

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0001	China	1	0			The methodology provided in the Guidelines for Wetlands should be focused on the estimation of the altered wetland emission caused by human factors. But the current methodology fails to clearly define natural and human-induced wetland emissions. It is suggested that an appropriate clarification of this issue be given in the Guidelines for Wetlands.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The issue was treated in revised section 1.3 "Application of the managed land proxy to wetlands". General guidance was provided to deal the anthropogenic emissions and removals with the natural fluxes.
G_1_0002	USA	1	General			Suggest harmonizing with other chapters in this Wetlands Supplement to make sure that other chapters are aware that a definition of organic soils can be found in Chapter 1 and refer the reader to this section instead of the 2006 Guidelines only.		Accepted	
G_1_0003	USA	1	General			Ch. 1 The use of decision trees, both in this chapter (Figure 1.1, line 76) and in following chapters, is quite useful in providing direction and guidance to the reader. Quantifying the definition of organic soils (beginning line 174) is informative and useful. The conceptual diagrams presented in Figure 1.3 (line 250) provide important insights to the reader. It would be helpful to tie these diagrams into the numerical framework in some of the following chapters, such as ch.2 and ch.3. Caution against "double counting" emissions appears throughout the document (e.g., lines 389-392). These statements are warranted and provide the reader or policymaker with insights regarding some of the challenges of correctly quantifying emissions and correctly defining a system.		Noted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0004	USA	1	General			Suggest clarifying for the reader how the authors will refer to Chapters in these guidelines. In some places in the text, the authors use for example "Chapter 6 of this Wetlands Supplement" and in other places just Chapter 6 is used. The authors could include a footnote that any chapter references without a reference to a title of the text (e.g. 2006 IPCC Guidelines) refer to chapters in this Wetlands Supplement.		Accepted	
G_1_0005	Spain	1	generic	generic		All types of wetlands should be considered, and this should be based in a sound scientific classification of wetlands, that each Country can adapt to its national circumstances and that allows the identification of the main ecological types (functional types) in the sense of their interplay with the carbon cycle. This should be mentioned somewhere in this chapter.		Noted	
G_1_0006	Sweden	1			general	This chapter has a good introduction and presentation of the following chapters and their relation to methodology. Table 1.4 is a good help.		Noted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0007	Germany	1	42	43		the chapter should start with the definition of wetlands before explaining the gaps of former guidelines. with the definition it becomes immediately clear how big the gaps were. we recommend to insert at the beginning of the chapter the definition of the 2006 Guidelines:"Wetlands include any land that is covered or saturated by water for all or part of the year, and that does not fall into the Forest Land, Cropland, or Grassland categories. Managed wetlands will be restricted to wetlands where the water table is artificially changed (e.g., drained or raised) or those created through human activity (e.g., damming a river)."		Rejected	Rejected.Bringing the definition in the beginning of the text would give the wrong impression that the Supplement only focuses on Wetlands, whereas in fact the request of SBSTA and the consequent content of the Supplement deals with wet/organic soil also under other land use categories as well as wetlands used for wastewater treatment.
G_1_0008	Germany	1	42	68		it should be noted in this chapter that the land categories for UNFCCC reporting are unchanged, whereas there is a new category for KP reporting "wetland drainage and rewetting" for the 2. Commitment Period(2/CMP.7), Annex §1(b)) which will gain a lot from this new supplement.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification.WDR for second commitment period is referred to one of KP activities, which is not directly provided a guidance on. But the guidance on estimation and reporting on land with organic soils and rewetting is provided in Chapter 2 and 3. Chapter One also provides the guidance to usage of both chapters.
G_1_0009	USA	1	43	49		The first sentence states the 2006 IPCC Guidelines are limited to peat, energy, and horticulture. Second sentence says the 2006 Guidelines also included guidance for reservoirs irrigation, etc. Which is it? We suggest merging the two introductory sentences to make it clearer what was included in the 2006 Guidelines and what not.		Accepted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0010	USA	1	55	55		If the SBSTA only asked IPCC to focus on "rewetting and restoration of peatlands", why are the new guidelines including so many additional categories? Confusing.		Noted	Noted. The issue has been addressed in Overview Chapter.
G_1_0011	Australia	1	61	61		Replace "other land uses" with " other land-use categories"		Accepted	Accepted
G_1_0012	Canada	1	61	61		The term 'managed' is referenced further throughout this chapter, but is not well-defined. It is also not found in the glossary.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. How to use Managed Land Proxy has been elaborated in new Section 1.3.
