 2.9.3.3 should be deleted. Add CO2 from liming and urea application in the list in section 2.9.3.4. 15/CP.17 AFOLU tables classified CO2 from lime application under Agriculture sector, in other word, in the Annex A of KP.		Accept	Accept

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0072	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5622	5624	I suggest this paragraph is clarified, since in the IPCC 2006 Guidelines, there is not anymore Agriculture and LULUCF but AFOLU sector.		Accept with modification.	For Section 2.9.3.4, It will be revised. Two paragraphs will be included in section 2.9.3.4. One is regarding to what to be accounted and reported in LULUCF. Another one is what to be reported in Agriculture. The related comments and suggestion will be considered.
4_0073	Paul, Sonja	2.9.3.4	5623	5624	what is meant by "the same list applies to"?		Accept with modification.	For Section 2.9.3.4, It will be revised. Two paragraphs will be included in section 2.9.3.4. One is regarding to what to be accounted and reported in LULUCF. Another one is what to be reported in Agriculture. The related comments and suggestion will be considered.
4_0074	Bernoux, Martial	2.9.3.4	5626	5636	why to start the list from(iii)?		Accept with modification.	For Section 2.9.3.4, It will be revised. Two paragraphs will be included in section 2.9.3.4. One is regarding to what to be accounted and reported in LULUCF. Another one is what to be reported in Agriculture. The related comments and suggestion will be considered.
4_0075	Rösemann, Claus	2.9.3.4.	5626	5636	The list of N ₂ O emissions begins with the symbol "(iii)" instead of "(i)"		Accept with modification.	For Section 2.9.3.4, It will be revised. Two paragraphs will be included in section 2.9.3.4. One is regarding to what to be accounted and reported in LULUCF. Another one is what to be reported in Agriculture. The related comments and suggestion will be considered.
4_0076	Rösemann, Claus	2.9.3.4.	5628	5628	"Biological nitrogen fixation" has been removed as a direct source of N ₂ O (see 2006 IPCC Guidelines, page 11.6, footnote 2), so this point is wrong and should be removed		Accept with modification.	For Section 2.9.3.4, It will be revised. Two paragraphs will be included in section 2.9.3.4. One is regarding to what to be accounted and reported in LULUCF. Another one is what to be reported in Agriculture. The related comments and suggestion will be considered.
4_0077	Paul, Sonja	2.9.3.4	5630	5630	"cultivation of soils with high carbon content" what is the definition of high carbon content? Is it equal to cultivation of Histosol?		Accept.	Organic soil is used, which is a defined term.

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0078	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.4.	5630	5631	N2O emissions of cultivated soils with high organic content (histosols, organic soils) are reported under the Agriculture sector. However, assuming that the nitrogen-pool that forms the basis of N2O emissions originates from mineralization, one would assume that there should be a consistent reporting of soil carbon stock changes under LULUCF (KP-LULUCF) and N2O emissions under the Agriculture sector. In the case of mineral soils this consistency has been considered at least in the IPCC 2006 Guidelines. However not so for organic soils. Why not?		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0079	Rösemann, Claus	2.9.3.4.	5631	5631	"N in mineral soils that is mineralised" should NOT be accounted under the Agriculture sector but in the LULUCF sector. In the respective "new" CRF-Table 3.D this item is left out (it should be included in "new" CRF-Table 4(III))		Reject.	According to 2006GL, it will be accounted in Agriculture
4_0080	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.4.	5638	5638	CH4 emissions from ditches in organic soils are not reported under the Agriculture sector. How is this to be understood here?		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0081	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5642	5645	To be clarified, since there is not anymore an Agriculture sector in the IPCC 2006 Guidelines but an AFOLU sector		Accept with modification.	Text has been clarified
4_0082	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.3.4	5645		Delete "137" --> Article 3.4 and not 3.4137		Reject.	137 is the number of footnote.
4_0083	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.9.3.4	5645		convert "4" of "CH4" in a subindex		Accept	
4_0084	Galinski, Wojciech	2.9.3.4	5645	5645	The article number is confusing		Accept.	137 is superscript and it is the number of footnote.
4_0085	Galinski, Wojciech	2.9.3.4	5645	5645	footnote 137: Decision 16/CMP.1 does not deal with art. 7. Please place correct reference to the CMP decision		Accept.	137 is superscript and it is the number of footnote.
4_0086	Rogiers, Nele	2.9.3.4.	5645	5645	delete 137 after 3.4		Accept.	137 is superscript and it is the number of footnote.
4_0087	Penman, Jim	2	5645	5645	We need to say what happens for the exception. I assume this is what we think, since WDR is an elective Art 3.4 activity		Accept.	Clarified.
4_0088	Penman, Jim	2	5655	5656	Is this what we mean? I am not quite sure why we are giving this advice here.		Reject, text is clear	Text is clear
4_0089	Schlesinger, Peter	2	5665	5686	None of the references listed in box 2.9.5 are listed in the reference section		Accept.	The references will be added.
4_0090	Federici, Sandro	2.9.3	5688	5690	N2O emissions have to be reported under agriculture, not under cropland management, as correctly noted in the previous section. Please revise the text		Accept	
4_0091	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.10.1	5696		Adding acronym (GM) after 'Grazing land management' would not harm, as it is then referred to GM in line 5712, and it is 1st time cited in this subchapter		Accept.	The term of "Grazing land management" first appears here in this section. Need to harmonize with other sections.

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0092	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.10.1	5697	5698	Bring footnote text to a real footnote.		Accept	
4_0093	Federici, Sandro	2.10.1	5705	5707	I guess that it is odd to provide here good practices on reporting for activities other than grazing land. Here should be said that it is good practice to report what kind of land use categories are included under the Grazing land activity		Reject.	Now, FM is mandatory (changed from 2003 GPG). So, need to notify this point before FM is mentioned in the next paragraph. Need to add "WDR if elected"
4_0094	Lund, H. Gyde	2	5709	5709	Consider defining 'treed lands' somewhere		Accept with modification.	Accept with modification.
