

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10001	Wagner, Fabian	1	0	0	General	Chapter 1 is well structured and generally clear in its objective and execution. What is still confusing is the relationship between the six categories and the description in this chapter. Maybe it would help to explain this further. For example: "While one of the six categories in 2006GL is Wetlands (capital W), wetlands can occur also in the other categories. For example, drainage ditches may already be included in Cropland or Grassland as part of a larger cropping or grazing area. In this document methodologies for estimating emissions and removals from these wetlands are provided, as well as reporting guidance."		Accept but differently address	See response for comment 10491
10002	Wagner, Fabian	1	0	0	General	Suggest not to use the word "impact" in the context of the consequences this Wetlands Supplement has on the existing guidance. "Consequence" is a perfectly good term.		Accept	Agree, changes suggested. Line 54, delete "(directly) impacted by" and insert "consequences of". Line 304 replace "impact" with "consequences"
10003	Wagner, Fabian	1	0	1	General	It may be useful to introduce an efficient cross-referencing system to the 2006GL. Especially in Sections 1.6 and Table 1.4 it is rather cumbersome to have long references like (Volume4, Chapter 2), where you could write, e.g. 2006IPCC 4(2) or V2C4.		Accept	the following simplified approach would be used Volume 4, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1 would be written as 2006 Guidelines Vol. 4, Sec. 2.3.1

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10004	Bratton, John	1	1	1	General	<p>This is a very comprehensive and generally well-written addition to IPCC guidance on treatment of wetlands in national greenhouse gas inventories. I reviewed the organization of the entire document and spent more time on sections relevant to my own expertise, particularly Ch. 4 (Coastal Wetlands). There are relatively few missing environments, concepts, or approaches in the guidance. Recognizing that this is a draft, there were several sections that could be improved by some close proofreading and editorial work, but perhaps that is more properly left for a later version. The comments below include a few specific errors, but mostly some references to other research that could be considered in slightly revising certain sections of the document. A recent national-scale reference that should be reviewed is: Zhu, Zhiliang, ed., Bergamaschi, Brian, Bernknopf, Richard, Clow, David, Dye, Dennis, Faulkner, Stephen, Forney, William, Gleason, Robert, Hawbaker, Todd, Liu, Jinxun, Liu, Shuguang, Prisley, Stephen, Reed, Bradley, Reeves, Matthew, Rollins, Matthew, Sleeter, Benjamin, Sohl, Terry, Stackpoole, Sarah, Stehman, Stephen, Striegl, Robert, Wein, Anne, and Zhu, Zhiliang, 2010, A method for assessing carbon stocks, carbon sequestration, and greenhouse-gas fluxes in ecosystems of the United States under present conditions and future scenarios: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2010–5233, 188 p. (Also available at http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2010/5233/.) (Supersedes U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2010–1144.)</p>		Noted	Noted, more relevant to other chapters. TSU will ensure other chapters are aware of this new reference.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10005	Bratton, John	1	1	417		Unclear whether invasive species introductions are considered human changes considered human changes (e.g., phragmites); associated GHG impact? Fig. 1.4: typo "Rewettied/Restored" in Ch. 3 picture title; line 271 typo: drainage (e.g., 'hydrotorf' procedures) hydroturf?; line 398, studies, combined with earlier habitat and ecosystem studies, allow to make a coarse estimate (awk); In 417 national inventory examined here, it has been assumed that this CH4emission (no space); other typos fairly common here		Accept	Determining whether lands are considered "managed" under the IPCC definition is a decision left to the country--this would include deciding whether invasive species constitute a land being considered "managed" and therefore part of the GHG inventory. This is discussed in section 1.5 "Managed Wetlands" in Chapter 1 of the Wetlands Supplement. The typo in figure 1.4 "Rewettied" will be corrected. Line 271 "hydrotorf" will be changed to "hydroturf". Line 398 to fix awkward sentence structure, insert "experts" after "allow". Line 417, space will be added between "CH4" and "emission". Other typos will be identified and corrected.
10006	Bratton, John	1	1	1		General topics that should be included or treated more fully in this version or a later one: broader agricultural uses of wetlands and associated GHG emissions (e.g., cranberry bogs, marsh hay operations, alligator aquaculture, turtle aquaculture, frog aquaculture, oyster and mussel aquaculture); other human impacts from Canadian tar sand mining; permafrost thawing impacts on GHGs, including thermokarst lakes (thaw bulbs) and submarine permafrost melting on Arctic continental shelves		Reject	It is not possible to provide specific guidance on every activity, the inventory compiler must utilize the existing guidance in 20006 GL and supplemental guidance in chapters 2-6 to estimate the emissions/removals from these activities. The guidance employed will depend on the specific actions involved with these activities, much of which will vary depending on local practices.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10007	Tuomainen, Tarja	1	1	1	1	In chapters 2 and 3 is referred several times to peatland types and peat types. Suggest to include definition or some explanation of these into Ch1.		Accept but differently address	A glossary will be included once the Supplement is developed that includes important definitions such as this. Chapter 1 should not provide a definition for every term used in the Supplement as it will make it too cumbersome. The Glossary will fill this role.
10008	FAGGI, Ana	1	28			delete the superscripts "3)" and "4)".		Accept	Noted, the superscripts will be removed
10009	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	45	63	1	The invitation from SBSTA 33 (FCCC/SBSTA/2010/13) asked IPCC to undertake work on wetlands, focusing on the rewetting and restoration of peatlands. However, the outline of supplement shows that rewetting takes only 1/5 of the report and word "restoration" does not appear in titles of chapters at all. It is not clear by which decision this supplement also covers coastal and inland mineral wetlands, as well as constructed wetlands?? some clarifications on legal matter is needed.		Accept but differently address	Agreed, some discussion on why the wetlands supplement goes beyond the initial IPCC 33 decision to undertake work on wetlands, focusing on the rewetting and restoration of peatlands needs to be explained in the Overview Chapter
10010	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	49			provide full name for UNFCCC		Accept	Agreed, will provide full name of United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
10011	Wagner, Fabian	1	51	51	1	of filling in the gaps should read "of filling the gaps"		Accept	Agreed, will change to "...with a view to filling in ...

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10012	Du, Rui	1	53	54	1	greenhouse gas from organic soils and wetlands		Accept but differently address	suggest changing text to the following to more accurately reflect the purpose of the wetlands supplement "...reporting greenhouse gas emissions and removals from wet/dry organic soils, wet mineral soils and constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment, in so far as they are consequences of human activities ("managed").
10013	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	53	53	1	Coment: wetlands can be source or sinks of GHG to the atmosphere Action: include "and removals" after "reporting greenhouse gas emissions" and before "from"		Accept	Agreed, on line 53 include "and removals" after "reporting greenhouse gas emissions" and before "from"
10014	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	54	54	1	the definition of managed lands should be in accordance to 2006 Guidelines and last decisions on this matter of Parties. The source or reference from which document definition is taken should be provided in brackets after it.		Accept but differently address	Noted. Definition of managed wetlands is discussed in rows 112-116 and also in Section 1.5.
10015	Wagner, Fabian	1	54	54	1	Suggest to use "influenced" instead of "impacted"		Accept but differently address	Agree. The word "iimpacted" will be replaced with alternative word choice
10016	Wagner, Fabian	1	56	63	1	suggest to add actual chapter numbers here		Accept	Agree. Chapter numbers will be provided for each bullet point between lines 56-63

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10017	Kolka, Randy	1	68	68	1	And throughout chapter one, use the term "wetland soils" not "wet soils"		reject	Need to clarify within chapter and amongst other chapters which wording we will use throughout document
10018	Wagner, Fabian	1	68		1	suggest to write "guides" instead of "can be used to guide" (the latter suggests that there is someone who uses the chart to guide someone else)		accept	Or can be stated as " can be used to guide the inventory compiler..." Ken: "can be used as a guide by the inventory compiler"
10019	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	68	69		use of decision tree very appropriate		Noted	
10020	Kishitomo, Ayaka	1	71	73	1	This Wetlands Supplement does not deal with "flooded land" and "rice paddy", it may need to stipulate in the texts.		Accept	Scope of supplement is outline in section 1.1 and rice and flooded land are not included in the scope. It will be clearly mentioned in Section 1.1 in the SOD.
10021	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	71	73	1	Figure 1.1 - Excellent key. The IPCC should consider adding such a key to for all six land categories. See http://home.comcast.net/~gyde/Guide_for_classifying_GHG.pdf as an example.		Accept	Will replace "Start" in Fig. 1.1 with the text "Land Use Category" to make it clear that Fig. 1.1 is applicable to all IPCC land use categories. Will also add short text to clarify this.
10022	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	71	73	1	Consider repeating the minimum area requirements (national choice between 0.05 and 1.0 ha) at the start of this flow chart as a reminder.		Reject	This minimum area requirement is the one under the Kyoto Protocol, not suggested by the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10023	PACIORNIK, Newton	1	71	73		In Figure 1 changes references "Chapter x" to "Chapter x of this Supplement" for clarity. This may apply also to references throughout the text.		Accept	I would suggest we change them to Chapter X, this supplement; for the flooded lands we ought to change the box to chapter 7, 2006 IPCC Wetlands guidelines
10024	PENMAN, Jim	1	71			No reason to put inverted commas around flooded land in box 3; suggest remove.		Reject	noted
10025	Gao, Qingxian	1	71	73	1	In the decision tree step 2 indicate that "Soil organic and/or wet" is the criteria for wetlands, if "No" refers to "2006 IPCC Guidelines", which chapter is suggested to be listed. And according to Box 1.1 of this chapter "the definitions of wetlands", the "Organic" is not a specific standard for Wetlands. Organic soil is not only existed in wetlands. The express of "is the soil organic and/or wet" is esay confused for reader. Between step 5 and 6, there is a judgement box "Is the soil organic?", why? Because the step 2 has already make the decision about "is Organic or not". According to Figure 1.4, Chapter 5 is relevant to "Other Freshwater wetlands".		Accept but differently address	Plan to standardize wording around organic/wet soils for all chapters, see comment 35. Once we decide on the wording, we will update this question accordingly.
10026	Wagner, Fabian	1	71	72	1	Wetlands Supplement instead of "Supplement"		Accept	Agree to change to "Wetlands Supplement"
10027	Radunsky, Klaus	1	72	73	1	It is suggested to include "Supplement" as appropriate when identifying the various chapters in figure 1.1		Accept	in the boxes in fig 1.1 add Wetlands Supplement before the chapter

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10028	Sookun, Anand	1	73	73	1	Can the flowchart include what report we are referring to for Chapters 2, 3,4,5,6 etc.; as pointed out in the other diamonds in the flowchart; e.g. "Use 2006 IPCC, Guidelines, Chapter 7". CAN WE PUT "Use this reports chapter 2, 3 etc.?"		Accept	See above
10029	Wagner, Fabian	1	73		1	on the "No" leading to Chapter 3, the comment is unclear. Is the questions "Is the soil drained?" supposed to be equivalent to "Is the soil wet or rewetted?"		Accepted but differently addressed	Change Step 6 diamond to: Have the soils been purposefully drained? No (soils have not been drained or sites have been rewetted/restored)
10030	Wagner, Fabian	1	73		1	A little confusing is the fact that Chapter 4 and 5 are in reverse order relative to the boxes of the other chapters. This makes readers wonder whether the chapter ordering of the document is useful		Accepted but differently addressed	We could change order of the chapters but this is a decision of others beyond chap 1

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10031	FRIBORG, Thomas	1	74	92	1.2	Most commonly I think that e.g. "rewetted wetlands" have their basis in a natural wetland, which size has been increased due to human activities (dams, reshaping of rivers ect.), in which case they fall only partly within the category .The categories seems too ridget to my mind, in the sense that I believe most European Wetlands exists because of a combination of natural and human conditions. Please consider revising the categories baring in mind examples of the history of wetlands, which you feel should belong in one category or the other.		Reject	Rewording the definition is beyond the scope of this report.
10032	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	74	75	1.2	According to the Durban desion 2/CMP.7, "wetland drainage and rewetting" is a new activity under the Kyoto Protocol (second commitment period). Authors might want to explore possible ramifications of this, and possible links to the new IPCC Guidance on Chapter 4 of the GPG 2003, to be updated.		rejected	Beyond the scope of this report
10033	Wagner, Fabian	1	74	78	1	Authors may want to clarify whether, in case there are wetlands in more than one of the six categories, the estimation has to be done separately for each of the areas falling into the different categories.		Accept	Good suggestion. This will be clarified either in the Fig. 1.1 footnotes or in the main text.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10034	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	76	77	0	Considering that the scope is to prepare estimates of carbon stock changes, and other non-CO2 emissions, I would suggest to rephrase as: "These categories will need to be subdivided into sub-categories with similar vegetation, management practices, and carbon stocks for the purpose of estimating carbon stock changes and other emissions"		Accept but differently address	Suggest changing text to " These categories can be further divided into sub-categories with similar characteristics for the purpose of estimating emissions and removals."
10035	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	76	76	1	Coment: it says that the categories "will need" to be subdivided- as far as I know, according to 2003 LULUCF GPG, the categories "may require" subdivision. Action: Replace the mandatory requirement by "may require"		Accept but differently address	see comment 10034
10036	Vitullo, Marina	1	76	77	1	Change of the text "These categories will need to be subdivided into sub-categories with similar vegetation, use and properties for the purpose of estimating emissions and removals." as follow: "These categories may be further subdivided into sub-categories by ecosystem types, management regime, climatic zone and activity for the purpose of estimating emissions and removals."		Accept but differently address	see comment 10034

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10037	Ginzo, Hector	1	77	78	1	The sentence beginning 'This Wetlands Supplement...refers to land that may be classified into any of the six IPCC categories'. However, in lines 94-95 it is stated that the Supplement includes any land that does not fall into any of 'Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland or Settlements categories'. These two statements seem mutually contradictory.		Accept - will be addressed	In comment 10060 (addressing lines 94-95), we have suggested text changes to clarify this issue. Furthermore, we suggest moving discussion of which land categories this supplement addresses to section 1.1 to be one of the high level introductory comments made at the beginning of this chapter.
10038	Radunsky, Klaus	1	77	78	1	The last sentence of the para starting: "This Wetlands Supplement .." may be misleading. The following wording is suggested: This Wetlands Supplement covers land that has been wetland or is restored as wetland or that remains wetland.		Accept but differently address	see previous comment
10039	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	78	78	1	The IPCC distinguishes between land cover and land use. Land cover is "the observed physical and biological cover of the earth's land, as vegetation or man-made features." In contrast, land use is "the total of arrangements, activities, and inputs that people undertake in a certain land cover type" http://www.grida.no/publications/other/ipcc%5Fsr/?src=/climate/ipcc/land_use/045.htm . The six IPCC land categories are a mixture of use and cover. Forest land, grasslands and wetlands are cover categories. Therefore, here and elsewhere references to the 6 categories should be referred to as "land use/cover" or "land cover/use".		Reject	It is beyond the scope of this report to change the official IPCC terminology

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10040	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	79	81		I suggest to rephrase as: "Wet soils are inundated or saturated by water for all or part of the year to the extent that soil microbes and rooted plants adapted to anaerobic conditions control carbon stock changes and other emissions"		Accept but differently address	We suggest an entire rewrite for footnote 2 as follows: Organic soils are those containing high concentrations of organic carbon at or near the surface (see section 1.4). Wet soils, also referred to as "hydric soils", are defined as soils that formed under conditions of saturation, flooding, or ponding long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper part of the soil (USDA, NRCS. 2003 Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 5.01. G.W. Hurt, P.M. White, and R.F. Pringle (eds.). USDA, NRCS in cooperation with the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils, Fort Worth, TX.) For Tier 1 methods, we define the time period of inundation needed to develop anaerobic conditions in wet (hydric) soils with a sufficiently high probability to be at least 7 days during the growing season with a typical return period of 1 in 2 years.
10041	FRIBORG, Thomas	1	79	81	1.2	It may be very difficult to judge if soils are "saturated by water for all or part of the year to the extent that soil microbes and rooted plants adapted to anaerobic conditions control the greenhouse gas emissions" without measuring the annual gas exchange, please consider rephrasing.		Noted	See comment 10040

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10042	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	79	79	1	What does it take to make an organic layer "substantial?"		Noted	See comment 10040
10043	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	79	79	1	Consider putting quotes around organic soils as done for the other definitions.		Accept	
10044	Podest, Erika	1	79	81		it is stated that "wet soils are inundated or saturated by water for all or part of the year...". I suggest being more explicit and stating how many months is meant by "part of the year". State approximate range.		Noted	See comment 10040
10045	SHARMA, Chhemendra	1	79	79		There is a need to quantify by numbers to clarify what constitute 'substantial layer'		Noted	See comment 10040
10046	Huissteden, Ko van	1	82	84	1	add here water retention basins for river floodwater storage		Reject	The definiton we use here for Flooded Land conforms to what is used in the 2006 IPCC guidelines.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10047	Rock, Joachim	1	82	84	1	Fisheries are neither included nor excluded here, but can have a significant share in a regions' wetland / pond / lake area. It might thus be good to reference them here.		Reject	An outline discussion of ecosystem services is provided in section 1.5 and Table 1.3. Fisheries is included in Table 1.3
10048	FRIBORG, Thomas	1	84	84	1.2	I would here prefer "Artificial" rather than 'Constructed wetlands'		Reject	Constructed wetland is the agreed IPCC terminology.
10049	Kishitomo, Ayaka	1	85	90	1	Constructed wetlands and "Coastal wetlands" are defined at Chapter 6 and Chapter 4, respectively. It might be better to indicate "see Chapter 6/4" in the footnote.		Accept	On line 86 at the end of the sentence add (see Chapter 6) on line 90 at the end of the sentence add (see Chapter 4).
10050	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	85	85	1	Can't people construct wetlands for uses other than wastewater treatment? How about reservoirs, fish ponds, etc.? See line 98.		Reject	Yes, but we have been asked to give guidance only on constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.
10051	Xu, Xiaofeng	1	86	86	1	I suggest to add "for example rice paddies" at the end of the sentence.		Reject	Rice paddies are not included in the scope of this supplement

