

<General review comments on 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
G_0001	Bellassen, Valentin	General comment			The entire document should be checked for repetitions. Some elements are repeated more than three times which does not seem useful. Conciseness will also make the GPG more practical for use by inventory compilers and reviewers.		Accept. The KP supplement has been reviewed and reduction of repetitions has been completed.	
G_0002	Bernoux, Martial	All document			This document is particularly not easy to follow (due to the complexity of the issue itself), perhaps one solution would be to add a complete example (annex?) with the solutions and referring to it in the text?		Accept with modification. More examples have been added and text improved for clarity.	
G_0003	Bernoux, Martial	All document			Consider adding the text corresponding to Article 3.3 and 3.4 of the KP		Accept with modification. Relevant text has been added in places for clarity. However the entire text of 3.3. and 3.4 cannot be added.	
G_0004	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	general		1	OVERALL COMMENT: I reviewed Chapter 1 and almost the entire Chapter 2. In general the chapters are well written; but, sometimes, it was difficult to follow how these chapters are linked with the 2006 guidance. It may be useful to add graphics, tables and equations to the each chapter that explicitly describes the relationship between this guidance and the sources (mainly the 2006 guidance). The use of symbols and abbreviations is usual; therefore, I suggest including a list of abbreviations / symbols to aid the reading (e.g., page 1.3 to 1.9). The text has a lot of abbreviations and this guidance leads to the other documents (which in turn have a lot of other acronyms and symbols); occasionally it results in a very difficult text (I think we need to make a text more friendly to facilitate the understanding of users). Sometimes the text is repetitive (e.g., Line 690 until 1340).		Accept with modification. Glossary has been added and more cross-references to 2006 Guidelines (and decisions where appropriate) have been added.	
G_0005	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	general			OVERALL COMMENT: I reviewed Chapter 1 and almost the entire Chapter 2. In general the chapters are well written; but, sometimes, it was difficult to follow how these chapters are linked with the 2006 guidance. It may be useful to add graphics, tables and equations to the each chapter that explicitly describes the relationship between this guidance and the sources (mainly the 2006 guidance). The use of symbols and abbreviations is usual; therefore, I suggest including a list of abbreviations / symbols to aid the reading (e.g., page 1.3 to 1.9). The text has a lot of abbreviations and this guidance leads to the other documents (which in turn have a lot of other acronyms and symbols); occasionally it results in a very difficult text (I think we need to make a text more friendly to facilitate the understanding of users). Sometimes the text is repetitive (e.g., Line 690 until 1340).		Accept with modification. Repeated comment; see response to G_0004	
G_0006	Bianchini Jr., Irineu		2		Perhaps the main equations related with 2006 IPCC Guidelines (mainly that related to the Chapter 4, volume 4) could be written in order to make this document more self-sufficient. (e.g. line 1784)		Reject. We are not expected to repeat 2006 GL - this document only refers to Supplementary Guidance not repetition of the 2006 GL.	
G_0007	Bianchini Jr., Irineu	general			OVERALL COMMENT: I reviewed Chapter 1 and almost the entire Chapter 2. In general the chapters are well written; but, sometimes, it was difficult to follow how these chapters are linked with the 2006 guidance. It may be useful to add graphics, tables and equations to the each chapter that explicitly describes the relationship between this guidance and the sources (mainly the 2006 guidance). The use of symbols and abbreviations is usual; therefore, I suggest including a list of abbreviations / symbols to aid the reading (e.g., page 1.3 to 1.9). The text has a lot of abbreviations and this guidance leads to the other documents (which in turn have a lot of other acronyms and symbols); occasionally it results in a very difficult text (I think we need to make a text more friendly to facilitate the understanding of users). Sometimes the text is repetitive (e.g., Line 690 until 1340).		Accept with modification. Repeated comment; see response to G_0004	
G_0008	Bianchini Jr., Irineu		2	2575	... For revegetation and wetland drainage and rewetting, default uncertainty ranges cannot be specified at present. I suppose that the 2014 IPCC Wetlands Supplement cover this information.		Noted.	