G_1_0013	USA	1	61	61		Suggest changing "managed" to managed land in italics to make it more prominent in this background text that the new guidelines are only focusing on managed land area		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The "mananged" has now been changed to "managed land", but not in italics, for consistency with 2006 Guidelines.
G_1_0014	Germany	1	63	68		it is confusing to have the two categories "drained inland organic soils" and "inland wetland mineral soils" that gives the impression the former are not wetlands. It begs the following question: why are rewetted organic soils, inland wetland organic soils or drained inland mineral soils not elaborated? Therefore, simply having the two chapters titled "inland wetland organic soils" and "inland wetland mineral soils" would be preferable.		Rejected	Rejected. Rewetted organic soils are included in both chapters 3 and 4, inland wetland organic soils in chapter 3. Drained inland mineral soils are indeed not included because they are neither wet nor organic and sufficiently covered in the 2006 Guidelines.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0015	Germany	1	64	64		the addition of peatlands is confusing, implying these are something other than organic soils; why is this chapter not simply about rewetted organic soils, which would be consistent with the formulation of all other chapters (Besides chapter 7 explicitly on cross-cutting issues)?		Accepted	Accepted. Restored peatlands have now been skipped.
G_1_0016	Germany	1	68	68		the outline of the supplement makes it clear that there is still a gap in the guidelines which concerns an important emissions source, namely emissions resulting from barrages, dams or any artificial lake, e.g. flooded land. Therefore a sentence should be added at the end of 1.1 (especially since the title of chapter 7 gives the impression the whole wetland category is concerned) like: "These guidelines close several gaps of former guidelines however improved guidelines are still missing for the important emissions coming from flooded lands."		Noted	Noted.The issue has been dealt with in the overview chapter.
G_1_0017	Germany	1	69	121		In the Draft 2013 KP Supplements the Introduction provides in Line 50 "Relationship between UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol reporting:". A reference to this text would be helpfull.		Noted	Noted. The Wetlands Supplement is meant for UNFCCC reporting (not specifically KP reporting) while the KP Supplement is meant for KP reporting only.
G_1_0018	Canada	1	70	71		Suggest deleting "in conjunction" to improve readability of sentence.		Accepted	Accepted.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0019	Germany	1	70	121		The decision tree refers to other chapters in the 2006 Guidelines. This could lead to confusion for those reporting under the Kyoto Protocol, since the rest of the LULUCF reporting under the KP for the second commitment period will be based on the 2013 LULUCF GPG. Where appropriate, the 2013 LULUCF GPG should be referred to in the Tree, and the explanation of when 2006 AFOLU GPG should be used vs. 2013 LULUCF GPG should be included in the Scope text.		Rejected	Rejected. There seems to be misunderstanding here. KP Supplement needs to make reference to both 2006 GLs and this Wetlands Supplement, but Wetlands Supplement does not need to refer to KP Supplement.
G_1_0020	Germany	1	70	73		This is a key phrase regarding the scope of these guidelines: "that includes land with organic and/or wetland mineral soils across all IPCC land-use categories". We suggest the following formulation which should help prevent the allusion that organic soils are something other than wetlands and to also include drained mineral soils: "that includes land with wet or drained organic and/or mineral soils across all IPCC land-use categories"		Noted	Noted. The issue has now been further elaborated in Chapter 1.2.
G_1_0021	Finland	1	76	79		The decision tree needs some minor modification, e.g. chapter 2 contains updated emission factors for rice cultivation (text on this should be added to the relevant diamond); change the text in the fourth diamond to "Is this constructed wetland used for wastewater treatment?"; the box on chapter 3 should be changed to a diamond saying "Is this rewetted organic soil" and then refer to a box on chapter 2 (not all organic soils are wet, drained or rewetted).		Accepted	Accepted. The Decision Tree has now been revised.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0022	Kenya	1	77	78		In the decision tree, some decision boxes are labeled with numerals 1-7 and others are not. An explanation for the omission is necessary for the reader to understand fully the procedure.		Accepted	Accepted. The Decision Tree has now been revised.
G_1_0023	Japan	1	79	84		The decision tree of Figure 1.1 starts from classification into the six IPCC land use categories. In chapter 4, coastal wetlands seem to include sea area up to 40 m depth. It is unclear whether IPCC six "land" use categories can include "sea" area or not. This point should be explained.		Accepted	Accepted. The Definitions have been further elaborated in ch. 1.2.