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10052	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	89	89	1	Consider defining 'mineral soils' or 'inland mineral soils' as they are mentioned quite frequently in throughout the text.		Accept	Cross-cutting issue and good point. We have defined wet soils in comment 10040 we could also need to discuss with Chapter 5 and add their definition of mineral soils at the bottom of line 81.
10053	FAGGI, Ana	1	91			footnote??		Accept - will be addressed	All of these comments (10053-10058 and 10566) refer to the sentence on line 91-91. This sentence should be rewritten to: " "Drained" refers to those wetland ecosystems whose hydrology has been altered to drier conditions for land use activities (agriculture, forestry etc.). "Rewetted" refers to those drained wetland ecosystems which have been restored to again meet the criteria of footnote 2) above."
10054	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	91	91	1	Reference to "footnote 2 above". There is no footnote 2 in this document.		Accept - will be addressed	See comment 10053.
10055	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	91	91	1	I did not find a "footnote 2" above...and I did not find any footnote 1 or a reference to it.		Accept - will be addressed	See comment 10053.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10056	Thomson, Amanda	1	91	92	1	There is a reference to 'footnote 2' but this list is not in a footnote. The 'drained' definition should include some reference to the water level lowering being human-induced/artificial		Accept - will be addressed	See comment 10053.
10057	Wagner, Fabian	1	91	92	1	use of quotation marks inconsistent with FN 2		Accept but differently address	See comment 10053.
10058	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	92	92	1	action: The word "currently" could be replaced by "in the moment of the estimation of emissions"		Accept - will be addressed	See comment 10053.
10059	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	92	92	1	Should 'rewetted' a definition number?		Reject	The sentence starting with "Rewetted" is part of the bullet number 6), and not an independent sentence. Therefore, the number will not be given before this sentence.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10060	Freibauer, Annette	1	93	151	1.3	the definition and coverage of "wetlands" as described in chapter 1.3 is inconsistent with the definitions in the 200 6GL and chapter 7. The information is not necessary in the Supplement. Furthermore, references are not the original literature with observations, which should be quoted here to support the statements. I suggest to delete chapter 1.3.		Accept	To replace lines 94 to 99 inclusive: "For the purpose of this supplement, a clear distinction is made between the IPCC land-use category Wetlands (Box 1.1.) and the ecosystem type "wet land". It is important to note that a wet land ecosystem can exist within any of the six IPCC land-use categories (Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements, Other Land). Guidance is provided within this supplement for managed wet land ecosystems which fall within each IPCC land-use category. Unless, otherwise stated, in this document the term "wetlands" refers to wet land ecosystem types. "It is also suggested that a subtitle be added to the Supplement that will help clarify to the inventory compiler what the supplement covers: "(Covering all Organic and Wet Soils Across all Six Land Use Categories)"
10061	PENMAN, Jim	1	93			suggested title: 1.3 DEFINITION, COVERAGE AND ECOLOGICAL FUNCTION OF WETLANDS		accept	That under advisement, may not be possible to change agreed title.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10062	Tiner, Ralph	1	93		1	<p>Definition and Coverage of Wetlands</p> <p>The wetland definition appears to include all waterbodies regardless of depth. Is this the intention? If so, I would suggest separating "wetlands" into shallow-water/saturated wetlands and deepwater wetlands for there should be significant differences in carbon sequestration and other functions. The former would include traditional wetlands (e.g., marshes, swamps, bogs, and fens) and shallow water habitat, while the latter would include deepwater aquatic habitats (>x meters).</p>		Note	In the context of the Supplement the land extent is that which is currently covered under IPCC 2006 definitions for land use. There is no intention to in include new categories of land use.
10063	Tiner, Ralph W.	1	93		1	<p>The wetland definition appears to include all waterbodies. If this is so, I'd recommend separating wetlands into two groups "shallow-water/saturated wetlands" and "deepwater wetlands". The former would include traditional wetlands - marshes, swamps, bogs, fens, and shallow-water habitat, while the latter would include deepwater habitats >x meters.</p>		Reject	In the context of the Supplement the land extent is that which is currently covered under IPCC 2006 definitions for land use. There is no intention to in include new categories of land use.
10064	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	93			<p><coverage> not clear. I would use 'function' and it will be consistent with maintaining C/N balance, and other ecosystem services on next page.</p>		Accept, but differently addressed.	That under advisement, may not be possible to change agreed title. Otherwise text may be added to clarify the term "coverage" in this context.
10065	Du, Rui	1	94	94	1	<p>For the purpose of this Supplement, wetlands include ""</p>		Reject	Noted

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10066	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	94	96	1	An odd beginning. The purpose of this supplement is not the same as of the IPCC 2006 guidelines. And should it not be chapter 7 instead of chapter 3?		Accept but differently address	Inconsistencies in definition will be addressed with revised text. See comment 10060
10067	Wagner, Fabian	1	94		1	this Wetlands Supplement, 'wetlands' instead of "this Supplement, Wetlands" or define alternative consistent rule for use of quotation marks in definitions		Accept but differently address	Inconsistencies in definition will be addressed with revised text. See comment 10060
10068	Wagner, Fabian	1	94	106	1	Pls make efficient use of quotation marks, caps und italics to properly distinguish the land use category and the actual land. Wetlands (caps) is one of the six categories, wetlands (lower case) can fall (according to footnote 1) into any of the six categories. This needs to be made very clear at the beginning, at the first reading I found this confusing.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.
10069	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	94	99		Some repetition with information in box occurs. I would reduce this paragraph by removing last 2 sentences and make reference to box # 1.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10070	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	95		1	Would it not be better to tell the reader what is included into ch7 wetlands of 2006 guidelines. That wet forests, crop- and grasslands are very superficially covered in other chapters, which needs co-herance and coverage.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.
10071	LANE, Charles R	1	95	96		is it not possible to have forested land that are wetlands? or are the descriptors of the land cover types sufficient to limit classification errors?		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.
10072	Podest, Erika	1	95	95		part of the year. Same as comment #10044.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.
10073	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	95	95	1	it says that for the purpose of this supplement wetlands includes land which does not fall into Forest Land, however in lines 74-78 it is clearly stated that the supplement covers wetlands that may be classified into any of the six of IPCC land-use categories. need for further clarification.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10074	Radunsky, Klaus	1	96	99	1	It is suggested to add some language clarifying whether this supplement addresses onyl managed wetlands or also unmanaged wetlands.		Accept with differently addressed	Unmanaged systems are outside the scope of the Supplement. See section 1.1 Background
10075	Smith, Keith	1	97	97	1	Good idea to explain (in footnote, perhaps) distinctions between swamps, marshes, fens, peatlands, bogs		Accept but differently address	This is addressed in the relevant chapters
10076	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	98	98	1	Line 85 only lists water wastelands.		Noted	The TFI are tasked to provide guidelines for constructed wetlands for waste treatment only (in the context of man-made wetlands). Addition text will be added to clarify the scope of the supplement.
10077	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	100	106	1	Consider moving the definition of wetlands to the start of the chapter.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10078	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	100	110	1	Which definition should nations use for reporting? Why are two definitions given? If I interpret the Ramsar definition correctly, wetlands would not include rivers and lakes that exceed 6 m deep whereas the IPCC definition would include them.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.
10079	PENMAN, Jim	1	100			Need to link the box to the text.		Accept	Revised text will be supplied to reference Box 1.1 in main text.
10080	Thomson, Amanda	1	100	110	1	Is Box1.1 cross-referenced anywhere in the text?		Accept	Revised text will be supplied to reference Box 1.1 in main text.
10081	Podest, Erika	1	104	104		part of the year. Same as comment #10044.		Accept but differently address	Guidance is provided in the relevant chapters as to when a land area should be consider a "wet land" in the context of the Supplement. Broadly speaking a "wet land" is one where the ecosystem has adapted with specific characteristics which allow it to cope with "wet" conditions.
10082	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	105	105	1	Should "other land" be listed as one of the categories as is done in line 78?		Reject	The IPCC guidelines for land use classification are based on a hierarchy approach, whereby "Wetlands" areas are identified before "Other Lands"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10083	Bratton, John	1	107	110		Section states: Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, Article 1.1: "Wetlands are areas of marsh, fen, peatland, or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water the depth of which at low tide does not exceed six meters." Given this, there is not much treatment in the document of submarine peat, submarine/subestuarine/sublacustrine sediments, mud flats, coral reefs, seagrass, etc. Perhaps this should be clarified? References to consider: J.J. Middelburg, G. Klaver, J. Nieuwenhuize, R.M. Markusse, T. Vlug, F.J.W.A. van der Nat, Nitrous oxide emissions from estuarine intertidal sediments, <i>Hydrobiologia</i> , 311 (1995), pp. 43–55; Bie, M.J.M. de; Middelburg, J.J.; Starink, M.; Laanbroek, H.J., Factors controlling nitrous oxide at the microbial community and estuarine scale, <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> , Volume: 240 (2002), pp. 1-9; Abril, Gwenael, and Iversen, Niels, 2002, Methane dynamics in a shallow non-tidal estuary: <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> , v. 230, p. 171 - 181; .		Accept but differently address	A useful comment. Additional text will be added to this and the relevant chapters if it is within the scope of the Supplement as set out under the UNFCCC decision.
10084	Podest, Erika	1	107	108		fen, peatland, or water. Just clarify if that means just open water.		Noted	This is a citation of the text in 2006 Guidelines.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10085	Wagner, Fabian	1	107	110	1	Quoting Ramsar is useful to provide context, but it may be further useful to highlight differences and maybe give an example where the IPCC GL are different, as you do for organic soils below in l. 168ff.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.
10086	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	112	113	1	Emissions should only be calculated for managed land, why national definitions on which land is managed or not, may result in underestimation of emissions. But I suppose this was something negotiated and agreed.		Note	Unmanaged systems are outside the scope of the Supplement. See section 1.1 Background
10087	PENMAN, Jim	1	113			comment: need to be more definite; suggested change: Wetlands should be subdivided into managed and unmanaged sub-categories. Managed wetlands are wetlands where the water table is artificially changed (e.g., lowered or raised) or those created through human activity		reject	The suggested ammendment to the text could be interpreted in a very restriction way, which is not the intention of the authors.
10088	Wagner, Fabian	1	113		1	e.g. should read "i.e.", because there do not seem to be any other possibilities (I understand that "e.g." is consistent with 2006GL)		rejected	Noted
10089	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	113			within <each> country		Accept	Noted
10090	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	114			through <other> human activity		rejected	Noted

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10091	PENMAN, Jim	1	116			suggested addition: Countries may have national definitions that elaborate these general definitions.		accept	Clarify if this is allowable. My understanding is that whilst a country can create subdivisions of existing categories, not to swap between categories
10092	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	117	117		I suggest to rephrase as: "Wetlands occur from the tundra to the tropics (see Figure 1.2) and shows high diversity in carbon stocks level and a high variability in carbon stock dynamics and fluxes of other emissions"		rejected	we want to express diversity in most general terms in this introduction. So: no change.
10093	PENMAN, Jim	1	117			suggested change: The total area of wetlands on Earth is not precisely known but they occur from the tundra to the tropics (see Figure 1.2) and are extremely diverse and variable. Lehner and Doll (2004) estimate that global wetlands (excluding lakes and reservoirs) cover about 8-10 million km ² , or 6.2-7.6% of the total global land surface.		rejected	same content as existing text. No change.
10094	Savolainen, Ikka	1	117	119	1	Because the primary data is expressed with one digit accuracy (8 - 10 million km ²), the secondary data (6.2 - 7.6%) should be expressed highest with the same accuracy. Instead of the numbers 6.2 - 7.6 use the numbers 6 - 8%.		accepted	okay, will be done
10095	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	117			are <> diverse		accepted	change "extremely" to "highly"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10096	Choowaew, Sansanee	1	118	119	1	any updated figures (after 2004) for global wetland extent ?		accepted	updated figures from new satellite data are included now
10097	Navarrete Encinales, Diego Alejandro	1	118	118	1	The name Doll from the cite "Lehner and Doll (2004)" in the text is wrong. It should be "Lehner and Döll (2004)", including the symbol "ö" over the "o".		accepted	will be corrected
10098	Podest, Erika	1	118	119		There have been other studies assessing global wetland coverage. Those should be mentioned too, rather than just 1 reference.		accepted	some other studies will be quoted.
10099	Schwendenmann, Luitgard	1	118	118	1	Lehner and Döll (not Doll)		accepted	see 126
10100	Xu, Xiaofeng	1	118	119	1	I suggest to add several more estimate of global wetland provided in Mitsch's book, for example Maltby and Turnver (1983), Matthews and Fung (1987), Aselmann and Crutzen (1989), Finlayson and Davidson (1999). Personally, I thought the estimate from Lehner and Doll (2004) is overestimated since the inland lakes and several other categories were included. (Page 46, table 3.1 in Mitsch and Gosselink, Wetland, 2007)		accepted	Estimates of wetland extent varies considerably from xxx to xxx (ref., ref., ref.) reflecting not only differences in accuracy of inventory but also different approaches to wetland definition. Wording adapted in this sense.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10101	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	118			<not precisely>: this is a dynamic surface so it cannot be precisely known. Just acknowledge this.		accepted	Agree, but in the context of an inventory the boundaries have to be sharp because the country has to come up with a concrete wetland extent and solve the issue of delineation
10102	Huissteden, Ko van	1	139	139	1	converted' - - better: 'affected'		Accept but differently address	we skipped the sentence
10103	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	119	119	1	But the authors include lakes and rivers in figure 1.2. See lines 121-122.		accepted	solved, because figure is replaced
10104	Navarrete Encinales, Diego Alejandro	1	119	119	1	The coverage area of wetlands around the world should be more precisely. In their paper, Lehner and Döll (2004) report a global area of 8219 - 10,119 million km ² .		rejected	pseudo-accuracy... [Need clearer description of the reason for rejection!]
10105	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	120	122	1	Would be possible to place a newer picture? 2004 reference seems an old one already		accepted	done
10106	Wagner, Fabian	1	120		1	Fig 1.2 the legend is confusing because categories may not be mutually exclusive, i.e. any wetland should have a green hue as it - by definition - falls in some category between 0 and 100%, but the other colours suggest a categorization according to type. The mix of the two categorizations does not seem to make sense.		noted	not applicable any longer because the figure will be changed in response to other comments

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10107	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	121	122	1	Map legend - I don't understand the last 3 categories. What makes a wetland 50% wet, etc.?		noted	not applicable any longer because the figure will be changed in response to other comments
10108	Schwendenmann, Luitgard	1	121	121	1	Lehner and Döll (not Doll)		accepted	corrected
10109	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	122	122	1	Should there be a comma between Doll and 2004 as done elsewhere?		accepted	yes
10110	HAYNE, Shari	1	123	149		It is challenging to make general comments on the GHG balance and associated controls of all wetlands globally under natural, drained and restored conditions. Suggest adding references from a variety of wetlands and improve text to clarify these generalized statements. Also suggest the inclusion of text to explain how non-diffusive trace gas flux pathways contribute to the GHG budget of these ecosystems.		Accept but differently address	we are well aware of these emissions patterns and pathways, but we want to make an introduction to an inventory manual, not a handbook on emissions. More details are in the various chapters. We include now the hotspot character to explain why we presented peatlands and mangroves as examples.
10111	HAYNE, Shari	1	123	124		Suggest using the following references: Gorham 1991; Mitra et al., 2005	Attachment_1 0111A.pdf, Attachment_1 0111B.pdf	accepted	Put in Gorham 1991 and Mitra et al. 2005

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10112	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	124			<Joosten and...> Later in text <&>. Stick to one of them and check them all.		accept	
10113	HAYNE, Shari	1	125	126		Suggest adding vegetation or plant community to the list of what controls GHG emissions. Suggest using some of the following references to support this statement : Blodau 2002; Limpens et al.,2008; Lafleur 2009	Attachment_1 0113A.pdf, Attachment_1 0113B.pdf, Attachment_1 0113C.pdf	accepted	okay, will be done
10114	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	125			<can be both>		rejected	not at the same time for all gases
10115	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	125			<their emission>		accepted	Skip "The"
10116	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	126			<controlled by...nutrient availability> link not very clear. Suggest reframe sentence.		rejected	It is meant to be a general statement and we feel that what is written covers the main sources of variability in emissions
10117	HAYNE, Shari	1	127	128		Undrained wetlands can also have very high fluxes of CO2, depending on the condition. Perhaps state that wetlands are generally sinks of CO2 and sources of CH4 while draining wetlands generally increases CO2 emissions and decreases CH4 emissions, or use the term CO2 emissions for clarity.		accepted	add "generally" between "but" and "have"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10118	FRIBORG, Thomas	1	128	128	1.3	Un-drained or rewetted wetlands with water levels at or near the soil surface emit methane (CH ₄) (Couwenberg & Fritz, 2012), but have very low fluxes of CO ₂ and N ₂ O I do not necessary agree with respect to CO ₂ (1000 g m ⁻² y ⁻¹ - please see e.g. Herbst et al. / Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 151 (2011) 841–853), but the wording "very low" of cause leave room for interpretation		rejected	this special situation does not change the general rule on a global scale
10119	Xu, Xiaofeng	1	128	128	1	I would like to add references “Song C.C., Xu, X.F., Tian. H.Q., Wang Y.Y., 2009, Ecosystem-atmosphere exchange of CH ₄ and N ₂ O and ecosystem respiration in wetlands in the Sanjiang Plain, Northeastern China, Global Change Biology, 15, 692-705, DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01821.x” and “Xu, X. and Tian H., 2012, Methane exchange between marshland and the atmosphere over China during 1949-2008, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 26, GB2006, DOI 10.1029/2010GB003946.”.		accepted	include additional references with general and global scope
10120	HAYNE, Shari	1	129	129		The Couwenberg 2010 reference is only related to wetlands in Asia, therefore in attempts to make a generalized wetlands statement, would suggest that additional references are utilized.		accepted	meant is probably Couwenberg et al 2010. This paper also includes substantial information on temperate european peatlands. But wer will also include additional references.
10121	Kolka, Randy	1	129	129	1	Literature needs to be consistent with that cited, e.g. Couwenberg 2010 is not listed in the literature cited.		accepted	okay, must be Couwenberg et al. 2010

