

<General review comments by experts on Second Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
GE_E_001	Ambulkar, Archis		Although "Table of Contents" is provided for each chapter separately, it might be helpful to have an overall "Table of Content" for the whole report at the beginning before "Overview" Section.		Accept	
GE_E_002	Ambulkar, Archis	0	Since so many terms and their abbreviations are used in the report, it might be helpful to include an Index of all the terms at the beginning or end of the report for ease of readers.		Accept. List of Abbreviations has been added.	
GE_E_003	Ambulkar, Archis	Overview	Term "revegetation" used in this and other chapters should be revised as "re-vegetation"		Reject."Revegetation" has been used in the UNFCCC decisions.	
GE_E_004	Ambulkar, Archis	Overview	Term "interannual" used in this and other chapters should be revised as "inter-annual"		Reject."Interannual" is correct.	
GE_E_005	Ambulkar, Archis	1	Term "devegetation" used in this and other chapters should be revised as "de-vegetation"		Reject. "Devegetation" is correct.	
GE_E_006	Araki, Makoto	All	I do not have any particular comments		Noted.	
GE_E_007	Bianchini Junior, Irineu		OVERALL COMMENT: I reviewed Chapter 1 and almost the entire Chapter 2. In general the chapters are well written. Sometimes, it was difficult to follow how these chapters are linked with the IPCC 2006 guidance. It may be useful to add 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. 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. It is necessary to make a text more friendly to facilitate the understanding of users.		Accept. The acronyms are explained when used first time in the text, following general practice in published texts. This approach allows avoiding longer text. Special boxes make explicit the links with IPCC 2006. List of Abbreviations has been added. It already contains boxes containing links to 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Wetlands Supplement and other section of the Supplement	
GE_E_008	Gao, Qingxian	0	In the whole report the abbreviation of FM,FMRL,AR and HWP are suggested to be uniform.		Accept. Abbreviations and acronyms have been used consistently.	

<General review comments by experts on Second Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
GE_E_009	Gao, Qingxian	2	This special report is a guideline, but the contents of this chapter are too general, especially, there are no clear definition of scope for some calculation methods. The relevant content, methodologies are suggested to be further refined for more transparency.		Accept with modification. This is a supplement to be read in conjunction with the 2006 GLs. Links to the relevant sections of the 2006 GLs have been clarified.	
GE_E_010	Gao, Qingxian	2	In this chapter, each section is not balanced, some sections are too short and some sections are too long. For example, the section 2.3.9.6 is too short, there is only one paragraph, and the section 2.3.9.7 is too long. So the modification is suggested for the author to balance each section in this chapter.		Accept with modification. While length is not the same as balance. Implemented as much as possible, under condition to provide essential information at the right section.	
GE_E_011	Goheer, Muhammad Arif	2	The chapter is well composed, nicely written and well interwoven. It properly links to various sections within the same chapter and also with various volumes of 2006 Guidelines.		Noted.	
GE_E_012	Gyldenkaerne, Steen	General	Whenever there is a reference to Agriculture (and its related reporting), is that reference to the current reporting CRF tables where N <sub>2</sub> O and CH <sub>4</sub> from agriculture is reported in table 4X or is it to the 2006 IPCC guidelines. In the latter we are talking about AFOLU and the "former agriculture" is part of Table 3X. Check for consistency.		Accept. References to reporting tables have been checked and clarified.	
GE_E_013	Kasimir Klemedtsson, Åsa		A final reflexion. The guidelines show the difficulty to make clear guidelines on decisions made by the CMP, which shall lead to transparent Kyoto-reporting by Parties. This complexity of rules is a risk for both avoidance of emission reporting and double counting. We can only hope for more simple rules to come the next period.		Noted	
GE_E_014	Lund, H. Gyde	References	Consider providing URLs for all the references where they exist and the date accessed. If you list for one, you should list for all.		Accept with modification. URLs have been provided for sources that can only be accessed online.	
GE_E_015	Lund, H. Gyde	References	Be consistent in how year is presented - with brackets as in line 7271 or without as in 7274		Accept. Consistency in presenting years has been ensured.	
GE_E_016	Pan, Xubin	0	I suggest to use Forest Management, Grassland Management, Cropland Management, Wetland Management, Settlement and other to organize the Chapter 2.		Reject. Names of Art. 3.3 and 3.4 activities are the same as those given in the UNFCCC decisions.	