G_1_0024	Spain	1	85	85		this chapter explicitly mention that countries "should" subdivide land use categories into subcategories. We have noticed that, in other chapters of the document, this subdivision is considered mandatory, for example, Chapter 2, line 393-394, where it is said that the land use has to be stratified "by climate domains, soil nutrient status, drainage class or additional criteria..."		Accepted	Accepted. Language has now been made non-prescriptive throughout the document.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0025	Japan	1	86	88		Separating managed land and unmanaged land is a standard way for whole LULUCF sector, however, how to separate "managed" and "unmanaged" in sea area is maybe new concept for inventory compilers. It seems better to note here that the way of separating "managed" and "unmanaged" is explained in each sector, and this point is clearly explained in each sector's discription.		Noted	Noted. In L.117-122 of the final draft, a clearer explanation of how to the managed and unamanaged land issue is dealt with in the supplement is provided.
G_1_0026	Finland	1	88	89		In text: "It is good practice to sub-divide each of the six managed land-use categories into four subcategories: wet organic soil, dry organic soil, wet mineral soil and dry mineral soil." These four subcategories are not defined or descibed in the WL Supplement, and at least in chapters 2, 3, 5 this division is not used consistently. Please be consistent with the terminology throughout the Wetlands Supplement.		Accepted	Accepted, see new version Decsion Tree and the corresponding foddnotes, which now clarify this situation
G_1_0027	Canada	1	88	88		good practice, which is italicized, should be defined. It is not found in the glossary.		Rejected	Rejected. GP has already defined in 2006 GLs.
G_1_0028	Germany	1	94	94		organic matter of more than 20 % is the definition for "organic soils", but this is not reflected or explained		Rejected	Rejected. Section 1.5 of SOD explained.
G_1_0029	USA	1	94			Is the 20% by weight or by volume? This is probably in the reference but it might be good to specify so that one does not need to look it up.		Accepted	AC D, see Section 1.5 of SOD for explantion.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0030	Australia	1	98	102		Suggest clarification to limit future confusion about the def of wet soils - add 'for a significant' before 'part' so that the sentence reads 'Wet soils' are inundated or saturated by water for all or for a significant part of the year to the extent that biota, particularly soil microbes and rooted plants, adapted to anaerobic conditions control the greenhouse gas emissions and removals. Collectively these soils are referred to as Hydric soils – soils formed under conditions of saturation, flooding, or ponding long enough to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper part during the growing season.		Rejected	Rejected. The "extent that biota, particularly soil microbes and rooted plants, adapted to anaerobic conditions control the greenhouse gas emissions and removals" has already provided the indication of "a part of the year", no duplicate expresses needed.
G_1_0031	Spain	1	98	99		biota, particularly soil microbes and rooted plants, adapted to anaerobic conditions control the greenhouse gas emissions and.... Better say that rooted plants are adapted to cope with the anoxic conditions of the sediment because they have morphologic and metabolic mechanisms to cope with it.		Rejected	Rejected. Current language is preferable and relevant to an inventory compiler.
G_1_0032	USA	1	101	101		Change "part" to "soil layer"		Accepted	
G_1_0033	Japan	1	103	107		Maybe "Flooded land" and "Inland mineral soil wetland" are not mutually exclusive. Chapter 5 often refers dam and rivers. Thus, the chart of "Flooded land or not" in decision tree figure 1.1 should be moved much bottom direction at least the place after the chart for IMSW.		Rejected	Rejected. The revised Decision tree provides proper guidance for the inventory compiler to know what chapter to utilize for estimating emissions and removals.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0034	Finland	1	108	111		Is the last sentence consistent with guidance provided in Chapter 5 on "created wetlands"? What is the difference with "created" and "cosntructed" ? We would prefer consistent use of terminology throughout the Wetlands Supplement.		Accepted	
G_1_0035	Germany	1	108	111		why are no other than constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment included in the supplement?		Noted	Noted. Referring to ToR, the Supplement only have guidance available for constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.