4_0095	Lund, H. Gyde	2	5709	5709	Consider including a definition of 'treed lands' as compared to 'forest land'. I assume treed lands would be any land with tree cover of X amount regardless of use where as 'forest land' may or may not have tree cover of x amount and excludes lands classed as croplands.		Accept with modification.	Need reference to the Ch. 1.
4_0096	Penman, Jim	2	5710	5711	Delete: ""Forest lands that are only temporarily used for grazing shall be included under forest land management." Comment: What does this mean? There is no category 'Forest land management' and the next sentence tends to contradict what the deleted text says.		Accept.	Deleted.
4_0097	Federici, Sandro	2.10.1	5711	5713	because its higher hierarchical order, a forest land subject to management activities must be reported under forest management. For the same reason, the reforestation of a grazing land must be reported under reforestation even if it remains subject to grazing. Please redraft the text accordingly		Accept.	We reference to Ch.1.
4_0098	Federici, Sandro	2.10.1	5714	5717	still, it depends on how those lands have been classified. If are forest land, then they have to be reported under forest management		Accept.	We reference to Chp.1. So, "can" be included in GM
4_0099	Federici, Sandro	2.10.1	5721	5724	I do not see the need of such a good practice. Indeed, whether a party reports all cropland and grassland under cropland management or under grazing land management, the accounted quantities are the same. Further the reference to the IPCC-GPG for LULUCF must be updated to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The good practice should be not to flip areas from grazing management and cropland management to avoid confusion in reporting.		Accept with modification.	If a party reports all cropland and grassland used for livestock production under CM (or GM), then, the party do not need to elect one of CM or GM activities. We remove reference to GPG LULUCF and make reference to GPG supplement Ch.1.
4_0100	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	5725	5725	land managemnt		Accept	
4_0101	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		5725	5725	land management		Accept	
4_0102	Penman, Jim	2	5729	5729	Delete: ""the accounting exercise"; comment: The accounting exercise is undefined. Accounting generally means showing how commitments are complied with, which is not the case here.		Accept with modification.	No comments for line 5092 in CM. So, need consistency.

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0103	Penman, Jim	2	5732	5733	Replace: "If no change in management practices occurs, the carbon stocks are assumed to be at equilibrium, and hence the change in carbon stocks is deemed zero." with "" Once equilibrium is reached, no further change in carbon stocks is assumed to take place unless management practice changes again. "		Reject.	We believe that original statement was more informative to inventory compilers than to suggest change.
4_0104	Federici, Sandro	2.10.1	5737	5740	The understandability of the text should be improved, possibly making examples.		Accept.	Included example
4_0105	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5739	5739	what does PRP N2O means in the text?		Accept.	N2O emission due to urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals. Need reference to 2006GL.
4_0106	Penman, Jim	2	5739	5739	what is "PRP"?		Accept.	N2O emission due to urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals. Need reference to 2006GL.
4_0107	Federici, Sandro	2.10.1	5741	5744	a stratification is useful if there are not overlapping on space. To achieve such goal, stratification has to be done according to cycle of practices (rotation) that are implemented on areas; this stratification will may overlap on time, which means that some lands may move from a cycle of practices to another and this determine a change in carbon stock that need to be accounted.		Reject.	The lands under grazing land management can be stratified based on national definitions. So, such a cycle of practice can be allocated to one of management practices by national definition.
4_0108	Sturgiss, Rob	2	5750		This seems inconsistent with line 307, which states that lands that meet definition of forest may be CM or GM, and line 774 which states that grazing land can occur in managed forests. It does not follow that land that is grazing land in the reporting year must have been through a deforestation event.		Reject.	Based on the hierarchical order, such lands should be reported under D. May need reference to Figure 2.1.2.
4_0109	Rogiers, Nele	2.10.1.	5753	5758	The paragraph is rather of general importance and seems to me a bit isolates here. I would rather allocate the issue in chapter one.		Reject.	Reject. Base year is not issue for 3.4 activities, Chp1 is generic.
4_0110	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.10.2	5762		update "x" reference, or add footnote: "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"		Accept	
4_0111	Federici, Sandro	2.10.2	5786	5786	this is not a stratification criteria; but an eligibility criteria of land to be reported under grazing land management. Delete this row		Accept with modification.	Land use history.
4_0112	Federici, Sandro	2.10.2	5811	5812	This is not consistent with what reported for other activities. Consistency needs to be ensured		Accept.	Deleted.
4_0113	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.10.3	5818		Replace "Agricultural" by "Agriculture" for harmonization within the whole document		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0114	Penman, Jim	2	5818	5819	Delete: "These, however, shall be reported in the Agricultural sector (see Section 11.3 CO2 emissions from liming of the 2006 IPCC Guideline Volume 4)."; Comment: Surely liming is included under Art 3.4. It's in CH 4 of GPG 2003 – see page 4.85		Accept.	Deleted.
4_0115	Sperow, Mark	2.10.3	5829	5829	Please identify the document containing "Section 4.2.3.1".		Accept.	Need reference to a desicion.
4_0116	Sturgiss, Rob	2	5831		My major concern with GM text is whether it adequately cross references available methods. What is table 4.2.8? Is this reference still correct?		Accept.	Need change to Table 2.9.1. In line 5833, need similar change in number of Table.
4_0117	Sturgiss, Rob	2	5831		Should cross reference section 2.3		Accept.	Need change to Table 2.9.1. In line 5833, need similar change in number of Table.
4_0118	Sperow, Mark	2.10.3	5833	5834	The report that contains the box and table referred to should be specified.		Accept	
4_0119	Rogiers, Nele	2.10.3.	5836	5848	Various issues in Box 2.10.2 are not addressed above in the text (5838 N2O emissions from savannah burning; 5842 Non-CO2 greenhouse gas emissions; 5848 Non-CO2 greenhouse gas emissions from biomass burning). I would welcome some further guidance on these issues in the text above as well as more guidance on natural disturbances (e.g. on the distinction and the implications of natural and human induced savannah burning).		Accept.	Deleted.