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10122	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	129	129	1	Couwenberg 2010 is not listed in the references, but Cowenberg 2011 (lines 532-533) is and is not cited in text.		accepted	okay, must be Couwenberg et al. 2010
10123	Wagner, Fabian	1	129		1	It may be useful also to comment on how extraction of carbon stocks *further* affects the emissions of GHGs. (i.e. the emissions from the remaining stocks, not from what happens to the removed stocks; similar to how SOC changes by deforestation).		rejected	we are not talking about peat extraction. This issue must be addressed in chapter 2
10124	Xu, Xiaofeng	1	129	131	1	This case is definitely true for wetland degradation processes too; when wetland degradation proceeds, the water level drops, less CH ₄ emits while more CO ₂ produces. I agree that N ₂ O emission in wetlands is normally small, yet our study did find that N ₂ O emission got substantially enhanced during wetland degradation (Song C.C., Xu, X.F., Tian. H.Q., Wang Y.Y., 2009, Ecosystem-atmosphere exchange of CH ₄ and N ₂ O and ecosystem respiration in wetlands in the Sanjiang Plain, Northeastern China, Global Change Biology, 15, 692-705, DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01821.x). So I suggest to partially addressing N ₂ O issue in the text. Or at least indicate N ₂ O issue is important yet not well investigated.		accepted	in line 133 and 134 we address N ₂ O emisisions in degraded /drianed wetlands. We will include more references.
10125	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	129			<.While...)		accepted	change comma to semicolon before "while"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10126	Bedard-Haughn, Angela	1	130	136	1	There are no references listed for this paragraph. Examples for the Prairie Pothole Region of North America could include Gleason et al (2009) Soil Biol Biochem 41:2501-2507 and Pennock et al (2010) Geoderma 155:308-319 (see also reference list for Ch. 5).		accepted	agreed. We will add more references
10127	HAYNE, Shari	1	130	136		There must be a few references to include for these statements?		accepted	agreed. We will add more references
10128	Kishitomo, Ayaka	1	130	149	1	Could be better to use a Table to show the trade-off between the three greenhouse gases (CH ₄ , CO ₂ , N ₂ O) and their changes with drainage, rewetting and other environmental factors.		rejected	we can not present a table here because too much detail would be required. Data will be provided in the chapters
10129	Lilleskov, Erik Andrew	1	130	130	1	Line 130. I believe the word "forcings" or equivalent should be substituted for "emissions" when considering the "balance" of different greenhouse gasses.		Accept but differently address	we now skipped line 130 and 131, because it is largely redundant as everything has been said just before.
10130	Schwendenmann, Luitgard	1	130	136	1	References required		accepted	agreed. We will add more references
10131	Wagner, Fabian	1	130	131	1	the terms "controlled" and "trade-off" seem not quite appropriate. Suggest: "is largely influenced by relatively higher CH ₄ emissions under saturating water levels and relatively higher CO ₂ emissions under dry soil conditions."		accepted	we have skipped this sentence now

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10132	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	131			<Therefore, the...> Provide some sort of link with previous paragraph		accepted	we have skipped this sentence now
10133	LANE, Charles R	1	133	133		atmospheric deposition can be significant, so atmospheric deposition could be added as an example in addition to run off from "nearby agricultural lands". See for example, Coastal Eutrophication and Harmful Algal Blooms: Importance of Atmospheric Deposition and Groundwater as "New" Nitrogen and Other Nutrient Sources, Hans W. Paerl Limnology and Oceanography , Vol. 42, No. 5, Part 2: The Ecology and Oceanography of Harmful Algal Blooms (Jul., 1997), pp. 1154-1165.		accepted	we have now replaced "the fertility of the soil as well as the addition of nitrogen fertilizers" by "nitrogen availability (soil fertility, peat mineralization, atmospheric deposition), oxygen status and carbon availability"
10134	Smith, Keith	1	133	133	1	Might be better to say "capacity of the soil to release active N by mineralisation", rather than "fertility" -- which seems too vague		accepted	see above
10135	Wagner, Fabian	1	133	133	1	see above (comment #10135). Replace "controlled" with "largely influenced"		accepted	okay
10136	Cai, Zucong	1	134	136	1	It depends on wetlands and location. References are needed.		accepted	agreed. We will add more references

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10137	Du, Rui	1	134	134	1	the soils as well as the addition of the nitrogen fertilizers ...		accepted	we have now replaced "the fertility of the soil as well as the addition of nitrogen fertilizers" by "nitrogen availability (soil fertility, peat mineralization, atmospheric deposition), oxygen status and carbon availability"
10138	Hamilton, Stephen K.	1	134	136	1	It would be good to cite reference(s) to back up this statement.		accepted	agreed. We will add more references
10139	HAYNE, Shari	1	134	136		Do aggregate emissions include non-diffusive sources such as ebullition? Has the net trace gas flux of CO ₂ , CH ₄ and N ₂ O from diffusive and non-diffusive emission pathways been assessed in a variety of wetlands under natural and drained conditions?		noted	1. Yes. 2. Should be, but has not been done in all wetland types yet.
10140	Segarra, Dr. Katherine E. A.	1	134	136		I think at least a citation is needed here to support this statement.		accepted	agreed. We will add more references
10141	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	134	136		Is this assumption, given same climatic conditions or calculated at global scale (give Ref.). Because temperature is an important factor in their variability.		accepted	Yes, we think this statement is generally true for all climates, taking into consideration that climate may (e.g. via evapotranspiration) affect humidity conditions in the soil. Details are presented in the chapters.
10142	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	135		1	I suggest exchanging "dry" for "drained", dry is something else for most people.		accepted	okay

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10143	Wagner, Fabian	1	136		1	are both fluxes generally positive? (cf. line 125) Is this a statement about absolute values?		accepted	yes. We changed "fluxes" to "emissions". Furthermore we have changed "Wetlandsa" in line 125 to "Wetland ecosystems"
10144	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	137	137		anthropogenic fires in wetland cannot be considered a human activity. They are the undesired result of some human activities (e.g. camping, weed control and land clearing in agriculture etc.). I suggest to delete anthropogenic fires		accepted	add "and their consequences" behind "activities"
10145	Savolainen, Ikka	1	137	138	1	After the word "wetlands" add the words "and CH4 emissions".		accepted	add after "wetlands": ", as well as GHG emissions"
10146	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	137	139		A reference is needed.		accepted	agreed. We will add more references
10147	Wagner, Fabian	1	138	139	1	unclear: 50% of what? Pre-industrial areas? Pre-agrarian areas? Since a particular year? Pls clarify. But the sentence hangs somewhat in the air and doesn't fit the paragraph		Accept but differently address	we skipped the sentence
10148	Podest, Erika	1	139	139		wetlands have been converted. Better word to replace converted might be lost or destroyed or degraded.		Accept but differently address	we skipped the sentence
10149	Segarra, Dr. Katherine E. A.	1	139			converted to what?		Accept but differently address	we skipped the sentence

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10150	Sperow, Mark	1	139	139	1	Sentence is incomplete - "converted" to what?		Accept but differently address	we skipped the sentence
10151	Wagner, Fabian	1	139	141	1	Repetition of 127-129?		accepted	edit 123-149 to avoid repetition
10152	Cai, Zucong	1	141	145	1	IPCC AR5 estimats the CO2 released from land use change (as I understand, land use change includes wetland conversion) was 0.9 Pg C y-1. If 0.5 Pg (is it C or CO2?) was from conversion of wetlands? Is it consistent with the IPCC estimation?		Accept but differently address	The peatland figures do not refer to land use change but to land use. Therefore we added behind peatlands ", i.e. land use" and after deforetstaion ", i.e. land use change". Add C after Pg.
10153	Wagner, Fabian	1	146		1	This sentence interrupts the flow of thought from the previous paragraph to this one. Suggest to delete or to integrated into l.136, e.g. "soils, i.e. rewetting of wetlands generally reduces overall CO2 equivalent fluxes."		accepted	edit 123-149 to avoid repetition
10154	Podest, Erika	1	148	149		wetlands emissions and removals depends on I suggest include growing season length to the list.		accepted	add length
10155	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	148			<vegetation composition>		accepted	agreed

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10156	DOS SANTOS, Marco Aurelio	1	151	152		The Global database on large hydropower reservoirs could be obtained with International Commission on Large Dams - http://www.icold-cigb.org/		rejected	remark not relevant because flooded lands is not supposed to be addressed in this Supplement.
10157	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	151	151	1	The table indicates four footnotes - but none are provided. In addition, a footnote 2 is given earlier in the text (line 91) so those in this table should be renumbered.		Accept but differently address	change reference in caption and table to a(, b) , c) , d)
10158	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	151	151	1	Table 1.1. Consider adding a totals row at the bottom.		accepted	total row will be included. Mind that categories are not mutually exclusive, but overlap
10159	Rock, Joachim	1	151	151	1	Table 1.1: Footnotes are not given		accepted	change reference in caption and table to a(, b) , c) , d)
10160	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	151		1	data in the table need ranges or uncertainty values for estimations		accepted	add remark on uncertainty and ranges that are even more uncertain. Data are order of magnitude
10161	Sperow, Mark	1	151	152	1	The footnotes contained in Table 1.1 are not defined.		accepted	change reference in caption and table to a(, b) , c) , d)

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10162	Wagner, Fabian	1	151		1	Table 1.1 Is the unit 10,000m2 a generally accepted and useful unit? Add row for global figure.		accepted	no: unit is 10,000 km2 for purpose of avoiding large numbers in table and undefendable accuracy. Global row will be added.
10163	Schwendemann, Luitgard	1	152	189	1	optimize link between wetlands and organic soils, I suggest combining chapter 1.3 and 1.4		accepted	we explain now clearer that the supplement deals with "wetland ecosystems" and "organic soils"
10164	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	152			1.4 section would benefit from improved flow of ideas as it easily loses reader's attention. Also, definition of organic soil far too complex and fuzzy. It needs to be simplified to at AT LEAST 1/2 of the current length. And all alternative definitions can be presented in a table that summarizes both FAO and IPCC.		accepted	We have now restructured par. 1.4 and put the IPCC definition in a box. Mind the definition of organic soils is the official IPCC one...
10165	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	153			<SOILS (HISTOSOL)		Reject	IPCC uses "organics soils" whereas FAO uses "Histosols". We have indicated that in line 168.
10166	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	154		1	to give a clear reference to 2006 Guidelines, including page		accepted	will do that
10167	LI, Qian	1	156	157		The coverage of defining organic soil should also be indicated.		rejected	Th text presented in 156-167 is the IPCC definition that we cannot modify.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10168	MacDonald, James Douglas	1	156	165	1	I do not like the attempt to define organic soils according to two criteria. As the definition stands in this document, many acidic forest soils with thick LFH horizons could be included in this definition. The soil science community has used very specific systems and language to define Histosols . Please do not try to reinvent the wheel, but simply refer to the system of soil classification, the FAO system seems to be the most obvious. Thus, an organic soil is a Histosol as defined by the FAO. If you wish to deviate from the definition, be specific about exactly what deviations you are allowing (for example , if you want to change the depth of the organic layer from 40 to 20. Simply state that the depth of the organic layer can be 20 cm and not 40.		rejected	We have not invented the definition but just quote IPCC 2006. This definition can not be changed (consult TSU).
10169	Wagner, Fabian	1	156		1	verb missing		reject	
10170	Lilleskov, Erik Andrew	1	157	157	1	Line 157: insert “by weight” after “organic carbon”		reject	
10171	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	157	171	1	Should percent be % in keeping with the style used earlier in the chapter?		reject	check official phrasing

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10172	PENMAN, Jim	1	159			insert "by weight" after "percent"; comment: Is this the meaning? The definition seems a bit imprecise, given that wter content is not clearly defined. Or are we talking about percent dry weight?		reject	check official phrasing
10173	Lilleskov, Erik Andrew	1	160	164	1	Line 160-164. Specify depth for criteria 3 a and b.		reject	check official phrasing
10174	Sperow, Mark	1	160	160	1	To be consistent with the other requirements, should the length of "episodes" be included?		reject	check official phrasing
10175	PENMAN, Jim	1	161			Similarly does ths mean dry weight?		Note	check official phrasing
10176	Du, Rui	1	165	165	1	end of the sentence 'should be deleted		rejected	no, is part of IPCC definition
10177	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	165	165	1	Delete the ' at the end of the line.		rejected	this is a quotation mark. Instead we have to add a quottaion mark at the start of the quotation
10178	Rock, Joachim	1	165	165	1	The ' at the end has no prior match, delete.		rejected	this is a quotation mark. Instead we have to add a quottaion mark at the start of the quotation
10179	Wagner, Fabian	1	165		1	Not clear where the corresponding openening quotation mark is and whether you need any.		accepted	corrected

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10180	PENMAN, Jim	1	166	174		This is very confusing. We have just said that organic soils meet criteria 1 and 2 or 1 and 3 above. Why then do we need this additional information on identification?		noted	this explains the relation between other often used terms, including histosols (FAO) and peatlands
10181	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	166	167	1	it is not clear if these criteria might be used for the GHG inventory in accordance to this Supplement		noted	yes, as from CP2 IPCC 2006 Guidelines are the valid ones, you may use that guidance.
10182	Wagner, Fabian	1	166	167	1	Confusing if read individually. Suggest to integrate into 154-155.		accepted	okay, will be done
10183	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	166			If peat and organic soil are regarded as the same, then one shall stick to only one name and keep consistent throughout the text, as at times it appears confusing. And this unique word could be introduced at the beginning of subchapter. 1.4.		accepted	we skip peat here
10184	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	167	167	1	FAO 1998 is not listed in the references		accepted	okay, we will include
10185	MacDonald, James Douglas	1	169	169	1	Remove "Indeed". Unnecessary.		accepted	Okay
10186	Rock, Joachim	1	169	174	1	Organic soils can change their thickness due to water content. C release will also decrease thickness. How should be dealt with soils that fall below the thresholds defined here (due to drainage, C emission etc.) and become "mineral soils"? Should they be included there (for reporting) or should they remain in the organic soils category?		noted	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10187	Sperow, Mark	1	169	169	1	Should the greater than sign be less than or equal to rather than greater than or equal to?		rejected	organic layers less than 10 cm thick do not feature under organic soils. A further depth criterion is not provided by IPCC (but is by FAO, s. lines 173-174)
10188	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	171			<100cm> of what?		accepted	add "of the soil profile"
10189	Philip, Elizabeth	1	172	174	1	Malaysia follows the USDA soil classification and also use a slightly thicker peat depth and therefore suggest that it should not be limited to European condition.		noted	IPCC allows national approach to thickness.
10190	Freibauer, Annette	1	173	174	1.4	The 40 cm criterion was omitted to take into account that shallow organic layers emit GHGs in the same order of magnitude as thicker organic layers when drained.		noted	noted
10191	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	173	173	1	IPCC 2003 is not listed in the references		accepted	include
10192	Sperow, Mark	1	173	173	1	Add "the" before "slightly lower". Should "or" or "and" or "and/or" be added before "omit"?		rejected	no improvement

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10193	Wagner, Fabian	1	173		1	replace "(Joosten and Clarke, 2002). IPCC (2003, 2006) omits" with "(Joosten and Clarke, 2002). Previous IPCC Guidance and Guidelines (IPCC 2003, 2006) omit"		accepted	okay
10194	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	176	176	1	As near as I can tell, figure 1.3 only shows organic soils with soil carbon greater than 144 tonnes per ha. Consider modifying the sentence accordingly.		accepted	okay, add the indicative character of the figure
10195	Wagner, Fabian	1	176		1	harmonize unit (million km ² vs 10,000 km ² in Table 1.1)		rejected	no improvement
10196	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	176	177		<...of peatland occur...> Is this used to represent organic soils ? Again, suggest stick to one word.		rejected	all peatlands are organic soils, but not all organic soils are peatlands. So we cannot use one concept if we do not have differentiated information
10197	FAGGI, Ana	1	177			Lappalainen not referenced		accepted	include
10198	HAYNE, Shari	1	177	178		Lappalainen 1996 and Page et al., 2011 references are not included in the reference list at the end of the document		accepted	include

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10199	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	177	177	1	Lappalainen 1996 is not listed in references.		accepted	include
10200	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	177	178	1	Page et al. 2011 is not listed in the references.		accepted	include
10201	Savolainen, Ikka	1	177	178	1	The references (Lappalainen 1996) and (Page et al. 2011) are missing from reference list of the chapter		accepted	include
10202	FAGGI, Ana	1	178			Page et al 2011 not referenced		accepted	include
10203	Freibauer, Annette	1	178	178	1	References are not the original literature (should be e.g. Gorham 1991)		rejected	also Gorham is not original literature. Furthermore Gorham only presents data on northern peatlands
10204	Freibauer, Annette	1	178	178	1.4	To what soil depth does the 500 Gt refer? If this information is maintained it should be related to the IPCC Tier 1 approach for mineral soils, which refers to 0-30 cm only.		noted	the 500gt refers to entire peat depth. Organic soils can - per defintion (FAO) not be limited to 0-30 cm.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10205	Freibauer, Annette	1	178	512	1.8	Clear guidance about the relation between the land use definitions in the data bases and IPCC definitions must be given, or at least a warning if this is inconsistent (which is, in most cases).		accepted	Relation between definitions are now addressed. Not specified which databses are meant.
10206	Philip, Elizabeth	1	178		1	Page et al in not in the refrence		accepted	include
10207	Schwendenmann, Luitgard	1	178	178	1	Page et al. 2011 not listed under references		accepted	include
10208	Wagner, Fabian	1	178		1	Maybe useful to harmonize Gt with Pg in line 142-144		accepted	
10209	FRIBORG, Thomas	1	179	181	1.4	The ref. Victoria et al. (2012) is not a refereed publication I		rejected	it is. List of reviewers is in the back of the publication!