G_1_0036	Australia	1	112	115		The definition of coastal wetlands is broad to the extent of being inoperable. This definition should be reconsidered and applied to take into account country's national circumstances, and to be consistent with existing international Conventions, including the Ramsar Convention. In particular, please delete reference to an unlimited seaward limit. Proposed wording: "Coastal wetlands are wetlands at or near the coast that are influenced by saline or brackish water and/or astronomic tides. Coastal wetlands may occur on both organic and mineral soils. Brackish/saline water is water that contains 5000 or more parts per million (PPM) of dissolved salts. 'Inland wetlands' are not 'coastal' . "		Partially accepted	Further discussion with Chapter 4 has resulted in improved language--see note 8 lines 202-213 in FD.
G_1_0037	Spain	1	112	115		The most common scientific classification of saline waters is that of Hammer (Hammer, U. T. Saline Lake Ecosystems of the World, Springer, 1986, p. 15 ISBN 978-90-6193-535-3), which could be mentioned as an option to be used in the clasification of wetlands		Partially accepted	AM: Further discussion with Chapter 4 has resulted in improved language--see note 8 lines 202-213 in FD.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0038	USA	1	112	112		Delete comma after "coast"		Accepted	
G_1_0039	Spain	1	114	115		<p>It has been argued that salinity inhibits methanogenesis, thus reducing methane emissions. In arid and semiarid regions, many inland lakes and other types of wetlands can be saline, moreover, coastal marshes and brackish lagoons usually display high salinities, even higher than the salinity of the sea, thus its ratio between methane emssions vs carbon burial could be more favourable than other wetlands. This could be mentioned in this chapter, as well as that the existence of management practices to imporve the role of saline wetlands as carbon sinks and, in general, the management practices that improve the carbon balance of wetlands.</p> <p>As an example, in Spain, more than 90 % of wetlands are coastal, commonly displaying salinities even higher than those of the sea, whereas among inland lakes and wetlands more than a half are saline (Casado and Montes, 1995, Guia de lagos y humedales de España, J.M. Reyero ed, ISBN 84-605-3109-0)</p>		Rejected	Rejected. The suggested additional text is not necessary for inventory compiler to utilize the guidance--this is not a textbook.
G_1_0040	Canada	1	115	115		(cf. Chapter), should this read (see Chapter) to be consistent with other chapter references?		Accepted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0041	Canada	1	120	120		Tier 1, 2 and 3 are referenced in the introductory chapter and throughout other chapters. While it is noted that an explanation is provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, it would be useful to have at least a cursory reference provided in the 2013 Supplement (whether the glossary or relevant chapter).		Rejected	Rejected. The Tier concept is basic to the IPCC 2006 GLs, it is not necessary to explain it here. Basic knowledge of the IPCC 2006 GLs is necessary in order to apply the wetlands supplement and not all concepts can be repeated in the supplement.
G_1_0042	USA	1	120	120		capitalize "chapter"		Accepted	Accepted.
G_1_0043	Australia	1	121			The Guidance does not include a definition of wetlands. Instead, the text notes that there are no commonly accepted definitions of wetlands. This is not very helpful for the development of national inventory systems. Suggest the following text be added after line 121: 'There is no commonly agreed definition of wetlands for use in these Guidelines. Countries should transparently document and report a country-specific definition of wetlands in accordance with their national circumstances.' This at least would give some clarity for inventory compilers as to how to proceed.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. Since the "Wetlands" has been defined in 2006GLs, "wet soil" has been defined in the Note 3 of FD.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0044	Australia	1	121			The definition linking wetlands with annual wetting is inconsistent with the description of wetlands in many countries. This inconsistency perhaps underlies the Report Table 1.1 (page 1.7 lines 168-169) where the area of wetlands are shown to vary widely from study to study. The IPCC definition, without further qualification, may cause confusion and apparent inconsistency in interpretation of future inventories. To help clarify what is in scope for this document please include an additional sentence after line 121: "No guidance is provided in relation to Saline IWMS or for semi-arid and arid zones where areas exist that may not be saturated at any time for a number of years, but which may be flooded as infrequently as every few decades and which consequently may be considered to have important ecological functions in some countries. "		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The definition of "wet soil" is provided in FD.
G_1_0045	USA	1	121	121		What does "general discussion" refer to? and where are the sections "dealing with higher tiers"?		Noted	Noted, the "general discussion" refer to the Sec. "supplementary guidance in this report"
G_1_0046	Canada	1	125	125		A definition of carbon balance would be helpful to the non-expert.		Noted	Noted, Section 1.3 has been deleted.