4_0120	Penman, Jim	2	5865	5865	No references to GPG-LULUCF		Accept	
4_0121	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5887	5887	Areas must be obtained from international datasets (e.g.. FAO) - I will add as for the cropland management section....helpful for cross-checking data.		Reject.	
4_0122	Lambrech, Jesse	2	5894	5894	specificsome		Accept	
4_0123	Rogiers, Nele	2.10.3.1	5894	5894	country-specificsome --> country specific some (blank!)		Accept	
4_0124	Penman, Jim	2	5899	5900	Delete: "An alternative to the use of more detailed descriptor categories is the use of relationships relating the intensity of a practice (e.g., grazing level) with a change in the carbon emission/removal factor." replace with: "Country-specific information on the multiplicative factors would need to be available to correspond either to the original set of management activities, or to the subdivided set."		Reject.	It is rational to tier 2 section. All information shoulder be country specific in tier 2
4_0125	Schlesinger, Peter	2	5908		Parton 1987 is not in refs		Accept	
4_0126	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5912	5921	I will suggest to clarify this paragraph and use similar titles as those used for cropland management. If applicable, refer also to the 2013 IPCC Wetland publication as done for the cropland management section.		Accept.	2.10.3.2 CARBON STOCK CHANGE IN ORGANIC SOILS.
4_0127	Penman, Jim	2	5920	5921	Delete sentence; comment: I am not sure of the origin of this statement but as a general point it looks wrong to me and I think it will cause confusion. If the assumption is it should be dealt with case-by-case.		Accept.	Deleted.
4_0128	Lambrech, Jesse	2	5930	5930	reprot		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0129	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		5930	5930	of this report		Accept	
4_0130	Condor Golec, Rocio Danica	2	5931	5931	As mentioned before it does not exist anymore Agriculture, but AFOLU sector with IPCC 2006 guidelines. Clarify.		Accept	
4_0131	Rogiers, Nele	2.11	5941	6152	In the whole section on revegetation (as well as in the respective chapters of the other activities) the issue of permanence (at least what concerns the permanence beyond the commitment period) is hardly addressed. Is there additional guidance in other IPCC or UNFCCC documents that could be cited or would it be possible to include some guidance on this issue here?		Reject.	Permanence is not a reporting issue, but an accounting issue, which is not dealt with here. Basically, continuous reporting would identify reversal of sinks.
4_0132	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.11.1	5943		Add ' ' between 'Revegetation' for harmonization within other "definitional issues", and if considered, also (RV)		Accept	
4_0133	Lund, H. Gyde	2	5944	5944	How much of the 0.05 ha has to be covered - 100%?, 20%, ? To qualify as being revegetated. Is this currently or at some point in time as with forest land? It seems like the two categories should be the same.		Reject.	The commentator does not fully grasp the meaning of the definition of revegetation. A revegetation activity must be performed on no less than 0.05 ha, no matter what is done on these. Example: Suppose a patch of 0.05ha of barren land is planted with just one single tussock of some stoloniferous grass species, which in due time might spread all over that area. This setup can be the starting point of a revegetation activity.
4_0134	Lund, H. Gyde	2	5944	5944	Shouldn't the minimum area be the same as the country selected as its threshold for 'forest'?		Reject.	This comes from KP decision.
4_0135	Fujiwara, Nobuo	2	5946	5947	"(see the decision tree Figure 2.5.1 in this report for further guidance)" should be deleted. Because Figure 2.5.1 doesn't explain about "RV" at all.		Accepted.	
4_0136	Penman, Jim	2	5946	5946	Delete: "and takes place after 1 January 1990"; comment: I realise this specification was present in GPG2003 Ch4, but revegetation is a net-net activity so I don't think it applies as an additional conditionality.		Reject.	The commentator mixes up «kind of accounting» with the requirement for any revegetation activity to be considered a valid one for the fulfillment of GHG net emission targets. KP worthiness is conferred by the time a revegetation activity was commenced (see paragraph 9 in the annex to decision 2/CMP.7).
4_0137	Kato, Junko	2.11.1	5947	5947	Delete "(see the decision tree Figure 2.5.1 in this report for further guidance)" or correct the Figure 2.5.1 so that the tree will lead to the RV. The Figure 4.2.5 of the IPCC GPG LULUCF includes the "RV", but the Figure 2.5.1 of in this (new) report (which is equivalent to the Figure 4.2.5 of the IPCC GPG LULUCF) does not include "RV" other than in its title. See my comment on Figure 2.5.1. as well.		Accept	
4_0138	Sperow, Mark	2.11.1	5947	5947	It is not clear that the referenced figure (2.5.1) is helpful for the discussion in this paragraph.		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0139	Fujiwara, Nobuo	2	5949	5950	"Area for area, revegetation is likely to have a lower impact than reforestation.(Akala & Lal, 2000; Cowie et al., 2007; Gessesse, 2009)" is not appropriate for GPG-LULUCF. This sentence discourages motivations of RV activities of the parties.		Accept.	The sentence could be deleted.
4_0140	Galinski, Wojciech	2.11.1	5949	5950	The sentence is difficult to understand		Accept.	The sentence could be deleted.
4_0141	Kato, Junko	2.11.1	5949	5950	The sentence "Area for area, revegetation is likely to have a lower impact than reforestation. (Alala & Lal, 2000; Cowie et al., 2007; Gessesse, 2009)" is better to be deleted. The circumstances and results of these three researches may vary, and the expressions "Area for area" and "impact" stays ambiguous anyway. It is not appropriate to discourage the motivation of RV activities by parties and to undervalue their effect by using scarce data obtained by the researches under limited condition.		Accept.	The sentence could be deleted.