G_0009	Brandon, Andrea	clarification on aspect throughout document			Where new guidance is given that has not been taken from a decision, for example on lines 1951-1954 "It is good practice for Parties to report in time for its inventory report for 2015 one or more specific types or combined types of natural disturbances it intends to be able to exclude from accounting of emissions from natural disturbances and the combined background level associated with these disturbances", what does "it is good practice" imply? Are there compliance issues associated with any guidance that starts with "it is good practice"? And can this be stated up front in the guidelines please?		Accept. The KP supplement has been reviewed to remove references to the use of "good practice" for mandatory requirements.	

G_0010	Chidthaisong, Amnat		1	general		Since one of the problems that may arise is double counting, I think some examples of potential cases that lead to double counting should be given. Such would greatly avoid double counting.		Accept with modification. Text has been clarified to address this issue and specific examples have been provided in some sections.	
G_0011	Eve, Marlen		1		6677	Editorial note: The footnotes are inconsistently formatted, especially regarding the level of indentation.		Accept. Footnotes have been properly formatted.	
G_0012	Galinski, Wojciech	2.7.6.2		3970	3974	Please remove repetitions among chapters. Applies not only to this line.		Accept. Repetitions amongst Chapters were reduced throughout.	
G_0013	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	General comment		0	0	It is a little bit confusing that the GPG some times apply only to 2CP, and some times it seems that they will apply longer. It should be clarified		Accept. Tried to be more specific where things apply to CP2 and where they might apply beyond it.	
G_0014	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	Gen. Comment		0	0	the definition of reforestation has not been revised. All provisions in the GPG based on a revised definition should be deleted.		Accept. The text has been revised.	
G_0015	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	Gen. Comment		0	0	There are references to Marrakech Accords, and decisions from those accords that should be updated. Most of the issues related to LULUCF KP reporting where adopted in Doha, and are contained 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). By the time these GPG are adopted, the decision will have a number		Accept. All references to decisions have been updated.	
G_0016	Gonzalez, Patrick	References		6395	6677	To be consistent with other IPCC reports and publications and for ease of use by readers, provide an alphabetized list of references at the end of each chapter. The current list (by section) is a non-standard format and is difficult to use.		Reject. It is the the way references have been provided in the Guidelines in the past.	
G_0017	Herold, Anke	General				Good first draft, well structured and clear. Boxes with examples are a good improvement and make the guidance user-friendly.		Noted.	
G_0018	Kabo-bah, Amos Tieryangn	GENERAL				I have noted that the mention of remote sensing as in the use of satellite images has been clearly demonstrated as key to the monitoring of parcels of land, land use and is the key to ensuring that proper account of these annual changes are captured and computed properly. Unfortunately, it is not clear as to the exact working satellite images that countries may be considering. Since there are many satellite vendors, it may be worthwhile for authors to consider mentioning some suitable images that countries may consider to use bearing in mind issue of spatial and temporal resolution. For example, QuickBird and SPOT images may stand in as a good choice though these are commercial available. The question is there has to be a way to include these satellite image providers into the whole discussion and strike out some deal with them. Maybe, some accrued credit from wetland accounting supported with free high resolution satellite images may earn such vendors some credit! This is to offset satellite vendors with the high cost of production of high resolution satellite images.		Reject. Advocating specific vendors is not the role of the IPCC.	
G_0019	Kabo-bah, Amos Tieryangn					In a whole, I comment the authors for the hardwork done. Wishing ALL authors GOOD LUCK with the final drafting and publication.		Noted.	
G_0020	Kim, Raehyun	Reference		6397	6677	It is required a uniform style reference.		Accept. Efforts have been made to maintain a uniform reference format style.	
G_0021	Lambrecht, Jesse	all				Very comprehensive and elaborate draft. I have no meaningful technical comments.		Noted.	
G_0022	Lambrecht, Jesse			6394	6395	I think it would be useful to include a glossary with all abbreviations used (and their meaning) at the end of the document, just before the References.		Accept with modification. Glossary has been added.	
G_0023	Lund, H. Gyde		1	0	0	Supplement is very thorough, logically organized, but is very wordy and cumbersome to work through. Is there any way to reduce the frequent references to Articles 3.3 and 3.4? The figures help a lot.		Accept. We have revised the text and tried to improve the clarity.	
G_0024	Lund, H. Gyde		1	8	23	If this report is to be electronic consider having hot links from the table of contents to the particular sections.		Noted. This is subject to a decision by the IPCC Plenary.	