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10210	Ishizuka, Shigehiro	1	179	181	1	With Figure 1.3: Although this figure originally shows the soil carbon stock to 1m depth in the world, the legend indicates "indicative map of organic soils". I am afraid that this explanation leads to misunderstanding of the distribution of organic soils. The soil carbon stock varies by various reasons, for example, the high stock in Japan is probably due to the distribution of Andisols which has high density carbon layer more than 18% (under oxic condition, not organic). Therefore, the area of "organic soil" in Japan does not match to this figure. I recommend to delete this figure, or alter the figure legend as the original one in Victoria et al.. The description in line 176 "Figure 1.3 presents the occurrence of organic soils in the world" is completely wrong for the reason mentioned above.		accepted	take the original figure of Victoria et al 2012 in and add that the highest class gives a fair idea of the distribution of organic soils.
10211	LANE, Charles R	1	179	179		Modify figure legend to simply say >145 t/ha, as the legend simply has 0-144 t/ha as white and >145 as black.		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10212	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	179	181	1	Figure 1.3 - Legend - do we need the categories that are less than 145 tonnes shown. I think that the last category is the only one displayed on the map. If that is the case, consider changing the caption and the legend to reflect that.		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10213	MIAO, Chiyuan	1	179	181		In Figure 1.3, the legends about different soil carbon contents are not easy to distinguish		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10214	Podest, Erika	1	179	180		The text on Figure 1.3 needs to be made legible.		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10215	Wanger, Fabian	1	179		1	Fig 1.3 currently shades of grey are indistinguishable		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10216	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	180	180	1	What does HWSD stand for in the source?		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10217	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	180	180	1	Source of the figure...Scharlemann et al. is not listed in references		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10218	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	180			Image: <from HWSD>. Provide full name,		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10219	PENMAN, Jim	1	183	189		Doesn't seem to belong in a section on definition and coverage.		accepted	okay include in re-edition of l. 123-149.
10220	Wagner, Fabian	1	183	189	1	Here drainage is highlighted, but rewetting is not discussed. In contrast, 146ff discusses rewetting. Is there a reason for this asymmetry/bias? If yes, make it explicit, if not I suggest to harmonize		Accept but differently address	not applicable any longer

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10221	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	187	189	1	...takes the intensity of drainage Into account when estimating..., unfortunately not at tier 1 level (in chapter 2).		noted	
10222	Sperow, Mark	1	188	189	1	Suggest replacing "takes" with "accounts for" and delete "into account".		Noted (Differently addressed)	
10223	Cai, Zucong	1	191	195	1	Repeat the definition described above.		Reject	No repeat of definition here because of avoiding lengthy. The definition of wetlands as described in the 2006 IPCC guideline, Chapter 3 page 3.6
10224	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	191	193	1	Somewhere with in the IPCC guidelines there should be a key for classifying land use/cover classes as shown in http://home.comcast.net/~gyde/Guide_for_classifying_GHG.pdf .		Note	this point is mentioned in session1.2 and also showing in Figure 1.1
10225	Vitulo, Marina	1	191	193	1	Change of the text: "According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines it is good practice that, when preparing a greenhouse gas inventory, a country first produces a complete and consistent land-use representation that divides the land-uses into six major land-use categories: Forest Land, Grassland, Cropland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Lands." as follow "According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines it is good practice that, when preparing a greenhouse gas inventory, a country produces a consistent land-use representation, that classify the land-uses into six major land-use categories: Forest Land, Grassland, Cropland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Lands."		Accept	1) Acceptable to change from "a country first produces a complete and consistent " to "a country produces a consistent " 2) "devides" is betetr than "classify " because six major land-use categories is devided as like Figure 1.1

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10226	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	192	192	1	consider changing "land-use categories" to "land use/cover categories" here and elsewhere.		Reject	We cannot change this term as we need to be consistent to the 2006 IPCC guidelines. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines use the term "land-use categories".
10227	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	192	193		<major categories>.		Accept	Acceptable to delete "land-use" between these two words
10228	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	194	195		Land representation methods and definitions are provided in the 2006 guidelines, so I consider the following text is not needed: "however, these are not prescriptive, and can 194 be adjusted by the country to better represent their unique conditions". I suggest to delete it.		Accept but differently address	As there are a variety of wetlands in the world, and we are aware that this present definition may not cover all wetland types, we provide a "room" for a country to define the wetlands, but to consistently adhere to the 2006 IPCC guidelines. It is also important that this supplement does not aim to change the 2006 IPCC guideline. It is important comment on "however, these are not prescriptive, and can 194 be adjusted by the country to better represent their unique conditions", because of following Figure 1.1 Decision tree for finding the appropriate guidance chapter within this Supplement or the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10229	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	1	194	195	1	Coment: the document says that definitions for each of these land-use categories can be adjusted by the country to better represent their unique conditions. In my opinion, is the other way around. The categories of the country can be adjusted to the six land-use categories of UNFCCC. action: redraft those two lines to correctly reflect the relation between definitions/categories.		Rejected	Sholud use land-use categories of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines
10230	PENMAN, Jim	1	194	195		replace with:Guidelines provide broad definitions for each of these land-use categories which countries may elaborate according to their own circumstances, provided this is done in a consistent fashion.		Rejected	no need replacement
10231	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	197			< gases...> from where ?		Noted	In this supplement, we will focus GHG induced by human activities that associate with wetland uses. We also state this focus in line 197-199
10232	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	198			<assumption (the managed>		Accept	The word "proxy" is used in the 2006 Guidelines.
10233	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	198	199		This largely depends on the degree of management.		Noted	Anthropogenic GHG emissions are not only dependent upon a management scheme but also other factors that drive human activities to exploit wetlands. We are aware that the underlying factors of anthropogenic GHG emissions are not simple.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10234	PENMAN, Jim	1	200			replace "examined" with "reexamined", delete "further" and "but", replace with "and"		Accept	Yes
10235	PENMAN, Jim	1	204			insert "further" before "restricts"		Accept	Yes
10236	Freibauer, Annette	1	208	209	1	The sentence is misleading and contradicts the previous guidelines. It should be said that for all inland wet soils (organic, mineral) management means human changes in water table and/or nutrient management. For coastal wetlands, management needs any kind of human change in C stocks and nutrients, which affects GHGs.		Accept but differently address	In the 2006 IPCC guideline, managed wetlands refer to wetlands where the water table is anthropogenically changed. In reality, managed wetlands are not always characterized by water table change.
10237	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	208	209	1	This is very good, I think.		Noted	Thanks
10238	PENMAN, Jim	1	208	213		Whilst the previous Chapter 4 definition was suitable for the wetlands activities included in the 2006 Guidelines, and continues to apply to activities such as drainage and rewetting, this Wetlands Supplement includes activities and land-use subcategories where the water table is not changed, so the restriction imposed by Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines do not always apply. Therefore, under the broader definition included in the 2006 Guidelines, emissions and removals should be estimated for all land in a country that is designated as managed. Figure 1.4 illustrates some typical human activities and associated GHG emissions and removals on managed wetlands. Table 1.3 provides some examples of production, ecological and social functions that can result in 'managed' wetlands.		Accept but differently address	No, we keep the sentences with some necessary revision

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10239	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	299	299		REMOVALSFROM should be "REMOVALS FROM"		Accept	Revised text "REMOVALS FROM"
10240	PENMAN, Jim	1	209			An important link to the Durban decision		Reject	Not clear
10241	Sperow, Mark	1	209	209	1	Rather than "restriction imposed by...", it is more precise to say "water table is artificially changed", which is the restriction I believe this refers to.		Accept but differently address	Yes, this is correct. We will rephrase this sentence, and clearly state the restriction on water table changes as an indicator of managed wetlands
10242	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	210	211		I suggest to rephrase as follows: "Therefore, where wetlands are impacted by human activities -i.e. managed-emissions and removals should be estimated".		Accept but differently address	We will rephrase this sentence. "Therefore, when human activities influence natural wetlands, emissions and removals should be measured".
10243	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	210		1	Wetland Supplement should not prescribe rules for reporting of managed lands. This sentence should be deleted.		Reject	We cannot delete this sentence because the purpose of this supplement is to provide a guideline only, not to prescribe to a country what to do or adopt a specific protocol
10244	Wagner, Fabian	1	211		1	Confusing in combination with 198-199: the latter says: if managed, then attribute to human activities ('anthropogenic'); 211 says: if human activities, then call it managed. Logically this means managed and anthropogenic are equivalent. Is that what you want to say? Please streamline.		Accept	Management always refers to anthropogenic activities.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10245	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	211			<by direct human activities> . You can have high altitude lakes impacted by long range transport of pollutants, without being managed.		Accept	Yes, It is important point that human impacts is not restricted in one ecosystem only, and can be distributed beyond the administrative and ecological boundary. Therefore, it is enough description in this sentence for "managed".
10246	LANE, Charles R	1	212	212		is this the first use of GHG in this chapter? If so, define acronym.		Accept	GHG will be always spelt out as "greenhouse gas" throughout the report.
10247	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	212	212	1	Consider defining GHG.		Accept	GHG will be always spelt out as "greenhouse gas" throughout the report.
10248	PENMAN, Jim	1	212			check consistency of how managed wetlands definition is applied in this section and as compared with 2006GLs		Accept, but as a result of check, we are certain the definition is consistent...	We are certain the definition of managed wetlands in this supplement is consistent with the 2006 IPCC guideline. In majority, managed wetlands are associated with water table changes, and other forms of anthropogenic disturbances, e.g. timber harvesting
10249	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	212			Has GHG been named in full words before ?		Accept	GHG will be always spelt out as "greenhouse gas" throughout the report.
10250	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	212			<and associated GHG....wetlands> not represented on figure 1.4		Accept	It will appear on the revised fig 1.4, by following suggestion of Attachement_10587.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10251	Hatala, Jaelyn	1	213	213	1	This table is a bit confusing - 'Benefits' and 'Activities' seem like more or less the same concept, so I think it would be more appropriate to either rename these categories or get rid of the two separate 'Function's		Accept but differently address	As the concepts of benefits and activities in Table 1.3 are clearly different, we keep the sentences. Although both of them may share some similarities. A human activity denotes an act or an attempt to gain a benefit or benefits of wetland existence and sustainability. When wetlands are degraded, these benefits would decline, and may direct to more activities that disturb on wetlands. Benefits are products and services, and activities are actions that might lead to wetland sustainability or wetland loss/decline
10252	Kishitomo, Ayaka	1	213	214	1	Grazing could be a Production function; Diversity could be an Ecological function.		Accept but differently address	We agree with you about grazing as one of production functions. We rewrite "Agriculture and horticulture" to "Agriculture, horticulture, and animal husbandry" in TABLE 1.3. We are aware that all types of human activities and benefits are shown in this table. As diversity as an ecological function is indirectly, we have no mention on this. referred as genetic condition. Diversity is essentially measured or indicated by genetic diversity
10253	Kolka, Randy	1	213	213	1	Table 1.3, change to "shrimp" and add bullets to column 2 like columns 3 and 4		Accept but differently address	We may reformat this table as you suggested. At Activities in column of Production functions, it is rewritten as "Production, conservation, restoration and management for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunting/fishing/gathering • (so on)".

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10254	LANE, Charles R	1	213	213		social functions that can result from... instead of "result in..."		Accept but differently address	We will consider to rephrase this word
10255	Lilleskov, Erik Andrew	1	213	214	1	Line 213-214. In heading of Table 1.3 "result in" is ambiguous, and could mean "lead to" or "occur in". Please disambiguate if possible.		Accept but differently address	We will consider to rephrase this word
10256	Wagner, Fabian	1	213		1	replace "result in" by "occur on" - or did you mean "result in land being classified as managed wetlands"? Pls also harmonize with header of Table 1.3 and harmonize quotation marks.		Accept but differently address	We will consider to rephrase this word
10257	Wagner, Fabian	1	213		1	Table 1.3 Why is provision of food a benefit, but fishing and xxxculture an activity? I don't buy that distinction of rows. What kind of classification do the ROWS suggest? Also col headers confusing:I assume that 'Benefits' and 'Activities' are not meant to be headed by 'Functions'.		Accept but differently address	We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands
10258	Freibauer, Annette	1	214	214	1	Table 1.3 is not considered useful nor necessary as it refers to a wetlands definition which is different to the one of IPCC. I suggest to delete Table 1.3.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10259	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	214		1	Table 1.3, I was first lacking "grasslands" in the square "Production functions" and "Activities", but it is thought to be included into Agriculture I believe. Could be made clear.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands
10260	LANE, Charles R	1	214	214		Table 1.3: the benefits for the social functions as defined reads awkwardly, especially the portion describing "... one's position in the world." Would suggest removing the identification of one's position in the world portion.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands
10261	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	214	214	1	Table 1.3 - 4th column - consider adding a comma after soil amenity and signalization as done elsewhere in that column.		Accept but differently address	We will revise the content of this table and correct some editorial concerns
10262	Navarrete Encinales, Diego Alejandro	1	214	214	1	Table 1.3: in the cell that includes the activities of the Ecological functions, "biological diversity" should be included.		Accept but differently address	Yes, biological diversity will be included in next version
10263	Rock, Joachim	1	214	214	1	Table 1.3, column "social functions": what is meant by "signalisation" and how should this be a social function?		Accept but differently address	We will fix this unclarity by adding a brief explanation on this issue
10264	Thomson, Amanda	1	214	214	1	Table 1.3: 'Benefits' is a confusing row title, and suggests it should be balanced by a 'Disadvantages' row. I suggest 'Purpose' would be a more appropriate row title.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands. Contents of the table will be revised, too

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10265	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	214			Table not very clear, especially column or row headers.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands. Contents of the table will be revised, too
10266	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	214			Header: <Examples of human? activities>		Accept but differently address	
10267	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	214			Subheader: not clear what function really represents here. Is benefits a function ? I suggest setting up table around ecosystem services idea. I would change social function definition to something like: Provision of psychological, philosophical and artistic expression.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands. Contents of the table will be revised, too
10268	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	214			Rows: I would present Activities first, then Benefits of those activities.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands. Contents of the table will be revised, too
10269	Du, Rui	1	215	215	1	The use of the managed land proxy to identify anthropogenic emissions and removals have some drawbacks,		Accept but differently address	We will revise this sentence

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10270	Freibauer, Annette	1	215	224	1	The rule is "once managed, always managed", and that all GHGs from managed land are reportable. This is to be said. I would avoid any discussion about implications here. I suggest to delete the paragraph.		Accept but differently address	We will keep this paragraph and make some revision. We agree with you about this. And we need to be sure that countries will be able to measure GHG emissions from managed wetlands. Thus, we need clarify the present drawbacks in the 2006 IPCC Guideline, and resolve these problems
10271	Lilleskov, Erik Andrew	1	215	224	1	Lines 215-224. This is a significant problem with the approach and could potentially lead to perverse incentives or disincentives.		Accept but differently address	We will address this issue of your major concerns in order to inhibit the occurrence of bad practices or cranky responses
10272	PACIORNIK, Newton	1	215	217		For balance include in the sentence the other drawback: exclusion of anthropogenic emissions in "unmanaged lands"		Accept but differently address	We restrict that unmanaged wetlands are not included
10273	Radunsky, Klaus	1	215	224	1	These statements are very important and should be kept as written.		Accept	Thank you. Keep as written
10274	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	215	224	1	even with such statement in the Chapter 1, which is correct, in the Chapter 2 the methodology to estimate remaining CH4 emissions from drained wetland is presented (that subsection should be deleted as these emissions, if any might be, are still natural)		Noted	Chapters 2 authors will address..
10275	Kabo-Bah, Amos Tierayangn	1	217	220	1	Here, it is stated that "...no alternative approach" was agreed by the authors. It will be nice to state the possible problems that may be encountered in the estimation and inclusion of "non-anthropogenical emissions and removals.		Accept but differently address	

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10276	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	224			<Tier 1 or 2...> Reference to IPCC 2006 report.		Accept but differently address	revise as "(4) difficulty of capturing these emissions using Tier 1 or 2 methods (Figure 7.1 in Volume 4, 2006 IPCC Guidelines) "
10277	FRIBORG, Thomas	1	226	227	1.5	Figure 1.4 How are the classes logically connected to those of section 1.2? They do seem to similiar, but not identical.		Reject:	As Fig 1.4 describe more detail of Fig 1.1, it is very important figure to comprehend overview of wetlands managemnts.
10278	LANE, Charles R	1	226	226		Figure 1.4: I don't believe the material in this figure is beneficial to the reader and worthy of a full color page. Perhaps a table with definitons rather than a schematic/cartoon. The figures do not address "associated GHG emissions and removals" either, so at the very least the caption should be modified.		Accept but differently address	As Fig 1.4 describe more detail of Fig 1.1, it is very important figure to comprehend overview of wetlands managemnts.
10279	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	226	229	1	Very nice illustrations, however neither of the before or after forest and agriculture images would be considered 'wetlands' according to the IPCC definition. In addition, the managed 'wetland' may not be counted as wetland if the primary use of the area is agriculture. In order for 'forest land' to qualify as 'wetlands' enough overstory must be removed so it falls below the canopy cover threshold. If that happens, then the area can also be considered 'deforested'.		Reject:	As Fig 1.4 describe more detail of Fig 1.1, it is very important figure to comprehend overview of wetlands managemnts.
10280	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	226	228	1	not clear the purpose of that figure, better to delete		Reject	As Fig 1.4 describe more detail of Fig 1.1, it is very important figure to comprehend overview of wetlands managemnts.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10281	Segarra, Dr. Katherine E. A.	1	226			In Figure 1.4 there is a misspelling of the word 'Rewetted' as 'Rewettied'		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.
10282	Wagner, Fabian	1	226		1	Fig 1.4 is very useful but completely unmotivated at this stage, it would make more sense closer to Fig 1.1		Accept but differently address	As Fig 1.4 describe more detail of Fig 1.1, it is very important figure to comprehend overview of wetlands managemnts.
10283	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	226			Title needs to stand alone; suggest using full name for GHG		Accept	GHG may need to be fully spelled out earlier in this Chapter.
10284	Bedard-Haughn, Angela	1	227	228	1	Typo: Should be "Rewetted" not "Rewettied" (heading of panel that refers to Ch.3)		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.
10285	Sookun, Anand	1	227	228	1	Rewettied/Rewetted		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.
10286	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	227			Middle-right: <Rewetted> Also use either peatlands or organic soils		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.
10287	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	227			Middle-low: Constructed wetlands. Where are reservoirs ?		Accept	described in Chapter 6