4_0142	Federici, Sandro	2.11	5955	5957	This sentence should clarify that in any case: any forest land cannot be reported under revegetation, so that any planting of trees in forest land use never qualifies as revegetation		Accept with modification.	The commentator is right, but she did not fully grasp the meaning of the original text. This refers to the conditions a revegetation activity involving the plantation of trees should not meet to avoid being confused with an article 3.3 activity. In order to further clarify the conditions to be fulfilled by a revegetation activity involving trees is not confused with any article 3.3 activity, the following text is intended to replace the original text New text: Any tree planting could be elected as a revegetation activity if besides meeting the area requirement for this activity it did not either meet the requirements for a forest as defined in paragraph 1(a) in the annex of decision 16/CMP.1 or satisfy the definitional criteria a Party uses to specify the shape of forests and areas subject to afforestation, reforestation, deforestation, or conversion of a natural forest to a planted forest (see 2.2.6.1 of this supplement).
4_0143	Kato, Junko	2.11.1	5955	5955	(see table 2.11.1) should be (see box 2.11.1)		Accept.	
4_0144	Sperow, Mark	2.11.1	5955	5955	I believe Table 2.11.1 is missing from the text. Is this the correct reference?		Accept.	Reference to Table 2.11.1 must be removed.

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0145	Federici, Sandro	2.11	5960	5963	Again, the example of forest areas along roadsides can induce to consider a forest land as an eligible land where to implement revegetation activities.		Accept.	The examples given involve either (a) trees (De Steven et al., 2006) or (b) forest lands (Skrindo et al. 2008), so they actually are examples of natural afforestation (a) and natural reforestation (b). The sentence should be deleted, because it contributes more to obfuscation than to clarity.
4_0146	Sperow, Mark	2.11.1	5964	5964	Should there be a "(" at the start of this sentence? If not, where does the parenthtic statement begin?		Accept.	The text in lines 5964-5965 does not make much sense, because it is deficient. Replace text in lines 5964-5965 with the following text (taken from section 4.2.10.1 in 2003 GPG LULUCF): Set-aside lands such as cultivated lands subjected to revegetation should be included under cropland management if they are only temporarily set-aside (typically this is for 5 years or less, but any set-aside likely to return to cropland under the national conditions for set-aside should be counted as cropland).
4_0147	Kato, Junko	2.11.1	5965	5965	Delite “)” at the end of the sentence.		Accept.	See comment 4_0146
4_0148	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.11.1	5977		i.e. is understood as there are other activities... adding (to name just a few) is not consistent. Maybe consider adding "inter alia"		Accept with modification.	In line 5977 replace ...and soil preparation (to name just a few)...with...soil preparation, etc...

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0149	Fujiwara, Nobuo	2	5982	5990	The description about Japanese activities is not enough and shorter than other countries. I suggest using the definition of RV in Japanese NIR.		Reject.	The comparative shortness of the description given in Box 2.11.1. is not a valid reason to change it, unless it is demonstrated that description is meaningfully deficient. This is not the case, because that description contains the essential elements of Japan's RV activities. Japan's NIR defines (see A11.2.2.2. <i>National Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report of JAPAN. April, 2011.</i> http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/national_inventories_submissions/application/zip/jpn-2011-nir-26apr.zip) RV activities thus: «Practices for creation of “park and green space”, “public green space”, and “private green space guaranteed by administration” which have been carried out in settlements since 1990. » In the description given in the box reference is made to ... <i>plantation of trees in parks and green spaces</i> ... (NIR's «park and green space») in ... <i>both public</i> (NIR's «public green space») <i>and private</i> (NIR's «private green space guaranteed by administration») ... in ... <i>urban areas</i> ... (NIR's «settlements»).
4_0150	Sperow, Mark	2.11.1	5982	5990	What is the reason for the superscript with "Revegetaton.."?		Accept with modification. The superscript should be moved to the right of «Revegetation activities»; it is part and parcel of the box. The text of the superscript is the text in footnote #138, which should be deleted once the superscript becomes fully meaningful.	Accept with modification. The superscript should be moved to the right of «Revegetation activities»; it is part and parcel of the box. The text of the superscript is the text in footnote #138, which should be deleted once the superscript becomes fully meaningful.
4_0151	Rogiers, Nele	2.11.1.	5983	5991	Some confusion with the footnotes occurred.		Accept.	Accept. See the response to comment #4_0150.
4_0152	Lund, H. Gyde	2	5984	5986	This is a good working definition of grassland.		Accept.	
4_0153	Kato, Junko	Box2.11.1	5987	5987	Please change the paragraph (“ <i>Japan</i> :...urban areas.”) as the followings, in accordance with the latest NIR of Japan. (The definition of RV in the Japanese NIR.); “ <i>Japan</i> : Practices for the creation of "parks and green space", "public green space", and "private green space guaranteed by administration" which have been carried out in settlements since 1990. Activities which cover less than an area of 0.05 ha or meet the definitions of AR are not included.”		Reject.	See the response to comment #4_0149

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0154	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.11.1	5996		Footnote 139 --> Consider to harmonize this notation in other sections		Accept.	In line 5996 replace the text in parentheses with the following text: <i>see section 3-3-1 in chapter 3, volume 4 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> , and delete footnote 139.
4_0155	Kato, Junko	2.11.2	5996	5996	(§3.3.1 139) could be written in the same style with other references.		Accept.	See the response to comment # 4_0155
4_0156	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.11.2	6007		review [--> it is open only --> I see that 2.11 section is quite open to be harmonized with the 2013 IPCC WL Supplement		Reject.	I haven't seen any reference to revegetation of wetlands in the wetland supplement. Wetlands are rewetted, rehabilitated or restored, which are processes different from revegetation. I don't see a reference to the wetlands supplement is in order.