G_0025	Lund, H. Gyde		2	484	689	If this report is to be electronic consider having hot links from the table of contents to the particular sections.		Noted. This is subject to a decision by the IPCC Plenary.	
G_0026	Lund, H. Gyde		2	6407	6407	Consider having URL links for the other references as well.		Accept with modification. URL links have been provided for the online documents only.	
G_0027	Lund, H. Gyde		2	6427	6427	Should the co-authors last names come before their initials? Consider being consistent throughout the references.		Accept with modification. It depends on the reference style. Efforts have been made to maintain a uniform reference format style.	

G_0028	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6403	6403	Consider changing the 'and' to a comma to correspond with the previous reference. Consider having a consistent format and rules for all references.		Reject. URL links have been provided for the documents only available online.	
G_0029	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6397	6398	Consider adding URL http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gl/invsl.html		Reject. URL links have been provided for the online documents only.	
G_0030	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6399	6401	Consider adding URL http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/gpplulucf/gpplulucf_contents.html		Reject. URL links have been provided for the online documents only.	
G_0031	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6402	6404	Consider adding URL http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/index.html		Reject. URL links have been provided for the documents only available online.	
G_0032	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6399	6491	Shouldn't the editors (Penman, J....) be listed as the authors instead of IPCC?		Reject. All IPCC documents are referenced as IPCC products and not by editors or authors.	
G_0033	Lund, H. Gyde	2	6402	6404	Shouldn't the editors (Eggleston H.S. etc J....) be listed as the authors instead of IPCC?		Reject. All IPCC documents are referenced as IPCC products and not by editors or authors.	
G_0034	Munthali, Jack				It is apparent that a good job was done on this FOD and the methodologies are consistent and helpful to the parties. Good practices are well elaborated and expalined.		Noted	
G_0035	Ngarize, Sekai				Overall this improved structure of the 2013 KP Supplement have sorted out a number of ambiguities in the original guidance		Noted	
G_0036	Ngarize, Sekai				The use of example boxes and worked examples really helps inventory compilers. So I would encourage you to use these when you can.		Noted	
G_0037	Pan, Xubin		1	1	2.1-2.4 should be included in the Chapter 2 METHODS FOR ESTIMATION, MEASUREMENT, MONITORING		Accept. However, they are already included in this chapter.	
G_0038	Pan, Xubin		1	1	2.5-2.11 should be included in the Chapter 3 APPLICATION FOR TYPICAL ECOSYSTEMS (or LAND USE/LADN USE CHANGE)		Reject. The structure of the KP Supplement is according to the ToR as approved by the IPCC Plenary. There is no Chapter 3.	
G_0039	Pan, Xubin		1	1	2.5-2.7 should be integrated into one section of Chapter 3 Forest Management		Reject. The structure of the KP Supplement is according to the ToR as approved by the IPCC Plenary. There is no Chapter 3.	
G_0040	Pan, Xubin		1	1	2.9 should be Grassland Management in Chapter 3		Reject. The structure of the KP Supplement is according to the ToR as approved by the IPCC Plenary. There is no Chapter 3.	
G_0041	Pan, Xubin		1	1	2.11 should be Wetland Management in Chapter 3		Reject. The structure of the KP Supplement is according to the ToR as approved by the IPCC Plenary. There is no Chapter 3.	
G_0042	Pan, Xubin		1	1	2.10 should be the last section in Chapter 3		Reject. The structure of the KP Supplement is according to the ToR as approved by the IPCC Plenary. There is no Chapter 3.	
G_0043	Pan, Xubin		1	1	Other land use or ecosystem management (not just Forest, Grassland, Wetland, Cropland, Settlement?) should be added into the Chapter 3		Reject. The structure of the KP Supplement is according to the ToR as approved by the IPCC Plenary. There is no Chapter 3.	
G_0044	Perugini, Lucia	0	0	0	Update all the references to the relevant decisions for the 2CP.		Accept. This was done throughout.	