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10288	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	227			Low-left: add <lake> and <pond> on figure as examples		Accept	no include <lake> and <pond> in Wetland
10289	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	227			Low-middle: add <dam lake> as example of managed.		Reject:	no include <dam lake> in Wetland because dam lake (reservoir) is not within the scope of this Supplement.
10290	Freibauer, Annette	1	228	228	1.4	I did not understand the relevance of having figure 1.4 in the Supplement. Furthermore, it does not help in identifying the respective land use categories. I do not find it useful. I suggest to delete Figure 1.4.		Reject	Figure 1.4 assist to make clear Figure 1.1 Decision tree.
10291	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	228	228	1	The managed illustration under 'Other Freshwater Wetlands' may be classed and counted as 'Cropland', 'Settlement' or 'Other' rather than 'wetlands.'		Reject	'Other Freshwater Wetlands' follow up Figure 1.1 Decision tree for finding the appropriate guidance chapter within this Supplement or the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.
10292	Rock, Joachim	1	228	228	1	Figure 1.4: delete "i" from "Rewett-i-ed" organic soils.		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.
10293	Wagner, Fabian	1	231		1	Suggest to provide a chapeau for this section, along the lines: there are existing methodologies, however, they need to be supplemented, because of XYZ, etc...		rejected	The reason for supplement is explained in the forward. This section explains the relation to the IPCC 2006 Guidelines.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10294	Kishitomo, Ayaka	1	232	282	1	It would be better if this section could link with Figure 1.1 (Decision tree); It will help the users if it could indicate which is Existing Guideline and which is new ones in the Supplement.		accepted but differently addressed	Change title of chapter 1.2 to "Scope of this Supplement"
10295	Sookun, Anand	1	234	237	1	Can we extend ecosystem type to include eg deltas, mud flats etc see http://www.fao.org/docrep/009/a0444e/A0444E02.htm .		rejected. Incomprehensible remark.	
10296	Sperow, Mark	1	234	234	1	Does it not also include "Wetlands" and "Other Land"?		accepted	add "Wetlands" (other Lands do not give guidance)
10297	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	236	237	1.6.1	For organic soils, the Supplement provides information on Tier 1, as well as Tier 2 and 3, however, no such guidance is given for the other pools and activities, although this would be very much needed.		Noted	Guidance for other pools is provided in the 2006 Guidelines. Where necessary and possible additional guidance is presented in the Supplement.
10298	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	239	239		The title refers to "biomass C stocks" while the text provide information on dead mass stock changes too. It is suggested to rephrase as: Carbon stock changes		accepted	rephrase to Carbon stock changes
10299	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	245		1	N2O should be subscript.		accepted	change
10300	Baltzer, Heiko	1	245	245	1	Use subscript formatting in N2O		accepted	change
10301	KIM, Raehyun	1	245	245		N2O => N ₂ O (2 should be subscript.)		accepted	change

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10302	LANE, Charles R	1	245	245		Perhaps spell out N ₂ O in this subheading rather than using the chemical symbology		Accept	
10303	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	245	245	1	The '2' in N ₂ O should be a subscript.		accepted	change
10304	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	249			<forest lands soil>		Accept	
10305	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	251	251	1	the '2' in N ₂ O should be a subscript		accepted	change
10306	Sperow, Mark	1	252	252	1	Since other portions reference specific sections within the 2006 IPCC document, should the section be referenced here?		accepted	
10307	Rock, Joachim	1	253	255	1	If N input from anthropogenic sources is not assessed because the N emissions are already accounted for in other sectors, it has to be made sure that the different emission pathway into the atmosphere does not result in an overall emission factor that is different from the factor used for the first N accounting. If, for example, N was washed out from agricultural soils and the emission factor of N from wetlands is higher than for N out of non-wet mineral soils the emissions would be underestimated.		rejected.	The default values from e.g. agricultural leaching already include a N ₂ O component generated by wetland ecosystems

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10308	Lilleskov, Erik Andrew	1	254	256	1	Line 254-256. This is not clear to me. I would think it would be a conversion of the NOx or NHy emission to N2O emission, so in the pool of N2O it would not be double accounting, but in the pool of anthropogenic N emissions it would. So the N2O can not be ignored even if it arises from anthropogenic N emissions off site, because it has a different forcing from the previous emissions. This should be made clear, perhaps as an annex or by reference to another document that specifies this accounting process.		rejected.	The transformation of Nox and Nhy into off-site N2O is already included in the default values
10309	Sperow, Mark	1	259	259	1	Since other portions reference specific sections within the 2006 IPCC document, should the section be referenced here (e.g., Section 2.4)?		accepted	
10310	Sperow, Mark	1	263	263	1	I do not believe "In addition" is appropriate here, please delete.		accepted	change
10311	Wagner, Fabian	1	263		1	Replace "In addition CH4" by "Methane"		accepted	change
10312	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	271			<hydrotorf> Difficult to find this word. Can it be replaced with a synonym that is more common ?		Rejected	see below (Comment 10553)
10313	LANE, Charles R	1	276	276		How are "substantial changes in water area" defined? What is substantial?		rejected	this is a quotation of the 2006 Guidelines which do not specify the "substantial"
10314	Sperow, Mark	1	227	228	1	Please correct spelling ("Rewettied") for in the illustration for Chapter 3.		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.
10315	Radunsky, Klaus	1	279	279	1	It is suggested to delete "In" in the beginning of the first sentence.		accept	change
10316	Sperow, Mark	1	279	279	1	In at the beginning of sentence is not needed.		accept	change

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10317	Lilleskov, Erik Andrew	1	282	282	1	Line 282. Although the biogenic origin rationale for not including wastewater CO2 makes sense, it is not clear why CO2 from wastewater should not be considered because of "rapid turnover" or why it should turn over more rapidly than other CO2.		Noted	This treatment of biogenic CO2 is in accordance with the principle in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.
10318	Segarra, Dr. Katherine E. A.	1	282	282		It is not clear why CO2 emissions from wastewaters are not included. This sentence mentions their 'biogenic' origin but are not CH4 and N2O also biogenic in origin?		Noted	This treatment of biogenic CO2 is in accordance with the principle in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.
10319	Ishizuka, Shigehiro	1	283	296	1	The CH4 emission from plant is not addressed in any place. Not only direct CH4 production by plants (Keppler et al. 2006, Nature), but also CH4 emission through tree plant tissue (Rice et al. 2010, Geophys Res Lett) have been proposed. Because their estimates have not been well identified and the case studies are not enough, we can not show a good practice guidance and the emission factor, but I think it might be a good idea to introduce these studies as potential big issues for the future (and also not included in this supplement).		rejected.	These fluxes have been implicitly taken into account in the measurements that are the basis for the emission factors
10320	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	283	283	1.6.2	It is not clear which Tier supplementary and updated guidance is needed for.		rejected	The supplement addresses and gives guidance for all tiers.
10321	Wagner, Fabian	1	288		1	Insofar - did you mean "Because/As/Since"? How about: "On the basis of recent new scientific insights, this ..."		Reject	No substantive change in meaning

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10322	DOS SANTOS, Marco Aurelio	1	293	296	1.6.2	The Wetlands Supplement does not provide any additional guidance for Flooded Lands compared to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, which currently only provides guidance to estimate CO2 emissions and removals from land converted to flooded land. This is because the science has not advanced enough on this issue since publication of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. I am not agree with this statement beause after 2006 Guideliens a lot of publications in international journal appears as well as the International Hydropower Association - IHA Manual on Field Measurement as well as the International Energy Agency Implementing Agreement for Hydropower tecnholgies - Annex XII - Hydropower and Environment - Task 1-Managing the Carbon Balance of Freshwater Reservoirs. What is the reason to continue with a IPCC Guidleine with outdated information.		Reject	This is beyond the scope of the Supplement. The sentence will be left as it is. The background of exclusion of "flooded land" from this Supplement will be explained in detail in the Overview chapter.
10323	Radunsky, Klaus	1	293	296	1	This statement is a very important clarification.		Accept with differently addressed	The authors suggest deletion of the sentence on lines 295-296: "This is because....IPCC Guidelines"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10324	PENMAN, Jim	1	298	315		The logical relationship of these chapters is not entirely clear; on reading the title Ch2 seems to cover everything, so why are we projecting out some subjects? However the content of Ch 2 seems to be more about emissions from drainage. Perhaps we need to clarify this.		Rejected	Chapter titles are fixed
10325	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	298			<CHAPTER 2-GUIDANCE> Keep it simple. Similar for next title Table for this section is appreciated.		Noted	Will be considered in revising text.
10326	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	299		1	Insert space between REMOVALS and FROM		Accept	Revised text "REMOVALS FROM"
10327	MacDonald, James Douglas	1	299	299	1	Space, REMOVALS FROM		Accept	Revised text "REMOVALS FROM"
10328	Podest, Erika	1	299	299		space is needed between "emissions" and "from"		Accept	Revised text "REMOVALS FROM"
10329	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	299		1	..insert space between words "removals" and "from"		Accept	Revised text "REMOVALS FROM"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10330	Segarra, Dr. Katherine E. A.	1	299			Space needed between Removals and From		Accept	Revised text "REMOVALS FROM"
10331	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	299	309	1.6.3	The first heading, concerning Chapter 2, talks about organic soils in all land use categories, whereas the second heading talks about organic soils again. The difference is not entirely clear.		Accept	There is an ambiguity in the title. Will seek to address it in consultation with Authors of Chapter 3. Suggestions: change title ""....REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS".
10332	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	303	304		(Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, and Wetlands) should be "(Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlement and Other Land)". Indeed, chapter 2 covers all land use categories.		Accept with differently addressed	All land use categories are addressed, revise text to "(Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlement and Other Land)"
10333	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	304	305	1	the impact of drainage depth is not included into the Tier1 level, but higher Tiers.		Accept	Check with chapter 2 if this is the case. Suggest delete sentence on line 304-305 "Tier 1 guidance providedemission estiamtes."
10334	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	308	309		<PEATLANDS AND ORGANIC SOILS> Were not them regarded as same unit previously ?		Reject	The terms are not synonymous
10335	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	310	315	1	I lack abandoned drained land which ditches slowly fills and the land is again wetter. As I understand it, chapter 3 is dealing with actively rewetted land. Mayby reclamation is not so actively performed, but it could be made clear.		Noted	Consult with Chapter 3 on whether "passive" rewetting is a valid within the scope of the Supplement, and if it can be addressed at Tier 1 level

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10336	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	319	320		Move definition at beginning of section.		Reject	Comment is difficult to understand.
10337	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	330			<vertical or horizontal flow wetland>		Accept	delete parenthesis text
10338	PENMAN, Jim	1	331	333		replace last full sentence with: "Nitrous oxide emissions from wetlands managed for the filtration of non-point source agricultural effluents, such as fertilizers and pesticides, are included in indirect emissions from soil amendments covered by Volume 4, Chapter 11 of the 2006 Guidelines as part of the leaching/ runoff and volatilization components of indirect emissions, and are not delat with in this Supplement."		Accept	Insert additional text "..and are not considered within this Supplement" Also standarise the citation notation
10339	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	333		1	Insert '2006 IPCC Guidelines' before Volume4, Chapter 11.		Accept	Standardise Citation notation
10340	Wagner, Fabian	1	333		1	Add "See Table 1.4"		Noted	Table 1.4 will be address elsewhere
10341	Wagner, Fabian	1	335		1	wetland-specific either delete hyphen or also introduce earlier on "country specific"		Accept but differently address	Issues with regard to use of "wetland" terminology will be addressed.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10342	Kolka, Randy	1	336	336	1	This is not completely true, biomass stock changes are considered in Chapter 5,		Accept	Suggest rewording of lines 335-339 "Generic guidance for estimating carbon stock changes and greenhouse gas emissions and removals related to biomass and dead organic matter pools (i.e. dead wood and litter). can be found in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Chapters 4 and 5 provide new emission factors for biomass and dead wood in addition to soils and new stock change factors 338 associated with activities that occur in these systems."
10343	PENMAN, Jim	1	337	339		ensure there is no risk of inconsistency between what the 2006 GL say, and the new advice provided here.		Noted	
10344	Wagner, Fabian	1	340		1	Global check for "should". Here for instance, "It is good practice for countries" etc seems appropriate		accept	it is good practice for countries to avoid.....
10345	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	340	341		<double-counting> Provide a table to help overcome this issue.		Accept but differently address	The issue of double-counting will be dealt with in the text differently from the "table".
10346	Segarra, Dr. Katherine E. A.	1	346	347		I realize that rice paddy soils are not included in this supplement as they are already addressed in a previous document. However, I think this should be stated in the introduction chapter more clearly as 'flooded agricultural land' certainly sounds like rice paddy soil to me.		accept but differently addressed	we mentioned much earlier in the chapter that rice paddies are not included in the supplement but to avoid confusion on line 346 we suggest to modify seasonally flooded land
10347	Sperow, Mark	1	347	347	1	It is not clear what "can feature" means.		accept	suggested re-wording

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10348	Freibauer, Annette	1	348	350	1.6.3	Please add that it is good practice to use flux approaches for soils where the layer rich in organic carbon is deeper than 30 cm to avoid artefacts		Rejected	we agree it is good practice but for the scope of this introduction chapter we feel it is too detailed to provide good guidance for a specific soil depths
10349	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	352		1	Table 1.4, I want to refer to line 335-336, where it is stated that not all pools of C are included in this guidelines. The use of the expression "carbon stock" in table 1.4 can be confusing since it is the loss of organic soil C which is included.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10350	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	352		1	Table 1.4 the row 2.1.3 describes that updated EFs by water-table level is provided, which is not true.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10351	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	352	353	1	Table 1.4 .. Last column - what does AFOLU stand for?		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10352	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	352	353	1	Table 1.4 .. Third column - what do FL, CL, GL, WL stand for?		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10353	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	352	353	1	Table 1.4 .. Column two -what does EF stand for?		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10354	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	352	353	1	Table 1.4 .. Column two - second to last row -what does MCF stand for?		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10355	Romanovska ya, Anna	1	352	353	1	in the table for 2.1.3 mentioned that updated Efs by water-table level provided. However, I didn't find any Efs by water-table level, only precipitation regime is considered there		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10356	Romanovska ya, Anna	1	352	353	1	in the table for 2.1.4.1 mentioned only CH4 emissions from drained ditches (which should be correct), however, in Chapter 2 also remaining CH4 emissions from drained soils in included - this source (if any) is still natural and shall be excluded from Chapter 2		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10357	Romanovska ya, Anna	1	352	353	1	on p. 1.15 and 1.16 would be good to have titles for columns as well		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10358	Romanovska ya, Anna	1	352	353	1	should be consistency across table in wording: new guidance or new supplementary guidance or completely new guidance; and consistency in which column these words should appear (sometimes it is second column, sometimes it is 4th)		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10359	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	352	353	1	for 3.2.3 it is mentioned "insignificant (Tier 1 level)" it is not clear what does it mean - might be not estimated? But to Tier 1 reference is given.. Please, clarify		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10360	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	352	353	1	it is not clear why subsections 5.1 and 5.3 are not included in the table		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10361	Thomson, Amanda	1	352	352	1	Table 1.4. Rows for chapter 5 do not seem to be in the same layout as the other chapters. Notes on new supplementary guidance are in the IPCC 2006 GL column (col 4) rather than column 2		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10362	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	353	353	1	Table 1.4 - consider carrying the table headings each page.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10363	Wagner, Fabian	1	353		1	cf. my comment lines 0-1 (See the comment "10003".), also in Table 1.4 introducing a reminder ('FL = Forest Land, CL = ...') and systematically using shorthands will help make the table more compact and thus more useful.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10364	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	353			Chapter title at row heads suggest highlight it by using either bold letters or grey background.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10365	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	354	439	1	it is not clear for what purpose that subsection is included and what it is going to bring to the reader. In the present way it is confusing subsection and I suggest to delete 1.7		Accept	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10366	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	354		1.7	The section should talk about the issue indicated in the heading first from a general aspect, and any case study should only follow this general description as an example.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10367	Thomson, Amanda	1	354	440	1	This section (1.7) is rather incoherent. The case study needs some framing text to explain why it is included, and section numbering to make it clear when the case study is finished and the next subsection (reporting of GHG emissions and removals of managed wetlands with completeness and without double-counting) begins.		Accept with differently addressed	The issue of Removals completeness and double counting will be developed in the context of consistency with 2006 guidelines.
10368	Wagner, Fabian	1	354		1	From the title it is not clear that this is just a case study, so 357 is rather unmotivated. Also, since this is not a real case study but a rather stylized example (there is no real story about real places and real wetlands), I suggest to call it an "example" rather than a case study.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10369	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	356	357	1	I lack a title 1.7.1		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10370	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	357	419	1	Please describe 'case study' of which category. Is this a case study of emission and removals for rewetted and restored wetland?? I could not understand the aim of 1.7. I am just confused by this section.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10371	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	357	419	1	A case study is described, but no reflexion on this is given, or conclusion, or coupling to this new supplement. Something is lacking here.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10372	Kolka, Randy	1	357	419	1	I like the idea of case study but it needs to be more comprehensive to the point of actually calculating the C footprint, otherwise it falls short.		Accept with differently addressed	Carbon footprint methodology is not relevant to IPCC Inventory Guidelines.
10373	PACIORNIK, Newton	1	357	439		The inclusion of the "case study" is misleading. It is not clear if it should be understood as an example or a guidance. If it is just an example, there is a big risk that it would be understood as a guidance. So it should be carefully revisited. If an approach is seen by the authors to be overall recommended it should be presented as a guidance. If not it should be clearly stated that it applies only to the national circumstances of the country in question.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10374	Radunsky, Klaus	1	358	358	1	It is suggested not to be so specific to differentiate between Annex I and non-Annex I countries as this is not a common practice in the IPCC Guidelines. The IPCC guidelines are policy neutral. The sentence should read: The following approach has been taken by a country in reporting of emissions and removals		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10375	Sperow, Mark	1	358	365	1	It is not clear how this is a case study. Also, is the reference to the 1996 Guidelines correct, or should this be 2006?		Accept with differently addressed	The 1996 IPCC are more commonly used in current reporting. In the case study the comparison is between current reporting (1996 guidelines) and transition to combined 2006 Guidelines and 2013 Supplement
10376	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	359			<and Organic Soils>		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10377	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	360	360	1	IPCC 1996 is not listed in the references		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10378	Cai, Zucong	1	361	365	1	GHG emissions occur in natural wetlands. Does "only those associated with human activities on wetlands are reported" mean that the GHG emissions reported from human disturbed wetlands are the change in GHG emissions before and after human disturbance?		Accept with differently addressed	The 1996 guidelines do not provide clear guidance in this regard, however Section 1.5 in these guidelines addresses the issue, also refer to section 1.1 of the 2006 LULUCF Guidelines

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10379	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	362			<human activities are reported>		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10380	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	363			<agriculture, peat...>		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10381	LANE, Charles R	1	365	365		how are lands "indirectly impacted by drainage" defined?		Accept with differently addressed	Section deleted, however the "indirectly impacted" area is better defined as not exploited, but drained as an inadvertent consequence of the human activity
10382	MIAO, Chiyuan	1	366	409		It is preferred to readdress the data clearly;		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10383	Sookun, Anand	1	366	374	1	Classification - can we include climate regions as well?		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10384	PENMAN, Jim	1	367			delete " completely"		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10385	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	367			Insert peatland definition here. <case study, wetlands... nearly synonymous...>		Accept with differently addressed	Issues of defintions will be addressed in section 1.3 and 1.4