4_0157	Kato, Junko	2.11.2	6007	6009	"[(e.g., see section 2.9.2 for cropland management) and section 2.10.2 for grazing land management or2006 IPCC Guidelines for land-use categories in general. or by developing....]" should be "(e.g., see section 2.9.2 for cropland management and section 2.10.2 for grazing land management or 2006 IPCC Guidelines for land-use categories in general) or by developing...."		Accept.	
4_0158	Kato, Junko	2.11.2	6012	6012	"Guidelines) and section 3.3 ...in 2006 IPCC Guidelines." should be "Guidelines and section 3.3 ...in 2006 IPCC Guidelines.)"		Accept	
4_0159	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6014	6015	Footnote 138 - consider having hot links like this to other documents that are referenced.		Accept.	See the response to comment #4_0150.
4_0160	Rogiers, Nele	2.11.3.	6049	6049	delete "is in"		Accept.	
4_0161	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		6052	6052	mutatis mutandis ?		Accept.	Replace <i>mutatis mutandis</i> with ... <i>after making necessary changes</i> ...
4_0162	Lambrecht, Jesse	2	6055	6055	in in		Accept.	One <i>in</i> will be deleted.
4_0163	Penman, Jim	2	6057	6057	in reference to "cf. Figure 2.9.3of this report)", comment: DPlease refer to a decision tree in 2006GL. To avoid confusion it would be better to reproduce it, referring to Revegetation rather than cropland. By analogous do you mean identical to, apart from the name change? If not, the tree should definitely be redrawn.		Accept with modification.	No valid reason is given for not referring to figure 2.9.3 of this supplement; therefore, the reference to that figure is kept. As to the meaning of analogous, it is better for the sake of clarity to replace this word with similar.
4_0164	Kato, Junko	2.11.3	6060	6060	"grasslands or treed lands, (cf. sections 2.10, 2.7) and section2.9 and chapters 7 to 9 in volume 4 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for other land-use categories." should be "grasslands or treed lands. (cf. sections 2.9, 2.10 and 2.7 in volume 4 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for other land-use categories.)"		Reject.	The commentator did not fully grasp the scope of the references made in the text, because she considers sections 2.7, 2.9 and 2.10 to be part of 2006 IPCC Guidelines; they are not. However, in line 6060 the text...(cf. sections 2.10,2.7) and section 2.9...can be fruitfully replaced with...(cf. sections 2.7, 2.9, and 2.10 in the current supplement)...

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0165	Penman, Jim	2	6081	6081	Not clear what this fragment means		Accept.	Delete the extraneous text. By the way, the whole box should be removed because it is quite superfluous.
4_0166	Sperow, Mark	2.11.3	6084	6084	A "that" before "they" at the end of the sentence may be helpful.		Accept.	Welcome to <i>that</i> .
4_0167	Sperow, Mark	2.11.3	6086	6086	Add a period to the end of the sentence.		Accept.	The period should be next to the closing parenthesis.
4_0168	Rogiers, Nele	2.11.3.1	6088	6095	The "necessity to demonstrate that any carbon pool not reported is not a source of greenhouse gases" is mentioned twice.		Reject.	The text within double quotes is not mentioned twice. What is delivered twice but in different contexts is the message contained in the text in quotes.
4_0169	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.11.3.1	6095		Bring reference to "para 6(e)" to a footnote.		Accept.	The footnote mark should be put on <i>emissions</i> (L6095)
4_0170	Federici, Sandro	2.11.3	6123	6151	the all section is confusing and need to be revised		Accept.	An alternative version is provided in <i>KPSG-FOD_Cluster-4_RV_sect-2.11.3.3_v01.docx</i>
4_0171	Rogiers, Nele	2.11.3.3	6123	6152	The whole subchapter should be revised. Various issues are mentioned twice. Furthermore I could not understand the last paragraph.		Accept.	See response to comment #4_0170
4_0172	Rogiers, Nele	2.11.3.3	6126	6126	"of" or "in" the 2006 IPCC Guidelines?		Accept.	It should be <i>of</i>
4_0173	Kato, Junko	2.11.3.3	6131	6143	The marks “§ X.X” can be written in the same style with other parts. e.g., “Section X.X in this report”.		Accept.	See response to comment #4_0170
4_0174	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.11.3.3	6132		review] --> it is only closed		Accept.	See response to comment #4_0170
4_0175	Kato, Junko	2.11.3.3	6132	6132	“(land-use change)]” should be “(land-use change)]”		Accept.	See response to comment #4_0170
4_0176	Kato, Junko	2.11.3.3	6133	6133	“Urban soils],” should be “Urban soils,”		Accept.	See response to comment #4_0170
4_0177	Rogiers, Nele	2.11.3.3	6133	6133	Revise sentence		Accept.	See response to comment #4_0170
4_0178	Sperow, Mark	2.11.3.3	6133	6133	Add space between "soils" and "and" and delete "]" after "urban soils".		Accept.	See response to comment #4_0170

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0179	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6153		Line 6153 onwards (Wetland drainage and rewetting). As is mentioned: this paragraph is not finished yet. It needs major revisions.	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept.	
4_0180	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6155		'....a system for practices for draining and rewetting.....' What is meant??	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept.	Clarified.
4_0181	Ngarize, Sekai	2	6156		Please define or add a reference (page number) for the definition of organic soils (Histosols). e.g. at least 40 cm total thickness within the uppermost 100 cm, containing at least 12 % organic carbon (~20 % organic material) by weight ? Not sure if there is a new definition ?	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept.	
4_0182	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6156		'....organic soil...'. This excludes drainage and rewetting of other soils than organic soils. This is contradictory to line (305) that states: 'WDR can take place on wetlands and/or organic soils...'.	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept.	Clarified.
4_0183	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6156		'The activity....' = rewetting?	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept.	Clarified.
4_0184	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.12.1	6159		Footnotes 141 & 142 text are missing --> rename bottom footnote "7" page 2.185		Accept.	