G_1_0047	Canada	1	125	155		There is a lack of flow in this section. The section should begin by stating its intention and purpose, and a clear flow of ideas between paragraphs.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. We will merge text from sections 1.3 and 1.4 into a text box in section 1.1. The text from sections 1.3 and 1.4 will be generalized to give a broad overview of GHG fluxes from wet soils. Specific examples of ecosystem fluxes will be removed.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0048	USA	1	125	126		How is this calculated? On a per hectare basis? Overall, compared to other sinks like forests? This was unclear to us.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. Updated the text to say that wetland and organic soils have high organic carbon content.
G_1_0049	USA	1	125	127		This sentence needs clarification. Is it meant that peatlands, mangroves, and marshes have the largest C stocks on a per unit area basis? Or is this sentence suggesting that the entire global area for these 3 ecosystem types together account for total soil C stocks that are larger than the sum of soil C stocks in all other terrestrial ecosystems plus, as written, all global plant C stocks as well?		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. Deleted the specific examples of peatlands, mangroves, and marshes and generalized the text to say that wetland and organic soils have high organic carbon content.
G_1_0050	USA	1	125	125		Suggest deleting first appearance of "soils"		Accepted	
G_1_0051	Canada	1	128	129		Reducing the number of examples for human interventions, practices and their consequences would make the sentences easier to read.		Accepted	
G_1_0052	Spain	1	128	130		There are also positive practices that benefits the ecological health of the ecosystem and improve balances of greenhouse gas emissions		Accepted	
G_1_0053	USA	1	129	130		suggest changing "their" on line 129 to "wetland soil" and deleting "their" on line 130		Accepted	
G_1_0054	Spain	1	131	133		Salinity is also a very important factor in controlling methane production in wetlands, so that it plays an important role in the control of methane emissions.		Accepted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0055	Canada	1	132	133		It is also important to note that emissions are controlled by peat quality (determined by vegetation but also by the amount of decomposition that occurs prior to entering the area below the water table) (Laiho 2006 Soil Biology and Biochemistry 28:2011; Muhr et al. 2011 Ecological Applications 21:391)		Rejected	Rejected. Thanks for this comment, but this text is meant to provide a general overview of the major factors contributing to emissions. We won't capture all factors in all cases.
G_1_0056	USA	1	132	146		Is there an IPCC or other well-accepted synthesis text that can be cited in this section? This is generally accepted information and could benefit from additional citations from published literature reviews.		Accepted	
G_1_0057	Canada	1	134	136		The statement that "Undrained or rewetted wetlands with water levels at or near the soil surface...generally have very low fluxes of CO2 to the atmosphere" is not precise. The net effect of CO2 update and CO2 emissions can lead to interannual differences in wetland CO2 sink and source status.		Accepted	
G_1_0058	USA	1	134	137		Page 1.6 Lines 134 to 137 This statement is misleading. Although CH4-C emissions are indeed enhanced in a wetland setting CO2-C emissions are still the dominant forms of C emissions from wetlands. They are lower than for drained or upland systems with similar available C stocks.		Accepted	accepted with modification. To make it clear in the text that we're talking about CH4 and CO2 emisisions in terms of CO2-equivalent units.
G_1_0059	USA	1	134	136		Not sure why the authors separate the citations in this sentence?		Accepted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0060	USA	1	142	143		Would add Chapter where information about DOC and ditches can be found in this Wetlands Supplement		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. DOC and ditches are reated in Chapter 2 of this supplement. In the Chapter, generic information about drainage ditch is provied in Box 1.1.
G_1_0061	USA	1	144	150		Althoguh the quantitative detail of this series of sentences is appreciated, it is unclear how this text maps to Table 1.2. It may be that the table is a percent breakdown of the 0.3% reported on Line 147. Either way, this is confusing.		Accepted	accepted
G_1_0062	USA	1	145	151		Starting with "The global carbon emissions" until the end of the paragraph, this section is a series of examples of the influence which draining wetland soils can have on GHG emissions. Suggest separating these set of sentences into a separate paragraph and introducing the paragraph as a set of examples.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The paragraph has been deleted.
G_1_0063	USA	1	145	145		Wilson et al. 2012 is an Ireland only reference. For such a broad statement about global CO2, CH4, and N2O fluxes a more "globally" relevant reference seems in order.		Accepted	
G_1_0064	Canada	1	148	148		Change ">5%" to "greater than 5%"		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The paragraph has been deleted.