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10386	Sperow, Mark	1	369	369	1	Is this 14-20% reference to "global" land area? Please clarify.		Accept with differently addressed	This refers only to the case study country
10387	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	370	370		or and/soil should be "and/or soil"		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10388	PENMAN, Jim	1	374			is there an intention to convey "correspondence to the use after conversion", please clarify		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10389	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	385			<analysis of private commercial...>		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10390	LANE, Charles R	1	390	391		provide a reference for this claim		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10391	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	394	394	1	Consider changing 'use' to 'uses'		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10392	Sperow, Mark	1	398	398	1	Add "it" after "allow" - "allow it to make...".		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10393	LANE, Charles R	1	404	404		the water table likely varies markedly depending on the season and other conditions...		Accept with differently addressed	True, but some generalisation is required. No clear guidance in IPCC 1996. The uncertainty associated with variable water table (and other environmental drivers) should be included in the discussion of emission factors in the relevant chapters (Chp 2, 3)
10394	LANE, Charles R	1	408	408		resilience to change or resistance to change?		Accept with differently addressed	Resilience to change
10395	Stenhouse, Michel	1	408		1	Editorial: "peatlands' (plural)		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10396	PENMAN, Jim	1	409			is the intention to convey as related to recovery " that both rewetting and restoration lead to recovery"?; No indication of time –scale, but perhaps that is provided later.		Accept with differently addressed	No guidance in 1996 GPG
10397	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	410	419	1	It is very confusing that no default emission factors are provided in the case study. Also the last sentence (L418-419) is confusing. What is the point of having the case study section?		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10398	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	412	413		provide an example		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10399	Xu, Xiaofeng	1	414	414	1	this sentence is really confusing. It is disconnected with the context.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10400	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	414			Fit sentence into context.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10401	Baltzer, Heiko	1	415	419	1	The assumption that methane emissions are offset in the longer term by carbon sequestration is bold. It needs justification by citing relevant scientific literature (if such studies exist).		Accept with differently addressed	This is a review of the current methodology, and may be valid. However this section will be deleted
10402	Cai, Zucong	1	415	419	1	I do not think the CH ₄ emission from rewetted wetland could be offset completely by carbon accumulation and stopping of N ₂ O emission. At least, present some references.		Accept with differently addressed	This is a review of a reporting current methodology, and has passed review. However this section will be deleted

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10403	FRIBORG, Thomas	1	415	419	1.7	<p>Though I do agree with the first assumption that "Rewetting of peat is assumed to stop the emission of CO2 and N2O to the atmosphere from peat oxidation" I have difficulties accepting that "CH4emission is offset in the longer term by the gradual accumulation of new dead organic material (new peat formation). Therefore neither CH4 emissions nor sequestration of carbon in peat are reported." It is relatively well established that, historically wetland extend Globally has been a controlling factor for CH4 concentration in the atmosphere, therefor it may not be true that over time regrowth of wetlands and the associated CO2 uptake balance out increased CH4 emissions. Even for, what must be considered, natural wetlands there doesn't seem to be balance in a climate perspectives, because many examples exists of natural wetalnds being a source of GHG when fluxes are calculated global warming potential of the individual contributions (see e.g. Friborg, T et al GEOPHYSICAL RESEARCH LETTERS, VOL. 30, NO. 21, 2129, doi:10.1029/2003GL017797, 2003). If natural wetlands are contributing to the (natural) heating/insolation of the atmosphere there is no obvious reason why rewetted wetlands shouldn't be, however in this case it can not be considered natural. Please consider this issue again.</p>		Accept with differently addressed	Very interesting, and should be considered for inclusion in the relevant chapter
10404	Hatala, Jaclyn	1	415	415	1	Rewetting doesn't stop all oxidation to CO2, it just reduces it.		Accept with differently addressed	deleted section

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10405	Huissteden, Ko van	1	415	419	1	The assumption that rewetting of peat results on the longer term to a compensation of CH ₄ emission by peat formation is not always valid, and depends strongly on local ecological conditions.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10406	Segarra, Dr. Katherine E. A.	1	415	419		The idea that methane emission is offset by the gradual accumulation of new dead organic material is a major assumption. Wetlands in general are the major single source of methane to the atmosphere and peat wetlands are the largest component of global wetlands. I think this statement needs at least a citation to support it or to be reexamined. Also, there is a space needed between "CH ₄ " and "emission" on line 418.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10407	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	416	418		The following text: "In the national inventory examined here, it has been assumed that this CH ₄ emission is offset in the longer term by the gradual accumulation of new dead organic material (new peat formation)" The quantitative and qualitative elements supporting this "expert judgement" should be reported here. This is a relevant assumption and it is not good practice in the "GHGI environment" to set an assumption without providing evidences/reasoning on which such an assumption is based.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10408	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	417	417	1	Consider inserting a space between 4 and emission		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10409	MacDonald, James Douglas	1	417	417	1	space CH4 emission		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10410	Rock, Joachim	1	417	417	1	Add space between "CH4" and "emission".		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10411	Vitullo, Marina	1	417	417	1	A space is missing between the words CH4emission.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10412	Hatala, Jaclyn	1	418	418	1	This section is very confusing. I don't quite understand why CH4 emissions should not be reported, since the global warming potential of CH4 is much higher than CO2.		Accept with differently addressed	Need clarity in the guidance on this point. It must be clear in the relevant section (Chapter 3. Section 3.2.2) of the Supplement the rewetting is management and all emissions (including CH4) should be reported.
10413	PENMAN, Jim	1	419			Does this full-stop (at the end of this sentence) mark the end of the case study? If so I suggest putting the case study in a box; presently it's not clear where it ends		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10414	Klemedtsson, Asa Kasimir	1	420		1	This could be the title 1.7.2, since it is no longer a description of the case study.		Accept but address differently	Need to reword this sub-title and might remove it and replace into the title section 1.7

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10415	Thomson, Amanda	1	420	438	1	This subsection should come at the beginning of section 1.7. Table 1.5 does not add anything to the text and information already included in table 1.4		Accept but address differently	
10416	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	420			<ON MANAGED>		Accept	We will revise it
10417	Wagner, Fabian	1	422	425	1	This is generic and does not need to be repeated in this 'example' section. Note the word 'should', which - again - should not be here (cf. 1 340)		Accept but address differently	Yes, the subtitle will be revised
10418	LANE, Charles R	1	430	435		This paragraph is awkwardly phrased.		Noted	We will revise this paragraph
10419	PENMAN, Jim	1	430	435		replace with : "2. For wetlands remaining wetlands, emissions and removals resulting from the human activities of rewetting and/or restoring after peat extraction, managements on coastal wetlands and inland mineral soil wetlands and from constructed wetlands should be included, in addition to emissions from peatland undergoing peat extraction and from flooded land remaining flooded land, which are already covered by the 2006 Guidelines. Emissions from peat fire and water-borne carbon of drained wetlands and CH4 emission from drainage ditches during the drainage of wetlands should also be estimated and reported."		Accept	These issues expressed here will be accommodated and addressed.
10420	PENMAN, Jim	1	430	435		Previous text was difficult to untangle (See the comment #10419.)		Accept	The paragraph need major changes/revision

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10421	PENMAN, Jim	1	434	435		Presumably we provide methods for these categories.		Reject	Generic Methodologies is described in Vol 4, Chapter 2 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Green House Gas Inventories
10422	MacDonald, James Douglas	1	436	438	1	Poorly structured sentence, unclear. Revise for clarity.		Accept but address differently	Need some minor revision
10423	Romanovskaya, Anna	1	437	437	1	changes of soil organic matter in term of carbon and nitrogen... - it seems to be wrong statement. IPCC guidelines never before provided methodologies and asked to report changes in nitrogen stocks in SOM. Only fluxes of N might be considered.		Reject	In Tier 1, a method of stock changes is widely adopted, including the estimates of non CO2 emissions. SOM includes dead organic matter (DOM) pool that can be burnt and released GHG. Changes of DOM also occur during land conversion and decay. See Chapter 2 the 2006 IPCC Guidelines
10424	PENMAN, Jim	1	438			replace "counted" with "estimated"		Reject	There are big differences between "counted" and estimated. We think "counted" must be used as the emissions and removals will be calculated; not estimated.
10425	Huissteden, Ko van	1	440	440	1	Table 1.5, row 1 and 5, column 4: Managed wetlands also may have significant emissions caused by dredging of drainage canals and ditches. The organic-rich sludge is often stored on land and exposed to oxidation resulting in CO2 emission. This is common practice in the Netherlands for example, and should be included in emission inventories, since it is an effect of management.		Accept but address differently	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10426	Rock, Joachim	1	440	440	1	Table 1.5, column "Wetlands Supplement", row 3.B.4.a: delete "of" from "... removals resulting from the of rewetting ..."		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10427	Romanovska ya, Anna	1	440	440	1	titles for all columns should be added in the table 1.5		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10428	Romanovska ya, Anna	1	440	440	1	for 3.B.4.a.ii flooded land remaining flooded land - it is not clear where it should be reported and where are methodologies		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10429	Wagner, Fabian	1	440		1	The table is very clear. Good!		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10430	Wagner, Fabian	1	447		1	Good practice focusses sounds clunky		Accept	Accept, we made a change of "Good practice" with "The good practice od inventory compilation".
10431	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	448	449		It is suggested to rephrase as follow: "what are the largest emission sources, the sources that have the largest potential to change or have the greatest uncertainty		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the text shall be revised accordingly.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10432	Thomson, Amanda	1	449	452	1	Sentence starting 'Inclusion of emission and removal estimates...' is not really appropriate to this guidance and is more a matter for generic inventory management guidance. Recommend its removal.		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the text shall be revised accordingly.
10433	Wagner, Fabian	1	449		1	syntax unclear		Accept	Accept. See the response to the Comment #10431
10434	Wagner, Fabian	1	450		1	replace "will require" by "requires"		Accept	Accept. The sentence is deleted
10435	Wagner, Fabian	1	451		1	replace "access new data sources, engage new data suppliers," with "access additional data source and data suppliers that they may not have used previously."		Accept	Accept. The sentence is deleted
10436	Du, Rui	1	459	460	1	Data on wetland restoration or rewetting, in particular, is likely to be available through conservation organizations		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the text shall be revised accordingly.
10437	PENMAN, Jim	1	462			repalce "targeted" with " contacted"		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the text shall be revised accordingly.
10438	Du, Rui	1	464	464	1	To supplement in-country data on wetlands and organic soils, or if in-country data is not readily available,		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the text shall be revised accordingly.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10439	Vitullo, Marina	1	466	467	1	Change of the text: "there are certain meta-databases that may prove useful to inventory compilers." as follow: "Meta-databases that may be useful to inventory compilers."		Reject	Reject. At least, meta-databases are proved to be referenced for inventory compilers.
10440	LANE, Charles R	1	467	470		Not all Ramsar sites have all (or most) of the data noted. This is only provided if the member country provides the information. In addition, is there additional information that is more recently than 2004?		Accept	Accept. Further referring to the Ramsar sites Database to confirm the data listed in that database.
10441	Wagner, Fabian	1	470		1	replace "level of data" by "level of detail"		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the text shall be revised accordingly.
10442	Wagner, Fabian	1	474		1	there is no entry for "Wetlands International" in the list of databases. Consider italicizing.		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the text shall be revised accordingly.
10443	PACIORNIK, Newton	1	476	530		References to sources of data should be carefully presented. It should be clearly stated that if a country do not use default emission factors explicitly presented in the Supplement or country specific data documented it may use the sources listed as well as other sources provided the country document and justify why the data is judged to apply to its national circumstances.		Accept	Accept. In SOD,the all global sources of data shall be double checked for the suitability.
10444	LANE, Charles R	1	478	529		Date accessed would be useful.		Accept	Accept. Thanks a lot. All URLs of the global databases listed in text have been provided.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10445	Wagner, Fabian	1	478		1	Suggest to use a harmonized format: Product, Publisher, coverage (type of data, years, etc.), format (GIS, tables etc), additional notes, short info on publisher, link. Do all of these allow unlimited access and download?		Noted	Noted. We shall discuss this issue of the format with other chapters and TSU.
10446	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	482			what are flora and fauna values ?		Noted	Noted. Yes, all individual ramsar sites have the specific noteworthy fauna values and/or noteworthy flora values.
10447	MIAO, Chiyuan	1	488	488		The website of Global Lakes and Wetlands Database is out of work		Accept	Accept. The http://www.worldwildlife.org/science/data/lake sandwetlands.html is accessible and contains the downloadable data. In SOD, we will change to the URL http://www.worldwildlife.org/science/data/lake sandwetlands.html
10448	Sperow, Mark	1	488	488	1	This URL did not work for me - perhaps because it is a secure site.		Accept	Accept. Response as to the comment 10447.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10449	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	488			link not working but NASA Global Lakes and Wetlands Database works (http://gcmd.nasa.gov/KeywordSearch/Metadata.do?Portal=GCMD&KeywordPath=[Keyword%3D%27RIVERS%27]&NumericId=17224&MetadataView=Full&MetadataType=0&lbnode=mdlb1)		Noted	Noted. The link (http://gcmd.nasa.gov/KeywordSearch/Metadata.do?Portal=GCMD&KeywordPath=[Keyword%3D%27RIVERS%27]&NumericId=17224&MetadataView=Full&MetadataType=0&lbnode=mdlb1) is not working. If there is working URL, the database from NASA shall probably be included
10450	Du, Rui	1	503	503	1	Carbon stocks of peatlands		Accept	Yes, we will revise the sentence
10451	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	509			Why always examples are from W-industrialized countries. We need to be equitable so I suggest include few examples but from distinct places in the world.		Accept but address differently	Yes agree. It may not be available database in developing countries
10452	Xu, Xiaofeng	1	512	512	1	I would like add a database for wetlands in China. Chinese Wetland Scientific Database: http://marsh.neigae.csdb.cn/		Accept	Thank you. The site will be listed. http://marsh.neigae.csdb.cn/ (Note the site is in Chinese)
10453	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	518	518		Bureaux		Accept	Yes
10454	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	531	589	1	Formats of the references vary - Does co-authors last name come before their first name or initial as in line 534 or does the initial or name of co-authors come before the last name as shown in line 586?		Accept	Yes agree

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10455	Schwendenmann, Luitgard	1	531	589	1	different ways to list references are used		Accept	We will take care of this issue
10456	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	532	533	1	Not cited in text		Accept	Yes, it is not quoted
10457	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	533	533	1	Consider adding URL http://www.mires-and-peat.net/map08/map_08_02.pdf as done in line 553. Either include URLs for all where they are available or delete all from references. where they are		Accept	Yes, we will take this suggestion
10458	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	535	535	1	Consider adding URL http://www.mires-and-peat.net/map10/map_10_03.pdf		Accept	Yes, we will take this suggestion
10459	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	536	536	1	Publication date should be 2009.		Reject	No, the volume was published in 2010. The only version was first published in 2009
10460	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	537	537	1	Consider adding URL http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/env/biodiversity_climate/library?l=/ghgfluxestropicalpeatlan/_EN_1.0_&a=d		Accept	Yes, agree
10461	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	541	541	1	Delete 'Nick'		Accept	Yes, the name Nick was not necessary. His name is Nick Davidson

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10462	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	541	543	1	Not cited in text		Accept	This reference will be quoted in the text
10463	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	543	543	1	Consider adding URL http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-ts-27.pdf		Accept	Yes, agree
10464	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	548	548	1	Consider adding URL http://mangroveactionproject.org/files/resources/Donato.etal_2011_NatureGeo_MangroveCarbonStorage.pdf		Accept	Yes, agree
10465	Sperow, Mark	1	551	553	1	This URL did not link to the Pdf that is referenced.		Accept	ftp://ftp.fao.org/agl/agll/docs/wsrr103e.pdf . This is the correct link
10466	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	551			Not found this citation in text. Suggest check them all		Reject	No, it is mentioned on Table 1.2
10467	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	554			Why using full names. Please double check all references. Also I found <and> and <&> used both when referencing, so please check them too.		Accept	Yes, agree
10468	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	555	555	1	Consider adding URL http://www.eenews.net/assets/2011/11/21/document_cw_01.pdf		Accept	Yes, http://www.eenews.net/assets/2011/11/21/document_cw_01.pdf
10469	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	556	556	1	Change , to . after)		Accept	will be corrected

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10470	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	557	557	1	Change , to . After variability		Accept	will be corrected
10471	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	558	558	1	Consider adding URL http://www.wsl.ch/staff/niklaus.zimmermann/papers/GRL_Hodson_2011.pdf		Accept	Yes agree
10472	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	563	563	1	Consider adding URL http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/meeting/pdfiles/0905_MLP_Report.pdf		Accept	Yes agree
10473	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	564	565	1	Not cited in text		Accept but address differently	This publication (IPCC, 2011) is quoted! The IPCC (2003) is not quoted, instead
10474	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	565	565	1	Consider adding URL http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/meeting/pdfiles/1010_MeetingReport_AdvanceCopy.pdf		Accept	Yes agree
10475	Sperow, Mark	1	566	569	1	The URL provided for this reference did not work.		Accept	This is a valid link to http://www.wetlands.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=o%2bd%2bTaPldLI%3d&tabid=56
10476	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	571	571	1	Consider adding URL http://www.peatociety.org/sites/default/files/files/WUMP_Wise_Use_of_Mires_and_Peatlands_book.pdf		Accept	Yes agree

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10477	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	576	576	1	Consider adding URL http://www.geo.uni-frankfurt.de/ipg/ag/dl/f_publicationen/2004/lehner_doell_JHydrol2004_GLWD.pdf		Accept	Yes agree
10478	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	577	577	1	Change XXX to 583		Accept	Yes agree
10479	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	578	580	1	While Ramsar is mentioned many times in the text - a reference to Ramsar (2011) is not in the text.		Accept	Yes, the reference is not in the text
10480	Sperow, Mark	1	578	580	1	The URL for this reference did not work		Accept	The correct link is: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-texts/main/ramsar/1-31-38_4000_0__
10481	FAGGI, Ana	1	581	589		not referenced in text		Accept	Yes, Sirin and Laine (2008) not in the text
10482	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	581	583	1	Not cited in text		Accept	Yes, Sirin and Laine (2008) not in the text
10483	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	583	583	1	URL = http://homepages.see.leeds.ac.uk/~lecmsr/chapter7-9.pdf??		Accept	Yes Agree
10484	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	584	584	1	Consider adding URL http://www.peatociety.org/sites/default/files/files/PeatlandsandClimateChangeBookIPS2008.pdf		Accept	Yes agree

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10485	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	586	586	1	Consider adding URL http://www.unep.org/yearbook/2012/pdfs/UYB_2012_C_H_2.pdf		Accept	Yes agree
10486	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	588	589	1	Not cited in text		Accept	Yes, Whiting and Chanton (2001) is missing from the text
10487	Lund, Herluf Gyde	1	589	589	1	Consider adding URL http://tellusb.net/index.php/tellusb/article/download/16628/18567		Accept	Yes agree
10488	Ginzo, Hector	1	71		Figure 1.1	In its footnote no mention is made of wetlands in either non-brackish or non-saline waters; i.e. wetlands in rivers. The latter are Ramsar's entities, and may be coastal wetlands. Are these the wetlands influenced by astronomic tides mentioned in the definition of coastal wetlands shown in lines 319-320 (page 1.12)?		Accept - will be addressed	Based upon the comment and revisions from chapter 5 We should replace what is currently on lines 87-90. Coastal wetlands are defined here as organic and mineral soils vegetated by vascular plants (eg. marsh grasses, seagrasses, mangroves) that are covered or saturated for all or part of the year by tidal freshwater or salt water (>0.5ppt). The boundary of coastal wetlands is recognized as the landward extent of tidal inundation and extending seaward to the depth of vascular vegetation. This definition is very similar to a recent definition in a specialized treatise on coastal wetlands (Perillo et al. 2009).