4_0185	Galinski, Wojciech	2.12.1	6159	6159	Footnotes 141 and 142 are missing		Accept.	
4_0186	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.1.	6159	6159	Some confusion with the footnotes.		Accept.	
4_0187	Sperow, Mark	2.11.3.3	6159	6159	Footnotes 141 and 142 are missing. Should footnote "7" at bottom of the page have a different number?		Accept.	
4_0188	Ngarize, Sekai	2	6168	6169	In the examples for human-induced rewetting such installation of ditches, pipes etc. you may also add mulching as means of peatland restoration (rewetting) especially from afforested sites		Reject.	This is a practice on managed, but not a rewetting or drainage practice under WDR. The Activity WDR only refers to practices altering the water situation.

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0189	Fearnside, Philip	2	6170	6170	This points out that "flooded land" is not included in the present report. Hydroelectric reservoirs are the key item here. It needs to be made explicit whether emissions from the soil in the drawdown zones of reservoirs, which represents a substantial area of land that is subject to drying and re-wetting, is included or not in the present report, or whether these emissions are supposedly covered under the "flooded lands" section of the 2006 guidelines (vol. 4, sect. 7.3). Note that the question of emissions from hydroelectric dams represents a major item that is substantially underestimated by current IPCC accounting. See: Fearnside, P.M. 2012. Carbon credit for hydroelectric dams as a source of greenhouse-gas emissions: The example of Brazil's Teles Pires Dam. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change doi: 10.1007/s11027-012-9382-6. (online-first version published 6 May 2012 http://www.springerlink.com/content/c105v17021045048/fulltext.pdf). Additional information in: Fearnside, P.M. & S. Pueyo.. 2012. Underestimating greenhouse-gas emissions from tropical dams. Nature Climate Change 2(6): 382–384. doi:10.1038/nclimate1540 http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v2/n6/full/nclimate1540.html		Reject.	Flooded land is out by mandate of IPCC
4_0190	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.1.	6171	6171	What do you mean with "Agriculture Sector": AFOLU (UNFCCC) or Cropland Management (KP)?		Reject. The CRF tables still have the Agriculture chapter, not AFOLU	The CRF tables still have the Agriculture chapter, not AFOLU
4_0191	Ngarize, Sekai	2	6179		Should read "rewetting or drainage resulting in a conversion to forest....." and not "drainage and rewetting resulting in a conversion to forests ..." as conversion to forest will never result in rewetting?		Reject. There are examples of wet forests.	There are examples of wet forests.
4_0192	Penman, Jim	2	6180	6181	Delete: "As minimum the six broad land use categories and changes between these categories need to be specified and different types of revegetation activities separated ."; comment: This seems very strange advice; in many cases revegetation will not occur on each of the six categories.		Accepted, clarified.	Clarified.
4_0193	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.12.1	6190	6191	"for the Identification" --> "for identifying" --> or reference to Section 2.12.3 below		Accept.	
4_0194	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6195		Lines 6195 onwards: a decision tree is missing. Shall be added.	Attachment_6153.pdf	Accept.	
4_0195	Lilleskov, Erik	2	6196	6198	Convolutd ambiguous sentence that appears to be a fragment. Please edit for clarity.		Accept	
4_0196	Ngarize, Sekai	2	6197		Delete "and" from "on relatively small areas and can lead to proportionally large changes ..." as it is not consistence with line 6196.		Accept.	Partly deleted
4_0197	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6200	6201	stratification for wetland drainage and rewetting indeed can be based on WT, however, if LU can coupled to WT, this coupling could also be used to determine the WT depth.	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept.	This depends on national implementation.
4_0198	Araki, Makoto	2.12.2	6203	6205	I think smllest area is should be more small than 1 ha, because monitoring area is often used 0.1 ha on REDD project. If it has to be done detailed monitoring, 1 ha is too large to measur ground truth.		Reject.	1 ha is in the COP decision.
4_0199	Sato, Tamotsu	2.12.2	6203	6205	What do you base your decision on the minimum area as 1-ha?		Reject.	1 ha is in the COP decision.
4_0200	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		6204	6204	practices		Accept.	
4_0201	Galinski, Wojciech	2.12.1	6205	6206	Check footnote numbering (it says 7) and within that fotnote text, delete: FCCC/KP/AWG/2011/L.3/Add.2		Accept.	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0202	Lilleskov, Erik		6205	6207	How does this exception for long and narrow land use change affect accounting for emissions from ditches, and the definition of the area influenced by these ditches? These are long and narrow, but can be quite extensive and are thought to have very different C cycling and trace gas emissions. If only one long ditch is dug how is the area of its influence defined? The drainage area can extend quite far from the ditch. Defining the zone of influence would seem to be key and this is not clear here.		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0203	Penman, Jim	2	6205	6207	Delete: " [100 x 100 m]. Changes affecting areas of [e.g. 10 x 1000 m (although being 1 ha)] do not have to be reported. [consistency with e.g. geometry interpretation for minimum area in forest land management and revegetation.] " and replace with: "1 ha."		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0204	Chordá Sancho, Jose Vicente	2.12.2	6210		Ok, will be glad to review SOD		Noted	Noted
4_0205	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.3.	6211	6338	On line 6243 and 6247 the numbers 3. and 4. are used. However further on in the text, e.g. in the paragraph 6306 - 6312 identification options 1 and 2 are mentioned. Furthermore, I found it sometimes hard to distinguish between identification options (1/2 or 3/4) and approaches (1/2/3). The whole description is somehow a bit confusing for me and I think it could gain a lot from a thorough revision.		Accept	
4_0206	Lilleskov, Erik		6218	6218	Edit "no longer complies does not comply"		Accept.	
4_0207	Lilleskov, Erik		6218	6221	and Box 2.12.1. So to be clear lands that were organic soils in the base year, but have lost sufficient organic matter to no longer be considered organic soils, cannot be considered under this protocol EVEN IF by rewetting they will convert back to organic soils. How does this incentivize wetland restoration/rehabilitation activities on those lands? If these activities are incentivized elsewhere perhaps that could be made clear here.		Accept with modification.	