G_0045	Pulles, Tinus		1	all	all	<p>I do appreciate the possibility to comment on this first order draft guidance document. I think quite a lot has been achieved and additional guidance surely is needed by the Parties.</p> <p>I have one general remark though. In my view this document is too much formulated with the decisions of the CMP as a starting point. The story line should be inverted - in a way - to a line of reasoning that starts from what information is not available in the 2006 GLs to comply with the specificities and peculiarities of the KP accounting. A clear distinction between scientific understanding, reporting (translating scientific understanding into numbers in predefined reporting tables) and accounting. The latter is sometimes dependent on specific choices of Parties (forest definition, elected activities) but obviously these choices do not influence scientific understanding only the interpretation thereof towards the reporting tables and the accounting. As such the specificities and peculiarities of KP reporting and accounting form a background and not a starting point.</p> <p>Unfortunately I could not find enough time to go through all 200+ pages of this document. There might be many locations in the draft where an inversion of the line of thought might be needed, similar to what I propose in detail for the first chapter.</p>		<p>Accept with modification. Effort has been done to explain better the distinction between Estimation, Reporting and Accounting but in accordance with with the invitation to the IPCC (decision 2/CMP.7) the structure of the 2003 GPG has to be the starting point and has to be maintained to the extent possible.</p>	
G_0046	Puolakka, Paula	2.8		1	1	<p>As a reporting person it is difficult to understand what must be reported and what will be accounted for and if these two differ. Maybe all guidance related to FMRL could be under 2.8.5 and not mixed with reporting guidance.</p>		<p>Accept with modification. Shortcomings of the text were addressed as identified with the aim to provide clear guidance in Section 2.8. Proposals for reporting tables including information in FMRL were also added to Section 2.8.</p>	
G_0047	Radunsky, Klaus		0			<p>First of all I would like to thank all CLAs and LAs for their great effort to come to grips with that challenging task. However, the outcome shows that the product might not be fit for purpose. One of the reasons is that we do not start from scratch but that GHG inventories have been prepared using the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-use change and Forestry. The supplementary guidance need to be linked to the existing guidance in a much more transparent manner. One option would be to use the existing GPG-LULUCF and insert changes in track-change mode and explain the suggested amendment linking every amendment to the driving element of the new decisions regulating the LULUCF sector and/or the decision to substitute the 1996 IPCC Reporting GL by the 2006 IPCC Reporting GL. Another reason is that the operational text of the supplement is not consistent with the ambition: the introduction says that "This document covers supplementary estimation and inventory reporting requirements needed for accounting under the Kyoto Protocol. It does not address the implementation of accounting rules as agreed in relevant decisions of the CMP." However, the statement in the caption of table 2.1.1 saying that "Management activities cannot create "unmanaged land" may have significant accounting implications as there have been cases in the past that countries decided to reconsider the status of forests and change its status from managed to unmanaged. This more cautious approach with respect to the development of the 2013 KP Supplement should help to avoid lengthy debates later on that might result in not very fruitful discussions under the compliance committee later on. It will be extremely important that for the government review a document that meets the above requirements will be available. Otherwise there is the significant risk that adoption/acceptance by the Plenary cannot be achieved.</p>		<p>Accept with modification. Although it is not feasible to show all changes in track changes mode as there are too many changes, consistency with the structure of 2003 GPG has been maintained.</p>	
G_0048	Radunsky, Klaus		0			<p>It is noted that the text includes reference to the Marrakesh Accords (e.g. page 2.97, 2nd para under 2.5.3.1.). It is obvious that this is the result of copy and paste from the IPCC GPG LULUCF. However, such reference might be confusing now, for a IPCC GPG for the 2nd commitment period. It is suggested to avoid any such reference to the Marrakesh Accord but substitute it by a reference to the relevant CMP decision for the 2nd commitment period.</p>		<p>Accept. All references to decisions have been updated.</p>	
G_0049	Rock, Joachim	1, 2		all	all	<p>There are two problems recurring multiple times in the text: "georeferencing" and confusion of Reporting Method and inventory method. "Georeferencing" can be done by several techniques, however, quite often only estimation of boundaries is mentioned in the text, also often in a prescriptive way, precluding other approaches. This is wrong. The main goal of this text is to help to estimate GHG emissions and removals. If this is done by using total area affected by e.g. an activity and applying an emission factor, what counts is the total area, not its boundaries. Area can be estimated in various ways, delineating is but one and not necessarily the most precise or accurate one. The Reporting Method is, simply, the way the information is aggregated and presented. It is not the way the information is gathered and obtained. At some places the authors seem to mix this up and, by wording text referring to RM in a way that aims at inventory methods, penalise the one or the other Reporting Method and / or inventory method.</p>		<p>Accept. We have revised the text to clarify some of these points - but not all - and we do not agree that this is only about estimation - the guidance is also about reporting and that has to be reflected in the text.</p>	