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10489	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	179		Figure 1.3	This map may be including soils other than organic soils. Figure legend (Soil Carbon (tonnes / ha)) shows wide range of soil C content, while only the highest C content seems to be colored in figure. Please replace figure to show only organic soils. Also the explanation of 'HWSD' is needed.		Accept but differently address	not anymore applicable because of other figure included
10490	DOS SANTOS, Marco Aurelio	1	0		General	Considering the review process of Wetlands chapter of IPCC Guidelines on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories I'd like to point out some important aspects regarding Flooded Lands (Hydropower reservoirs, dams for irrigation, etc). The IPCC should be revisit the literature on emissions and removals of this flooded areas because the 2006 IPCC guidelines not exhausted the subject sufficiently to keep the guide as it was presented in 2006 Guidelines. Some improvements will be added in the further draft of 2013 Supplement Report on wetlands.		Accept but differently address	The Overview Chapter will explain the reasons why flooded lands are not being considered in the Wetlands Supplement.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10491	Freibauer, Annette	1	0		General	I miss guidance on changes in the land-use matrix. The main implication of the Wetlands Supplement is that for each land use category new sub-categories need to be added: organic soils, wet mineral soils, wet coastal soils/zones. I would like to see an example of a complete land use matrix provided in the Supplement and additional guidance on what data to use (soil + land-use), how to deal with uncertainties in the spatial resolution / classification and minimum requirements of detectable land-use changes. The additional requirements of the Wetlands Supplement with the additional wetlands types and activity types to be considered will lead to land use matrices with many very small categories, which may create large efforts for completeness and consistency in countries where these soil types are minor. Guidance on when to consider these categories would be helpful.		Accept but differently address	Delete lines 74-78 and replace with the following: Prior to applying the decision tree (Figure 1.1) the following steps should be undertaken: 1. Classify all land into the 6 IPCC land use categories. If using approach 2 or 3 of land presentation, land use changes should also be identified. This should not differ from the classification countries would have used without the Wetlands Supplement. 2. Each of these land categories has to sub-divided as indicated in the 2006 Guidelines. It is good practice to sub-divided all lands into four groups of subcategory: wet organic soil, dry organic soil (Ch2), wet mineral soil (Ch 4) and dry mineral soil. 3. In the case of dry mineral soil, use the 2006 Guidelines. In case of organic or wet mineral soil or it is converted to or from an organic or wet mineral soil, use this wetlands supplement.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
									<p>4. Further stratification may be necessary for applying the Tier 1 estimation methods. See Table x.x (saved as attachment "example stratification")below as an example. Additional guidance on stratifying land-use areas to match data needs for estimating emissions and removals is provided in V4Ch3.</p> <p>5. All area of any group of stratified wetlands and the changes in wetland area with management and Land use change should be presented as accurately as possible by the adopted Approach. It is a good practice to use a matrix of initial and final area of wetlands in the land presentation. Any land-use category or sub-category being represented should be consistent over time, without being unduly affected by artificial discontinuities in time-series data.</p> <p>6. By making both sources and sinks of all managed wetlands inclusive, the key category analysis should be applied to identify a key source category. The guidance on application of key category analysis is be referred in Ch5 of GPG-2000.</p>

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10492	Freibauer, Annette	1	0		General	Please add that it is good practice to use flux approaches for soils where the layer rich in organic carbon is deeper than 30 cm to avoid artefacts		Accept but differently address	Good practice is a term used in IPCC inventory development to indicate dpractices that meet the good practice procedures outlined in 2000/2003 GPG and 2006 GLs, applying this term to flux measurement is not in line with that guidance. Providing this type of guidance is more appropriate for chapters 2-5, where use of measurement data is an integral part of the methodology development.
10493	Freibauer, Annette	1	0		General	Links to 2006 GL are partly wrong, see Table 7.1 for much better links.		Accept	Agree. Tables 1.4 and 1.5 are somewhat redundant and table 7.1 does a better job of describing the links between the Wetlands Supplement and the existing 2006 GLs. Chapter 1 will be working with Chapter 7 to combine these three tables into a single comprehensive and well-designed table that clearly show the links. This final table will be included in Chapter 1 as it is necessary for the inventory compiler to understand these relationships from the beginning.
10494	Freibauer, Annette	1	0		General	Table 1.4, Table 1.5 and Table 7.1 roughly try to do the same. I suggest to keep Table 7.1, which is the natural way users look at the supplement (from what we know to what is new) and to replace Table 1.4 and 1.5 by 7.1.		Accept	Agree, see response to comment 10494

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10495	Freibauer, Annette	1	0		General	Chapter 1.7 does not follow the definitions of the 2006 GL and of Chapter 7 for land use and soil categories. Guidance on activity data is wrong. For example, peatland extent must come from a soil map of organic soils according to the definition of organic soils, irregardless of land use. A habitat map would be inconsistent with the land use classification of IPCC. Drainage and rewetting do not necessarily lead to land use change, but can also be changes in sub-categories undrained/drained /rewetted/ within a land-use category. I suggest to replace chapter 1.7 by an example of a new complete land use matrix.		Accept but differently address	The case study has been deleted
10496	Ginzo, Hector	1	0		General	Quite good!		Noted	Noted_thank you
10497	PACIORNIK, Newton	1	0		General	General remark: Improve clarity on the use of the Wetlands Supplement in Conjunction with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. As the Supplement is not intended to be a stand alone document it must be very clear which guidance add to the already existent guidance and which guidance replace the existent guidance. The specific guidance on the 2006 IPCC Guidelines that is not valid anymore should be clearly identified. This is essential to prevent multiple interpretation of the overall guidance.		Accept	Agree, as noted in comment 10494 this cross-linkage between the 2006 GLs and the Wetland Supplement will be clarified by developing a revised table combining theTable 1.4, 1.5 and 71 and placed into section 1.6 "Coherence and Compatability with 2006 IPCC Guidelines"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10498	PACIORNIK, Newton	1	0		General	General remark: Duplication of the 2006 Guidelines material should be avoided, as well as selective quoting in order to prevent misunderstanding. Additions or clarification of contents of the 2006 Guidelines should be restricted to points related to the specific areas covered by the Supplement.		Accept	Agree. The intent of Chapter 1 is not to duplicate sections of the 2006 GLs unless it is necessary to quote certain sections in order to provide clarity to the Wetlands Supplement. The authors will keep this comment in mind and ensure confusion is not created when repeating specific sections of the 2006 GLs
10499	PACIORNIK, Newton	1	0		General	General suggestion: As a result of the guidance on the Supplement, specific text of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines will not be valid anymore. An Appendix listing all specific text of the 2006 Guidelines that is overridden by the Supplement would be helpful.		Accept	Agree, as noted in comment 10494 this cross-linkage between the 2006 GLs and the Wetland Supplement will be clarified by developing a revised table combining the Table 1.4, 1.5 and 71 and placed into section 1.6 "Coherence and Compatability with 2006 IPCC Guidelines"
10500	SHARMA, Chhemendra	1	0		General	The intent to deal with the 'managed wetlands' (or influenced by anthropogenic activities) should be more explicitly mentioned in the chapter.		Accept	A discussion of managed land as it relates to anthropogenic emissions is included in section 1.5. This section is being edited to more clearly explain this issue.
10501	Ginzo, Hector	1	353		Table 1.4	Row headed 4.2.2, second column from left, 'N2O emissions...supplementing guidance' Boldface: Should it not be supplementary?		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10502	Ginzo, Hector	1	353		Table 1.4	Row headed Chapter 6 Constructed wetlands; second column from left: 'Supplementing Guidance...' Boldface: Should it not be supplementary?		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10503	Ginzo, Hector	1	440		Table 1.5	Row headed 3.B.4.b, third column from the left. For a non-English-speaking chap, the following text is abstruse: Emissions from land being converted for peat extraction from land converted to wetland. Does it mean that some land was converted to wetland in order to extract peat from it?		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10504	Ginzo, Hector	1	440		Table 1.5	Row headed 2.B.4.b.iii; right-column. The text is difficult for a non-English-speaking chap. The text runs: Emissions from land converted to other wetlands than flooded land... Should it not be Emissions from land converted to wetlands other than flooded land...? <input type="checkbox"/>		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10505	PENMAN, Jim	1	175		Table 1.2	Table needs to be refereed to in the text.		Accepted	
10506	ADHYA, Tapan Kumar	1	214		Table 1.3	Include 'Bioremediation of xenobiotics and heavy metals' Ecological functions/activities		Reject	There are many other human activities are not mentioned in these examples
10507	PENMAN, Jim	1	214		Table 1.3	This table promises activities in the title then describes functions. I think it needs re-casting, and should be more operational.		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands. Contents of the table will be revised, too
10508	PENMAN, Jim	1	214		Table 1.3	under Benefits of social functions - I don't think this is operatonal		Accept but differently address	See the previous reply on Comment 10507.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10509	PENMAN, Jim	1	214		Table 1.3	definition of "signalization" unclear		Accept but differently address	See the previous reply on Comment 10507.
10510	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	353		Table 1.4	Need the explanation of 'FL, CL, GL, WL and MCF'. Some of Chapter No. are missing.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10511	FEDERICI, Sandro	1	353		Table 1.4	Chapters numbering does not correspond with chapter 2 numbering		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10512	LANE, Charles R	1	353		Table 1.4	Throughout table: spell out acronyms if they haven't been used before (e.g., AFOLU, Efs, etc.)		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10513	MacDonald, James Douglas	1	353		Table 1.4	Formatting. References to Chapters are not correct. Ex: N2O emissions from drained organic soils not 2.1.4.2, but 2.2.2.2.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10514	Somogyi, Zoltan	1	353		Table 1.4	it would be nice to keep the standard structure of the guidances and separate information by indicating land use category and greenhouse gases in different columns		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10515	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	353	row 2	Table 1.4	<Link to 2006...>		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10516	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	353	row 3	Table 1.4	<Separate Tier 1 level guidance according to		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10517	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	353		Table 1.4	Provide full names for all acronyms as foot notes at end of table.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10518	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	353	row 6	Table 1.4	cell#4: remove double brackets		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10519	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	353	row 9	Table 1.4	again, decide whether to use peatland or organic soil. I vote for the latter.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10520	ZAHARESC U, Dragos G	1	353	row12	Table 1.4	cell#2: <soils, new guidance>; cell#3:<Insignificant>		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10521	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	353	row 14	Table 1.4	cell#3: <sea grasses>		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10522	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	353		Table 1.4	next rows <new supplementary...> appears on last cell. Keep consistent.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10523	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	440		Table 1.5	Wetlands Supplement' column of 3.B.4.a.ii: 'Emission from Flooded Land Remaining Flooded Land'. According to the decision tree (Fig. 1.1), this category is described in 2006 IPCC GLs?		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10524	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	440		Table 1.5	3.B4.b: What is 'land being converted for peat extraction from land converted to wetland'?		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10525	Akiyama, Hiroko	1	440		Table 1.5	3.B4.b to 3.B.4.bii: No explanation in 'Wetland Supplement' column.		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10526	Kishitomo, Ayaka	1	440		Table 1.5	This table is not easy understanding for the users.		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10527	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	440	row4	Table 1.5	cell#4: <resulting from re-wetting... management of coastal...>. Reframe last two lines.		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10528	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	440	row5	Table 1.5	are here peatlands equivalent to organic soils ? Just to keep consistent. Cell #3 cross-links are welcome.		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10529	ZAHARESCU, Dragos G	1	440	row8-10	Table 1.5	<Not available> in white cells ?		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10530	Radunsky, Klaus	1	440		Table 1.5	Table 1.5 wetlands supplement column, first row: the following wording is suggested: .. Are included as well as emissions from drained organic soil, peat fire and water borne carbon.		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10531	Radunsky, Klaus	1	440		Table 1.5	Table 1.5; 3.B.4.a.ii, wetlands supplement column: please add: no additional guidance (see line 293)		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10532	Radunsky, Klaus	1	440		Table 1.5	Table 1.5; 3.B.4.a.iii, wetlands supplement column:3.B.4.a.ii, which may be drained peatlands or organic lands,		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10533	Radunsky, Klaus	1	440		Table 1.5	Table 1.5; 3.B.4.b, 3.B.4.b.i, 3.B.4.b.ii: include some language in the wetlands supplement column: no additional guidance		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10534	Sookun, Anand	1	0		General	CHECK TYPO ERRORS		Noted	Noted, typos will be identified and corrected
10535	Sperow, Mark	1	353		Table 1.4	Table 1.4 for Chapter 2.1.3 - Acronyms need to be defined.		Noted	Table 1.4 will be completely revised. Due to changes made following other comments, this is not relevant now.
10536	Sperow, Mark	1	440		Table 1.5	Table 1.5: for 3.B.4.a under "Wetlands Supplement" delete "the of".		Accept but differently address	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10537	Pipatti, Riitta	1	71	73		The decision tree is in general good but may in some cases lead the inventory compiler to the wrong place. E.g. for rewetted lands in coastal regions the guidance should be found under Chapter 6, for organic agricultural soils guidance should be found in Chapter 5 according to the decision tree. Please make the decision tree more clear on how the wetlands supplement should be used?		Noted	Will consider clarity and accessibility of decision tree in SOD. Specific changes will be made to ensure the inventory compiler is led to the correct guidance

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10538	Pipatti, Riitta	1	152	189		In current reporting and according to the 2006 IPCC GLs, the guidance for reporting of emissions from organic soils and drained organic soils is in practise the same. Section 1.4 on the "definitions and coverage of organic soils" is not clear what the changes in respect to changes to current practise are, and how the definitions relate to those in the 2006 IPCC GLs. This section should clarify the difference in the terms "organic soils" and "drained organic soils" (if there is any?) from the reporting aspect, including any changes to previous guidance/guidelines. My understanding is that there are very few changes if any in this respect in the supplement. Please expand and clarify.		accepted	now the guidance also includes wet (incl. rewetted) organic soils
10539	Pipatti, Riitta	1	215	225		The use of the managed land proxy for the guidance given under the Wetlands supplement should be evaluated in more detail because for these land the use of the proxy may not be justified. The greenhouse gas balances in wetlands are complex, vary much from year to year based on change in temperature and weather and other non-human-induced reasons. The human-impact may be marginal compared to the natural impacts. Please consider the issue both from a scientific and practical point of view. Note also the text in lines 361 and 362 "Although emissions/removals ...only those associated with human activities are reported".		Accept	Describe more "non-anthropogenical emissions and removals" ?

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10540	Pipatti, Riitta	1	226	229		The terminology in the figure is a mix of terminology used in inventory reporting under the UNFCCC (IPCC categories) and Kyoto Protocol. It would be good to stick only to IPCC/UNFCCC category names.		Accept	Try to improve terminology according to suggestion
10541	Pipatti, Riitta	1	270	271		It is unclear how "sausage peat extraction" is linked to vegetation removal at peat extraction sites -- my understanding is that that "sausage peat extraction" is just one form of peat extraction (not related to removal of vegetation). Vegetation removal is also to my understanding covered in current guidance under lands converted to peat extraction (at least for woody biomass). Also, please explain the meaning of "hydrotorf", the meaning is unclear to an inventory compiler.		Accepted with modifications . Sausage peat extraction extracts peat without removal of vegetation	
10542	Pipatti, Riitta	1	335	339		E.g. in chapter 2 and 3 part of the guidance encompass estimates from DOM - this should be mentioned as this could be an area where emissions/removals are easily doublecounted.		Accept	Consult with Chapters 2 and 3 to ensure potential double counting issues are addressed. Suggest insert text "It is good practice to ensure any potential double counting of emissions associated with dead organic matter is avoided when estimating emissions due to activities covered in relevant chapters. "

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10543	Pipatti, Riitta	1	348	350		Why is this limited to "direct measurements" of the C stock change?		accept but differently addressed	suggested re-wording
10544	Pipatti, Riitta	1	411	413		Chapter 3 provided defaults for rewetted lands (no distinction between rewetted and restored lands)??		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10545	Pipatti, Riitta	1	415	419		Is this text in line with the guidance in Chapter 3 - please delete if not. In inventories annual emissions/removals are reported, not what emissions are expected to be on longer term.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10546	Pipatti, Riitta	1	440	440		Table 1.5 and Table 7.3 (Chapter 7) are not fully consistent .		Accept with differently addressed	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10547	Pipatti, Riitta	1	441	530		The availability of data is key to the implementation of the new guidance. Please complement the section by describing in more detail the data the mentioned databases provide, including how the data covers the AD needed in the inventory preparation. Provide also information, whether the data covers the time series since 1990.		Accept but differently address	accepted but differently addressed. Discuss with other chapters to see whether it is possible to include more data information about global databases for that purpose.
10549	Booneady, Prithiviraj	1	227	228		Figure label : rewetted instead of reweitted		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10550	Booneedy, Prithiviraj	1	245			write nitrous oxide (N2O)		Accept but address in different place	
10551	Booneedy, Prithiviraj	1	360	361		not sure if it refers to '1996 IPCC guidelines' or it is the '2006 IPCC guidelines'		Accept with differently addressed	The 1996 IPCC are more commonly used in current reporting. In the case study the comparsion is between current reporting (1996 guidelines) and transition to combined 2006 Guidelines and 2013 Supplement
10552	Bratton, John	1	227	228		Fig. 1.4: typo “Rewettied/Restored” in Ch. 3 picture title		Accept	Correction of "Rewettied" should be done.
10553	Bratton, John	1	271	271		line 271 typo: drainage (e.g., ‘hydrotorf’ procedures) hydroturf?		rejected,	hydrotorf is right word, hydroturf is something else
10554	Bratton, John	1	398	398		line 398, studies, combined with earlier habitat and ecosystem studies, allow to make a coarse estimate (awk)		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10555	Bratton, John	1	417	417		In 417 national inventory examined here, it has been assumed that this CH4emission (no space)		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted Section
10556	Bratton, John	1	0		General	other typos fairly common here		Noted	
10557	FAGGI, Ana	1	31	32		to harmonize "&" or "and"		Accept	Noted, "&" will be replaced with "and".
10558	Hunt, Patrick G	1	1			In general the introduction is easy to read and understand.		Noted	Noted, no action required
10559	Eggleston, Simon	1	54	54		delete "(directly)" - it is unclear		Accept	Agree. The word "directly" has been removed
10560	Eggleston, Simon	1	56	56		"Cross-cutting" - it is unclear what "cross-cutting: means here - it is used for GPG elsewhere/ - delete		Reject	The term cross-cutting is used in the title of both chapters 2 and 3. These titles can't be changed so the term must remain as we are just repeating the names of the chapters. For lines 56-63, for all chapter names be sure to use the exact title names as shown in the current FOD.
10561	Hunt, Patrick G	1	74	92		helpful		Noted	
10562	Eggleston, Simon	1	81	81		"control" - would dominate be better?		Noted	See comment 10040