4_0208	Ngarize, Sekai	2	6218		Delete "does not comply"		Accept	
4_0209	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.3.1	6218	6218	Revise sentence ("complies does not comply")		Accept	
4_0210	Rösemann, Claus	2.12.3.1.	6218	6218	"...that the area no longer complies does not comply with..." delete "does not comply"		Accept	
4_0211	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		6218	6218	shallow, that the area no longer complies does not comply with the criteria ?		Accept	
4_0212	Penman, Jim	2	6219	6221	Delete sentence; comment: This seems surprising on environmental grounds. Wouldn't we want to encourage regeneration even if the organic layer was thinner than the definition? I would have thought that it would be GP to apply the activity to land that had the potential to regenerate. Ignore this comment if it would re-open a difficult debate that I am unaware of.		Accept with modification.	See comment 4_0201
4_0213	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.3.1	6225	6237	Box 2.12.1: Which processes caused the shrinkage of Area a) to Area b) (if not drainage). Please add an example (e.g. peatland extraction?).		Accept with modification.	Box has changed considerably

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0214	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.3.1	6225	6237	Box 2.12.1: Where and how has to be accounted for the C release (loss of organic soil) in area $(a \cap c) - ((b \cap c) + (c \cap d))$?		Accept with modification.	Box has changed considerably
4_0215	Penman, Jim	2	6226	6226	Comment about net-net accounting: I am unsure how the base year idea works with the since 1990 for these activities. We shall need to address this, either in this round or subsequently.		Accept	
4_0216	Federici, Sandro	2.11.3	6236	6237	this is only one of the options for accounting for WDR. The other option is to account for the area that has been subject to WDR since 1990 only. The figure and the text should be revised for adding this option		Accept with modification.	This has been in the text already, text has been clarified
4_0217	wang, chunfeng	chapter 2	6236	6236	if there is editing error for the brackets?		Accept	
4_0218	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6239	6241	similar approach as described in section 2.9.1? Suggestion: refer to the Wetlands Supplement and create a box like box 2.9.1 here as well. Reference to this box is not appropriate, since it does not represent the WDR case, which is different in terms of definitions/overlap/stratification, and its organic soil only.	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept	
4_0219	Federici, Sandro	2.11.3	6243	6249	Both ways for land identification implement the accounting option "since 1990" (see comment to rows 6236-6237), while another option is to account for the all area subject to drainage and rewetting in 1990 and those subject to the activities in the commitment period year.		Accept with modification.	This has been in the text already, text has been clarified
4_0220	Rösemann, Claus	2.12.3.1.	6243	6247	The two ways of identifying lands subject to WDR should be marked by "1." and "2." instead of "3." and "4."		Accept	
4_0221	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6243		3. shall be 1.	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept	
4_0222	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6247		4. shall be 2	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept	
4_0223	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2	6250	6251	it is good practice to ensure that lands drained and rewetted since 1990 are completely included. Does this match with the lowest location in the hierarchy of Wetlands and the voluntary inclusion of WDR in the inventories?	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept with modification.	Box explains when and under which Activity drained and rewetted organic soils are accounted.
4_0224	Lilleskov, Erik		6265	6265	'taking account of...' is vague. What about "after subtracting"?		Accept	
4_0225	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.3.2	6265	6265	Erase "..."		Accept	
4_0226	Rösemann, Claus	2.12.3.2.	6265	6265	two dots		Accept	
4_0227	Rösemann, Claus	2.12.3.2.	6267	6267	"?]" should be replaced by "]"		Accept	
4_0228	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		6267	6267	of this report)		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0229	Federici, Sandro	2.11.3	6271	6272	Step 4 only applies when only WDR occurred since 1990 is accounted. Another option that accounts for the total area subject to WDR in 1990 and in the commitment period years can be implemented, this option does not require step 4		Accept.	This is essentially one of the two options presented
4_0230	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		6274	6274	practices		Accept	
4_0231	Federici, Sandro	2.11.3	6286	6288	Again, another option could be to report the total area subject to drainage and rewetting in 1990 and the total area subject to wetland and rewetting in the commitment period being in practice accounted only those changes occurred since 1990 in land drained and rewetted		Accept.	This is essentially one of the two options presented
4_0232	Penman, Jim	2	6300	6302	suggested edit - replace " It has to be documented that the water data represent the water table in the organic soil and for what land-use and drainage or rewetting activity or stratum and that the data cover a representative period, which is robust to interannual variability in water table." with: "Documentation should be provided showing that the water data represent the water table in the organic soil, and for what land-use and drainage or rewetting activity or stratum and that the data cover a representative period, and that changes in level are not simply due to inter-annual variability in water table."; comment: Is this the meaning?		Accept with modification	Accept with modification
4_0233	Schrier-Uijs, Arina P.	2	6306		suggestion: relocate this section to page 2.187 just below the explanation of the two approaches. Consequence needed in using 'approach 1 and 2' or 'option 1 and 2'.	Attachment_4_0179.pdf	Accept	
4_0234	Federici, Sandro	2.11.3	6309	6312	It is unclear why only approach 3 applies. Whether drained and rewetted areas are classified in two subdivisions, before and after 1990, approach 2 with additional information (and the subdivision is the expected additional information) seems a viable option. Please add more clarity to the guidance provided.		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0235	Sperow, Mark	2.12.3.3	6318	6366	The numbering system for these lists does not seem to make sense and do not start with the correct values.		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0236	Lilleskov, Erik		6322	6322	after "Supplement..." add "for drained organic soils..."		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0237	Lilleskov, Erik		6324	6324	after "Supplement..." add "for drained organic soils..."		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0238	Lambrechts, Jesse	2	6338	6338	e.g.,		Accept.	Text has been clarified
4_0239	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		6342	6347	to review the text.		Accept.	Text has been clarified

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0240	Fenton, Nicole	2,12,4	6359	6391	This section is apparently uncompleted but the issues that remain to be resolved seem to be important. What about wetland management that is not forestry, grazing, cropland such as peat extraction? Or anthropogenic fires to clear peatland? Peat fires were not clearly dealt with in the first draft of the 2013 wetlands supplement either.... Another issue to me would be the quasi-permanent flooding of peatlands/wetlands associated with road construction. Where would this fit in?		Accept.	