<General review comments by experts on Second Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
GE_E_017	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	General comment	<b>Extensive.</b> The document is very long with a high level of repetition throughout the document. One example: the definition “Wetland drainage and Rewetting” is a system of practices that.....or total partial reversal of drainage’ is being mentioned at least four times in the document (page O.5, page 1.3, page 2.165, page G5). There is a need for ‘bullet-style-lists’ and summaries throughout the document (180+ pages!) and avoidance of repetition.		Accept with modification. Changes have been made wherever necessary to make the document concise and easy-to-read.	
GE_E_018	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	General comment	<b>Base year.</b> There is a need for defining ‘base-year’ in either the introduction or the beginning of chapter 2. Currently explanation is scattered over the document which is confusing. Perhaps it would be good to have a paragraph on ‘instructions’ on how to choose a base year. Choosing a ‘right’ base year is important since e.g. climatic and environmental conditions as well as natural disturbances such as fires might differ, considerably between years. This paragraph could e.g. describe: Base year or business as usual scenario (line 496). When choosing just one base year, and when choosing longer term averages (lines 1866-1868); establishing a baseline by extrapolation (lines 2871-2875) Or specifically: instructions when NOT choosing a year as a base year.		Accept with modification. “Base year” in the context of KP and UNFCCC reporting has been defined in the Glossary. Choice of base year is outside the scope of this document.	
GE_E_019	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	General comment	<b>Fire.</b> The document gives good guidance on reporting/assessing of LULUCF related GHG emissions. The document in this context describes wildfires in forests. Note that peat fires are a significant GHG source in at least tropical zones. As an indirect result of drainage and management activities, fire frequency increases (Hope <i>et al.</i> , 2005). Drainage of peat will lead to peat oxidation and a higher frequency of forest and peat fires, resulting in an increase in GHG emissions and carbon losses (Gomeiro <i>et al.</i> , 2010). Couwenberg (2010) estimated a release of 260 t C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> during the 1997 peat fires in Southeast Asia, which corresponded well with the estimates of van der Werf <i>et al.</i> (2008) and Page <i>et al.</i> (2002). Limin <i>et al.</i> (2004) estimated a carbon emission of 186 and 475 t C ha <sup>-1</sup> for the drought years 2002 and 1997, respectively. Peat does seldom burn when it’s wet, so, peat fires are often related to drainage (human induced). There shall be more attention in this document for <b>peat fires</b> . Also non-catastrophic forest fires (LUC) such as 1) rotational burning of crops 2) clearance of forest etc. Perhaps it shall be mentioned under ‘identifying the land subject to FM with its specified forest management practices’.		Accept with modification. Peat fires in lands under the respective KP activities. Information on estimation of emissions from peat fires is included in the Wetlands Supplement. Suitable references to the WS have been added.	
GE_E_020	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	General comment	<b>Reporting requirements.</b> It is unclear what exactly is meant by ‘reporting requirements’, what the different reporting requirements are for LUC, articles 3.3 and 3.4 etc, and where they are listed (either reference or explanation in the text). There seem to be ‘new’ reporting requirements for ‘the second commitment period’, but where are they? And how do they differ from the reporting requirements of the first commitment period; reference needed.		Accept with modification. Overview Chapter provides a summary of the new reporting requirements. References to the relevant paragraphs in the CMP decisions have been provided wherever applicable.	

<General review comments by experts on Second Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
GE_E_021	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	General comment	<b>Elected activities.</b> Countries can elect activities for reporting; Please explain where this election shall be based on. In our opinion, the election shall have a basis such as the significance of source/sink of GHG's. The document reports the following: Line 387: 'Parties elect the reporting hierarchy among elected activities of CM, GM and RV'.Line 6839: 'Generally, all lands subject to RV since 1 January 1990 should be tracked in agreement with the national criteria that establish a hierarchy among Article 3.4 activities (if applicable) as explained in Section 1 of this report'.		Reject. The election of Article 3.4 activities is voluntary and is to be decided by the respective Party. It is not possible to provide this information in a policy-neutral fashion	
GE_E_022	Schrier-Uijl, Arina		It would be good to add clear information/guidance on where the hierarchy has to preferably be based on. Or is this something countries have to find out their selves.		Accept with modification	The hierarchy is derived from CMP decisions and explained in chapter 1.2.
GE_E_023	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	General comments	<b>WRD.</b> Inclusion of WRD in the general parts of chapters 1 and 2 shall be improved. E.g. include examples of WRD. At least one example has been added compared to the FOD in line 710 onwards, however, this is a relatively rare situation of dying of forest after rewetting where rewetting is mentioned as a natural force that has negative impact only. Its good to also mention an example of human induced rewetting of peat and having WDR as elected activity. Why restriction of 1 ha, while for all other activities there are no restrictions in terms of areal? More logical to split drainage and rewetting in to different activities, like has been done for deforestation and reforestation, afforestation. Different factors play a role, drainage and rewetting are not the exact opposite of each other. Table 2.12.1 also separates the two activities in the examples.		Accept.	The WDR definition including 1 ha results from CMP decisions, see footnote 3 of SOD. Chapter 1 includes WDR in examples 8, 10 and 11.
GE_E_024	Schrier-Uijl, Arina	General comment	<b>Explanation on ranking of the activities.</b> Explanation is still missing on ranking, is it Based on significance of activity in term of GHG emission reduction or increase? Based on the IPCC's historical structures For having the main focus on forest?		Accept with modification	The hierarchy is derived from CMP decisions and explained in chapter
GE_E_025	Sheppard, Margaret	All	This document focuses on LULUCF and does not look at other areas covered in the previous Good Practice Guidance that are my areas of expertise. Therefore, my comments will be brief and based on format rather than substance. Perhaps there could be a brief statement that the other sections of the Good Practice Guidance still apply.		Accept with modification. Only the parts on projects still apply	
GE_E_026	Dr. Trömel, Silke		agreed, no objections		Noted	
GE_E_027	Warsta, Elina		I would suggest to add a list of all abbreviations (spelled out) at the beginning of the document. For the moment abbreviations are explained when they are mentioned at the first time in the text, but as there are so many of them, it would be good for the reader to be able to refer easily to the abbreviations list. At the moment it is rather difficult to remember all the abbreviations, which makes the reading process rather slow.		Accept. List of abbreviations has been added.	

<General review comments by experts on Second Order Draft of KP Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter/Section	Comment	Supplementary documents	Authors' action	Authors' note
GE_E_028	Wiseman, Mike		No other comments as I unfortunately had a bereavement in the close family please accept my apologies		Noted	