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10563	Eggleston, Simon	1	83	84		Delete "Flooded Land excludes regulated lakes and rivers unless a sustantial increase in water area has occurred". In the diecion tree ALL flodded lands follow this path!		Reject	I would reject this comment. This is an IPCC definition; I doubt that it needs changing as rivers and natural lakes are an unmanaged component.
10564	Eggleston, Simon	1	85	85		"fully" - so a wetland that is extened by 99% would not be a constructed wetland? Delete or replace "fully"		Accept	Delete "fully"
10565	Jamsranjav, Baasansuren	1	90	90		May need after "Coastal wetlands" a brief explanation on the inland wetlands		Accept but differently modified	Will be addressed in consultation with Chapter 5 group
10566	Eggleston, Simon	1	91	91		what about non-organic wetlands that have been drained? I think here we are talking about drained organic soils. Drained mineral soils are covered by mineral soils in the 2006 GL.		Accept - will be addressed	See comment 10053.
10567	Eggleston, Simon	1	94	96		I think this is wrong! Does this definition from Vol 4Ch 3 really apply to this wetlands supplement? If you follow the decision tree a wetlands for this suplment could be classed as a Forest or grassland or crop land under the 6 IPCC land classes.		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be added which will create clarity on the difference between "Wetlands" in the context of IPCC 2006 Land Use category and "wet land" in the wider context of this Supplement.
10568	Jamsranjav, Baasansuren	1	98	98		"wastewater treatment plants" replace with "wetlands for wastewater treatment"		Accept	Noted revised text will be provided

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10569	Srivastava, Nalin	1	115	116		I think the definition of Managed wetlands should be broader (e.g., impacted by human actions including....) and not just limited to resource extraction.		accept	My understanding is that all land areas are reported, (managed and unmanaged) as far as is possible. However, reporting of emissions is provided for only those associated with managed systems, and additional emissions in unmanaged systems which have been influenced by human activity
10570	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	128			Couwenberg, 2011 et al. : not et al. in the reference list		rejected	in fact it is....
10571	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	129			Couwenberg, 2010: add et al.		accepted	okay
10572	Hunt, Patrick G	1	134	135		define "fertility of the soil"		accepted	we have now replaced "the fertility of the soil as well as the addition of nitrogen fertilizers" by "nitrogen availability (soil fertility, peat mineralization, atmospheric deposition), oxygen status and carbon availability"
10573	Hunt, Patrick G	1	135	136		reference needed for "relative contribution of dry soils and saturated soils"		accepted	we will look for references
10574	WINDHAM-MYERS, Lisamarie	1	137			Somewhere in this paragraph there should be a clear statement that wetlands predominantly store carbon in soils, which can be 10 meters deep, as opposed to other managed lands which store carbon primary in biomass.		accepted	in 125:. Wetlands store a lot of carbon in their soils. Add example of carbon density, carbon storage

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10575	Srivastava, Nalin	1	141	145		It is not necessary to cite the name explicitly in the sentence. Just (Joosten, 2010) is fine.		accepted	rephrased it to passive sense
10576	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	167			FAO (1998) not in the reference list		accepted	okay, we will include
10577	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	173			IPCC (2003) not in the reference list		accepted	include
10578	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	177			Lappalainen (1996) not in the refence list		accepted	include
10579	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	177	178		Page et al (2011) not in the refence list		accepted	include
10580	Eggleston, Simon	1	194	194		"these are not prescriptive" - better to say "only general defitions are provided so the precise use in a country can better represent their specific circumstances." as countries are not entirely free in their definitions.		Accept	
10581	Eggleston, Simon	1	197	198		"have adopted as a proxy" - why not be straightforward and say " The Guidelines assume that all emissions and removals form managed land should be considered as anthropogenic (the so-called "managed land proxy") (Section...		Accept	Yes

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10582	Srivastava, Nalin	1	200	200		The IPCC Expert Meeting was held in May 2009 and NOT 2010		Accept	Yes
10583	Srivastava, Nalin	1	211	211		"Where wetlands are impacted by human activities, they should be considered managed." needs to be rephrased.		note:	Yes, we will rephrase this sentence. See our response above (row 286)
10584	Joosten, Hans	1	213	214		Table 1.3 Production functions: better Provisioning functions; Ecological functions: better Regulating functions; Social functions: better Cultural functions		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands
10585	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	213	214		Table 1.3: in socia functions/activities column. Lack a comma after signalisation		Accept but differently address	Thank you! We will rewrite these headers and find the most suitable terms to show provision and benefits of managed wetlands
10586	Eggleston, Simon	1	217	217		"agreed upon by the authors" - sounds like the authrops had lots of ideas and could not agree. Better to replace this sentence "However, no alternative, globally applicable default method, has been identified."		Accept but differently address	Good sugestion, but as this wetland supplyment is preparing by reference of 2006 IPCC Guidelines, "agreed upon by the authors" is appropriate expression. [This sentence refers to the discussion at the expert meeting held in May 2009, not to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The comment seems to be correctly capturing the discussion made there.]

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10587	Joosten, Hans	1	226	227		improve on the basis of my earlier remarks on the draft figure!	Attachment_10587.pdf	Accept	Try to improve figure according to suggestion by Attachment_10587. For example, "Drained peatlands and organic soils", "Rewetted or Restored peatlands and organic soils".
10588	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	226	228		Figure 1.4: for Chapter 3: Rewetted not rewetted/restored/peatlands/organic soils		Accept	Correction of "Rewetted" should be done.
10589	Srivastava, Nalin	1	239	239		"Biomass" in the Guidelines parlance specifically means living biomass. So it should be, "Changes in carbon stocks in biomass and dead organic matter"		accepted	
10590	Srivastava, Nalin	1	257	257		It should be, "Non-CO2 emissions from biomass burning"		accepted	change
10591	Srivastava, Nalin	1	258	258		It should be, "... non-CO2 emissions from fires due to burning of biomass and dead organic matter..."		accepted	change
10592	Srivastava, Nalin	1	263	263		"In addition" needs to be removed.		accepted	change

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10593	Srivastava, Nalin	1	273	274		It should be: "The scope of the assessment is restricted to CO2 emissions from all lands converted to permanently Flooded Lands, i.e., where human activities 274 have caused an increase in the amount of surface area covered by water. CO2 and N2O emissions from Flooded Land Remaining Flooded Land are covered by methodologies for changes in C stocks and N2O emissions from soils in other Chapters."		Noted	
10594	JENKINS, Jennifer	1	280	282		The text states that CO2 emissions from wastewater treatment should not be included in national totals because of their "biogenic origin and rapid turnover." This is not true: emissions from LULUCF sources are not included in the energy sector totals because they are already counted in the LULUCF sector. That does not mean they are not included in national totals. This statement is misleading and should be removed. As rationale for omitting CO2 emissions from wastewater treatment from this supplement, you could say instead that biogenic CO2 emissions are already covered under other sectors (such as LULUCF). If the emissions come originally from agricultural sources, then you could say that the net emissions to the atmosphere over the course of a year are cancelled out by the feedstock growth (ie rapid turnover). Please scan the rest of the document for this incorrect statement about biogenic CO2 emissions being omitted from national inventories because they are biogenic in origin.		Noted	
10595	Srivastava, Nalin	1	286	287		"...for which methodologies scientific information were was at that time inadequate to produce general methodological guidance"		Accept	Revised Text "...for which scientific information was at that time inadequate to produce general methodological guidance"

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10596	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	293	296		See Teodoru et al (2012) Global Biogeochemical cycles vol 26, doi. 1029/2011Gb 004187.2012		Note	Beyond the scope of this report [Need to a little more elaborate on the reason for not including this reference.]
10597	Srivastava, Nalin	1	293	293		"Flooded Land"		Rejected	Singular is used in the 2006 Guidelines.
10598	Eggleston, Simon	1	301	301		"elaborated" - replace with "presented" (methods are not very elaborate!!!)		Accept with differently addressed	Revised text replace "elaborated" with "provided, which"
10599	Srivastava, Nalin	1	302	302		I don't think "Intensity of drainage" has really been taken into account.		Noted	This will be addressed by Chapter 2 authors
10600	Srivastava, Nalin	1	303	304		The land use categories should also Include Settlements. The 2006 GLs do contain guidance on organic soils for Settlements.		Accept with differently addressed	All land use categories are addressed, revise text to "(Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlement and Other Land)"
10601	Srivastava, Nalin	1	304	305		The tier 1 methodology provided in Chapter 2 does not take drainage depth into account. It provides EFs based on the climate and land use type.		Accept	Check with chapter 2 if this is the case. Suggest delete sentence on line 304-305 "Tier 1 guidance providedemission estiamtes."
10602	Srivastava, Nalin	1	314	314		"Climate domain" instead of "Climate region"		Accept	Need to ensure consistency of terminology with chapt 3 and IPCC 2006

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10603	Eggleston, Simon	1	334	334		"Cross Chapter Issues" - sounds strange the chapter is not cross!		Accept but differently address	Revised text will be provided. Suggest "Issues across Chapters"
10604	Eggleston, Simon	1	335	339		Confusing - chs 4 and 5 do provide info for biomass and DOM.		Accept	This comment was difficult to interpret, however, suggest revised text to remove "dead wood" and replace with "dead organic matter" to avoid a potential ambiguity.
10605	Joosten, Hans	1	336	336		remove parenthesis		Accept with differently addressed	insert ".i.e dead wood ..."
10606	Joosten, Hans	1	336	336		replace "greenhouse gas emissions and removals related to biomass and dead organic matter pools (dead wood and litter)." by "greenhouse gas emissions and removals related to biomass, dead wood and litter."		Accept with differently addressed	insert (" .i.e dead wood ...")
10607	Eggleston, Simon	1	341	341		Can't double counting occur in Ch 2 and 3 - N2O perhaps?		Noted	Will be addressed in the text.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10608	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	352			Table 1.4 : column linked with Chapter 2.1.5, correct the peranthesis in Climate zone (boreal, temperate)		Accept but differently address	Table 1.4 will be completly revised.
10609	Srivastava, Nalin	1	352	352		Table 1.4: 1) section 2.1.3 should include "Settlements" in the "linkage to 2006 GLs" as Settlements chapters does contain guidance on organic soils; 2) for Chapter 3 guidance, "Linkage to 2006 GLs" should contain reference to Chapter 2; 3)		Accept but differently address	Table 1.4 will be completly revised.
10610	Joosten, Hans	1	354	356		if this should be a case study representative for the 2013 Supplement, it should first and foremost describe how is dealt with organic soils under Forest land, Cropland and Grassland categories. Now the example focuses on the land use category "Wetlands" whereas the majority of the relevant areas in this country are in Forest Land .		Accept with differently addressed	It is recommended that this comment be addressed in the form of sample calculations in the relevant chapters.
10611	Srivastava, Nalin	1	354	354		I don't think the case study is relevant here especially the reference to Annex I etc.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10612	Eggleston, Simon	1	357	419		this case study seems very specific and artifical. I am not clear how much it helps. Replace.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10613	JENKINS, Jennifer	1	364	365		Minor editorial point: "data" is plural. This sentence should read: "However, data on the extent and on-going influence of activities on emissions and removals on lands indirectly impacted by drainage are very limited." Suggest checking this throughout.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10614	Joosten, Hans	1	367	368		it is unclear whether reference here is to "wetlands" as land use category or wetlands as such. This is confusing because apparently the story is also about cropland, grassland and forest land on organic soil. So better change to "wetland (without s) and organic (peat) soil"		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10615	Joosten, Hans	1	370	370		these parameters should not be used to define peatland. Peatland is defined by "peat", i.e. by soil. You can, of course, use the other parameters as proxies/indicators for the soil, but that is not a definition.		Accept with differently addressed	Issues of definitions will be addressed in section 1.3 and 1.4
10616	Joosten, Hans	1	372	373		How??? A case study illustrating the 2013 Supplement should focus on organic soils under Forest land, Cropland and Grassland, because there the vast majority of the land covered by the Supplement are situated.		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10617	Joosten, Hans	1	375	380		How long are these lands kept in the conversion category before finally changing into "unmanaged wetlands"? Should - in the light of the long lasting emissions from drained peatlands - not the principle "once in, always in" be applied to peatlands, to prevent perverse accounting?		Accept with differently addressed	Good question, however IPCC guidelines do not address this type of accounting issue. Current KP rules would seem to indicate "once in always in" approach.

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10618	Joosten, Hans	1	394	396		does abandonment change the categorization from "managed wetlands" to "unmanaged wetlands"; c.q. how long is the conversion period?		Accept with differently addressed	Issues of definitions will be addressed in section 1.3 and 1.4
10619	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	399	403		Canadian peat producers have initiated Life Cycle analysis in their industry. A recommendation to include this approach should be included in this Chapter		Accept with differently addressed	Life Cycle analysis is not consistent with IPCC reporting Guidelines
10620	Joosten, Hans	1	403	403		recovery of/to what?		Accept with differently addressed	In view of a number of similar comments, it has been decided not to include a case study of this type.
10621	Joosten, Hans	1	408	408		following the logic of this Supplement, restored peatlands are a subset of rewetted peatlands, as restoration always requires rewetting. So rephrase.		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10622	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	408	409		This assumption can be considered in terms of surface fluxes but not in terms of global sink		Accept with differently addressed	Deleted section
10623	Joosten, Hans	1	409	409		this is a logical impossibility. The state of the peatland formerly existing was one with a thick peat layer. After extraction this has been removed. The most typical feature of a peat-land is -per definition - its peat. So specify this "state" to e.g. "with a vegetation similar to the formerly existing peatland". Does this country in practise have peatlands that have "recovered" in this respect after peat extraction???		Accept with differently addressed	Yes, the vegetation type is restored (obviously the peat takes a little longer).

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10624	Joosten, Hans	1	420	421		don't forget the organic soils under other land use categories!!!		Noted	
10625	Joosten, Hans	1	436	438		how long should the lands stay in the conversion category, especially when moving other land use categories to the category (unmanaged) Wetlands?		Noted	It depends on the former land use before conversion. If a parcel of land is converted, e.g. FL to CL, and then permanently remains CL. This converted land belongs to CL, not the conversion category.
10626	Srivastava, Nalin	1	439	439		Table 1.5: 3.B.4.a.iii should make it clear that this does not contain constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.		Accept but address differently	Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1 will be combined.
10627	Eggleston, Simon	1	444	455		I presume this is about area data of land and how it is stratified. This is not clear from the text.		Accept	Accept. In SOD, the text shall be revised accordingly.
10628	Joosten, Hans	1	516			add: Research institutions of relevant former colonial powers		Accept but address differently	Need examples of the suggested institutions
10629	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	530			Add NGO's as well (e.g. Ducks Unlimited)		Accept but address differently	We will take care of this issue. Relevant institutions including NGOs and private sector that have information on wetlands will be identified
10630	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	530			Other potential resources to come: National Peat Depth Carbon Storage Project from UK		Accept but address differently	We checked the site, and it contains some useful information. See http://peatlands.org.uk/?q=map/node

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10631	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	541			de Groot, R.S. and others... (2006). Not found in the text		Accept	This reference will be quoted in the text
10632	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	581			Sirin, A. and Laine, J. (2008). Not found in the text		Accept	Yes, Sirin and Laine (2008) not in the text
10633	GARNEAU, Michelle	1	588			Whiting, G.J. and Chanton, J.P. (2001). Not found in the text		Accept	Yes, Whiting and Chanton (2001) is missing from the text
10634	Hunt, Patrick G	1	Figure 1.1			helpful		Noted	Thanks
10635	WINDHAM-MYERS, Lisamarie	1	Figure 1.4			This is a very small subset of coastal management. Although captured roughly in the grassland management diagram, the predominant management of tidal wetlands is related to constraining or restoring tidal flow.		Accept but differently address	Figure 1.4 will be revised, for which your comments will be reflected.
10636	JENKINS, Jennifer	1	Section 1.7			I don't understand why the case study is presented. Is it an example of an Annex I country reporting under the existing 2006GL for wetlands? Is it supposed to illustrate the shortcomings of such an approach, by comparison with the guidance offered in the supplement? Some context would help, or perhaps delete the section.		Accept but differently address	"CASE STUDY" will be changed as "Case of default data absence" or other

<Review comments by experts on Chapter 1 of the First Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
10637	Joosten, Hans	1	Table 1.5			this table restricts itself to the land use category "Wetlands" whereas it factually also covers the organics soils under all land use categories. Therefore expand this table to also include these reporting categories, including both the rewetting without change of land use category (i.e. as with paludicultures) and the conversion from the other land use categories to Wetlands. Include for all cases also guidance on the conversion category/period.		Accept but differently address	It will be combined with Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1
10638	Joosten, Hans	1	Table 1.5	3B4a		replace by "and from management activities" (actually the managed land proxy requires that all emissions from managed land (i.e. where management activities are taking place) are included, not only those resulting from the activities per sé.		Accept but differently address	It will be combined with Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1
10639	Joosten, Hans	1	Table 1.5	3B4ai		replace "peat soil" by "peatland"		Accept but differently address	It will be combined with Tables 1.4, 1.5, and 7.1