G_0050	Schlesinger, Peter		2	484	688	<p>the page numbers of the PDF document are all incorrect. The sections are correct, but the document page numbers are wrong</p>		<p>Accept. Page numbers have been corrected.</p>	

G_0051	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				<p>Overall comments: This document states in the introduction that it describes the methods and good practice for assessing GHG emissions and carbon stock changes resulting from LU, LUC and forestry, whereby 'activities' are included that are addressed under the articles 3.3 (mandatory) and 3.4 (voluntary, elected per country). Activities that are recently included are drainage of wetlands and rewetting of wetlands (negative and positive, resp. for reporting/accounting). Some remarks (are given as the following comments):</p>	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Noted	
G_0052	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				<p>Currently, in this FOD, WRD activities are the lowest in hierarchy to be accounted for in emission inventories: (line 175, 'wetland drainage and rewetting, being limited to lands that are not accounted for under any other activity, has the lowest position in the hierarchy among elected activities under Article 3.4' and lines 6175-6177: WDR activities are limited to lands that are not accounted for under other activities). Most (lines 6177 onwards) will be reported under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Forest land Management (FM) o In the case of conversion to forest: AR / D o If countries elect Crop Management (CM), Grassland Management (GM) or Revegetation (RE) WRD could fall under these categories. <p>Is this really the case? Are ongoing emissions from drainage of peatsoils fully being addressed under AR / D? We don't think so. In all other cases, these categories are being elected or not (voluntary). A country could skip reporting all of these categories. This has large influence on emission reporting knowing that peatland emissions from drained peat are one of the key GHG sources in the world.</p> <p>Suggestion: make WRD a mandatory category for reporting, preferably splitting this up in WD (drainage) and WR (rewetting), as this is the case for AR (afforestation/reforestation) and D (deforestation). This could be realised in STEP 1 and STEP 2 on pages 5 and 6 by creating a hierarchy of the various activities based on significance of source. Wetlands drainage is a major source/sink which in our opinion has to be accounted for in IPCC accounting/reporting in any case, also since the aim of IPCC is to reduce emissions worldwide. This means at least that the largest sources have to be addressed and that projects that aim emissions reduction have to be stimulated. There shall be a possibility that reporting on WDR activities (soil component) are being combined with reporting on e.g. AR activities (AGB component) or FM (forest management) activities. What is the reason that WDR activities are not allowed to be combined with others, while there is a total separation between sources and sinks (soil/biomass)?</p>	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Accept with modification. We need to distinguish between methods to estimate E/R and places where these are reported (and accounted). We improved the text to make this distinction.	
G_0053	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				<p>The focus seems on LUC, rather than on LU. Emissions from peatland drainage are not mainly caused by land use change, but rather by the land use itself. An initial emission peak will follow after land use change (drainage of peat) which is a one-point emission in time, while emission resulting from peatland drainage is a continuous process in time. Hooijer and Couwenberg (subm.) suggest a value of 55-73 t CO₂ ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ for continuous peat emissions from drained, managed peat in tropical regions, for the range of best to common practice. Given the significance of the source and the continuity of emissions (not only in the tropics, but the same is true for temperate peats and boreal peats), we would suggest to account for peat related activities (WDR) in any case and to make this mandatory. As soon as there is a peat component there shall be accounted for, and shall be combined with reporting of other sources and sinks related to other activities. A main question: again, where is election for the various 3.4 activities based on? This is not clear, and why shall countries choose the activities that have a negative influence on their GHG inventory. The election of activities shall be based on significance of source/sink strength.</p>	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Accept with modification. The comment is a misunderstanding of the accounting. WDR deals with human-induced changes in water table that lead to drainage or rewetting. These can happen within a land-use category or be associated with land use change. When such changes in water table occur on land that is accounted under ARD, FM, CM or GM, the related emissions and removals are reported under these activities. When the land is not accounted elsewhere and WDR is elected, they are reported under WDR.	