4_0241	Lehtonen, Aleksi	2	6374	6374	Excluding sources, this part of the GPG should be crystal clear. This is essential because many countries will use wetlands management to reduce CO2 emissions but at the same time they will not report increased CH4 and N2O emissions either by claiming that there is no methods that these gases are not source of emissions. CH4 and N2O emissions will increase when drainage of wetlands is reduced and water level rises.		Accept	
4_0242	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.4.	6386	6391	Not all non-CO2 emissions are reported under the Agriculture sector (e.g. CH4 emissions from organic soils). Furthermore I miss here some guidance on the consistency of CO2 and N2O emissions. Since sequestration and mineralization processes affect always both C and N fluxes the respective emissions should at least partly be addressed in a coherent manner (e. g. cross checks via the C/N ratio).		Accept	
4_0243	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6392	6393	Consider adding name of table		Accept	
4_0244	Ngarize, Sekai		6392		missing caption		Accept	
4_0245	Lilleskov, Erik		6392	6393	in Table 2.12.1, Wetlands entry states : All other greenhouse gas emissions including peat extracted for horticulture are reported under wetland drainage and rewetting.” This implies that peat extracted for horticulture is a greenhouse gas emission. Clearly, it is not, although its decomposition under horticultural use will lead to GHG emissions. Please clarify.		Accept with modification.	Reference to 2006 GL was made
4_0246	Rogiers, Nele	2.12.4.	6393	6394	Table 2.12.1.: I would welcome some more information in the table. Maybe also a decision tree or a figure that displays the allocation of the different source or sink categories graphically would be helpful here and in similar situations throughout the document.		Accept with modification.	Reference to 2006 GL was made
4_0247	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6395	6677	References - consider adding 'hot links' to URLs where available		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0248	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6395	6677	Most of the references listed here are not cited in the text. Exceptions are the IPCC documents, Merino et al. 2004, Post and Kwon 2000, Schlup et al.2008, Davis and Condron 2002, Guo and Gifford. 2002; Paul et al., 2003; Tate et al., 2003; Vesterdall et al. 2002. Consider citing all in the text or none		Accept	
4_0249	Munthali, Jack		6395	6677	Reference materials list is very comprehensive and complete in my view		Accept	
4_0250	Shimabukuro, Yosio Edemir		6395		References - to check the norms for co-authors list		Accept	
4_0251	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6617	6618	Consider adding URL http://www.nifc.gov/smoke/documents/Emissions_Trace_Gas_from_Biomass_Burning.pdf		Accept	
4_0252	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6618	6620	Cofer.... Is another reference. Separate from Andreae etc,		Accept	
4_0253	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6621	6621	Consider listing the rest of the co-authors instead of et al. as done in previous references. Consider being consistent.		Accept	
4_0254	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6621	6621	The word "Towards" should be the first word in the title of the paper.		Accept	
4_0255	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6624	6626	Consider adding URL http://www.mi.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/fnu-files/publication/working-papers/FNU_123_multifunclanduse.pdf		Accept	
4_0256	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6625	6625	The word 'science' and the word 'policy' should start with caps.		Accept	
4_0257	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6627	6628	Consider adding URL http://naldc.nal.usda.gov/download/30004/PDF		Accept	
4_0258	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6629	6630	Consider adding URL http://www.unulrt.is/static/fellows/document/gessesse-ta.pdf		Accept	
4_0259	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6637	6638	Consider adding URL http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpplulucf/degradation_contents.html . The year of publication is 2003.		Accept	
4_0260	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6637	6638	Shouldn't the editors (Penman J et al...) be listed as the authors instead of the IPCC?		Accept	

<Review comments on First Order Draft of KP Supplement: Sections 2.9-2.12>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Start Line	End Line	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
4_0261	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6643	6644	Consider adding URL http://www.eebweb.arizona.edu/faculty/huxman/mitch/Pavao-Zuckerman%202008%20Restoration%20Ecology.pdf This is also listed at 6647-6648. Suggest deleting this one.		Accept	
4_0262	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6647	6648	Previously listed at 6643-6644. Suggest keeping this one.		Accept	
4_0263	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6655	6655	ch4 should be CH(4subscript) and N(2subscript)O		Accept	
4_0264	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6656	6656	japan should start with a cap. J		Accept	
4_0265	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6657	6659	Consider adding URL http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00380768.2004.10408463		Accept	
4_0266	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6660	6661	Consider adding URL http://content.imamu.edu.sa/Scholars/it/net/303.pdf .		Accept	
4_0267	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6661	6661	The 2 in CO2 should be a subscript.		Accept	
4_0268	Schlesinger, Peter	2	6666		Smith 2004 is in refs but not used in document		Accept	
4_0269	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6667	6667	The 2 in CO2 should be a subscript.		Accept	
4_0270	Bianchini, Irineu	2	6153	6391	Line 6153 - 6391: In this entire item, wetland and organic soil were used like a synonym and it is not true; because the mineral wetlands are not included in this definition (as mentioned in line 6264). Please, in this context, evaluate the following lines: 6156; 6160; 6162; 6163; 6173; 6176; 6196; 6201; 6206; 6213; 6215; 6217; 6220; the text included in Box 2.12.1; 6243, 6253; 6256; 6262; 6271; 6272; 6279; 6284; 6299; 6301; 6307; 6345; 6362.		Accept	