G_0054	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				<p>Throughout the document the focus is very much on 'forest' related activities. In examples, text boxes, 'STEPS' etc. never the WRD activities are mentioned. In the specific comments, some suggestions are given, however, this has consequently to be maintained throughout the whole document. And example is paragraph 1.1: STEPS are given to determine area for a certain activity and for stratification of these areas, however, this is only being done for ARD and FM activities. WRD activities have different requirements, different stratifications. This shall be discussed and translated in STEPS as well. E.g. Remote sensing is mentioned as an approach for stratify the country based on LU/land cover to focus on CO₂ emissions through loss of live biomass. RS can not yet been used for determining peat-loss (carbon loss through oxidation) and not for stratification based on water level.</p>	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Accept with modification We increased the references to other activities.	

G_0055	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				This document states in the introduction that it describes the methods and good practice for assessing GHG emissions and carbon stock changes resulting from LU, LUC and forestry. The title of Chapter 2 shall be changes accordingly. The title of Chapter 2 now suggests that it is about reporting of LULUCF activities only, however, its about methods for estimating and reporting GHG and C resulting from these activities	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Accept with modification. While we agree with the observation we decided to maintain the title to remain consistent with the GPG (but we can reconsider for the final draft).	
G_0056	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				The order of paragraphs and sections is confusing, specifically that of chapter 2.3 – 2.4. We don't understand the logic behind it. In the specific comments some suggestions are given. Section 2.3.9 on (natural) disturbances is too long compared to the other sections.	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Reject. Order of sections follows the GPG LULUCF. Some new sections dealing with the new reporting requirements have been added. Section 2.3.9 deals with a substantial new area and because we need to maintain the 2003 GPG structure this section is rather long.	
G_0057	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				It is perhaps better to separate WD (source) and WR (sink) (note AR (sink) and D(source)), e.g. in Fig 2.1.2 and in the text.	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Reject. This would not be consistent with decision text (but we agree that for estimation methods will differ).	
G_0058	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				If forest fires are accounted for as 'disturbance', also peat fires shall be accounted for and being reported. Looking at significance of source/sink strength, this is globally a major source resulting from (directly and indirectly) human induced drainage of peat (on- and off site impacts).	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Accept. "Peat fires" occurring on lands subject to any KP activity have to be reported and accounted accordingly, not as a separate "type".	
G_0059	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.	2			(Inclusion of WDR) shall consistently be done throughout the entire document, also in Chapter 2.	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Accept. References to WRD increased where appropriate	
G_0060	Schrier-Uijl, Arina P.				There shall be made reference to the Wetland Supplement more frequently.	Attachment_G_0051-0063	Accept. References to Wetlands Supplement have been made where appropriate	
G_0061	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_G_0051-0063	Reject. There is no guidance on Article 6 in the supplement.	
G_0062	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_G_0051-0063	Reject. Noted but we maintain the structure of the 2003 GPG	
G_0063	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_G_0051-0063	Reject. Noted but we maintain the structure of the 2003 GPG	
G_0064	Schwarze, Reimund				(I am unfortunately unable to continue to review beyond Chap. 2 bc. of deadline approaching today!)		Noted	
G_0065	Sperow, Mark	References			Formatting is not consistent throughout the references section.		Accept. Efforts have been made to improve the formatting.	
G_0066	Weiss, Peter	2_2_2			This chapter (already in the IPCC GPG 2003) provides rather theoretical and detailed approaches, that in real do seldom have any chance of practical realisation. It seems to be based on a too narrow interpretation of Para 6 in Decision 15/CMP1. The chapter should be redrafted to better meet what is feasible and done by the countries (for instance in reporting during CPI and accepted by the reviews) in line with para 6 in Decision 15/CMP1. See also related comments below to later chapters. Is this chapter really needed, or wouldn't it be sufficient to link to section 2.3 representing land areas		Reject. The guidance provided will be widely accepted and implemented.	
G_0067	Woodfield, Michael	0	1		It would be helpful to have a contents list which shows that there are 2 chapters		Reject. The formatting follows the IPCC style.	