G_1_0065	Canada	1	149	149		With the reference to land-use change, "change" is italicized, however it is not clear if this is to differentiate mangrove deforestation from managed changes that are covered in this supplement. This italicized text should be clarified.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole paragraph has been removed.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0066	USA	1	152	153		Suggest deleting sentence which begins with "while rewetting of drained wetlands..." It is redundant with text earlier in this section.		Accepted	
G_1_0067	Australia	1	156			The section is titled "Definition of wetlands.." but no definition is included in the text		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. "wetlands"been elaborated in Note 3 of FD.
G_1_0068	Germany	1	156	171		Interesting would be the extent of wetlands according to the IPCC GPG definition. Also the use of the broadly defined term "wetland ecosystem" could lead to confusion, since the definition of wetlands occurs in the overview. We urge the consistent use of terminology or to make the difference between wetlands and wetland ecosystems clear, otherwise for reporting purposes countries may feel guided to use the wetland ecosystem definition for establishing land use categories. Yet in reality not all wetland ecosystems fall under managed lands.		Accepted	
G_1_0069	Germany	1	156	168		expanation for huge differences in the figures about global distribution of wetlands is missing		Partially accepted	Acceptedwith modification. The table has been deleted.
G_1_0070	USA	1	158	166		Would also suggest adding somewhere in this paragraph that wetland area or "extent" is not static. There is significant seasonal variation in wetland area, for ex. in tropical flood plains during the rainy vs. dry seasons or in boreal wetlands as they freeze vs. thaw.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The paragraph has been deleted in FD.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0071	USA	1	163	163		suggest changing "wetlands" to "wetland soils" and using "wetland soils" throughout the document, since this supplement is introduced as being for "wetland mineral and organic soils"		Rejected	Rejected. In the Chapter, terminology "wet soil" against "dry soil" and "organic soil" against "mineral soil" are used throughout.
G_1_0072	Chile	1	164	169		Line 164 says that "The GLWD estimates the maximum global extent to be 12,8 million km2 including lakes and reservoirs", adding that Table 1.2 present the classification of wetlands as represented in GLWD. Table 1.2 in line Total All Classes states that the total is only 9,226 million km2. Is recommended to review and confirm the proper total figure.		Accepted	Accepted with modification. The whole paragraph and Table 1.2 have been removed in FD.
G_1_0073	Sweden	1	168	169		Minor correction. Total area in the column "Gross wetlands map" has a thousand comma which is not use for other cells.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. Table 1.2 has been removed in FD.
G_1_0074	Germany	1	169	169		here wetlands seem to include lakes and reservoirs, previously defined not to be covered by this supplement		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. Table 1.2 has been removed in FD.
G_1_0075	Kenya	1	169	170		Definitions in table 1.2 may not hold for some countries for example where there exist lakes far much smaller than the threshold size provided here. In a such a case, are the anthropogenic emissions representative?		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. Table 1.2 has been removed in FD.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0076	Germany	1	172	248		Are all "organic soils" either found in existing "wetlands" or on land that was once wetland but has at some point been "drained"? Or are there "organic soils" that have never been a "wetland"? Describing what these two terms have to do with each other, as well as how and why they are related, would provide more clarity (e.g. the demand for productive cropland has been a driver of wetland drainage, therefore it is often the case that "organic soils" were once "unmanaged wetlands", but are now managed as "cropland" or "forestland"...if this example is even correct).		Accepted	Accepted. Has been addressed in the revised text of chapter 1.2
G_1_0077	Finland	1	174	195		Definition of peat and organic soils must allow country specific variations (also between the land-use classes) in cases where because of historical reasons data has been collected and thus available only in certain format. For example in Finland in Forest land peat soil is considered to be organic if the soil type is peat. Peatlands are defined in the same way as in the National Forest Inventory; a site is classified as peatland if the organic layer is peat or if more than 75% of the ground vegetation consists of peatland vegetation. Otherwise, the soil is considered mineral.			Accepted. Has been addressed in the revised text of chapter 1.2
G_1_0078	USA	1	174	186		Suggest putting excerpted text in italics to make it clear which text is excerpted and which is not.		Accepted	
G_1_0079	Canada	1	177	177		Suggest defining "organic horizon" in text or footnote.		Accepted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0080	USA	1	192	192		The text focuses on "European definitions" of organic matter. The authors should consider comparing other definitions of organic soils from other parts of the globe?		Accepted	Accepted. Has been addressed in the revised text of chapter 1.2
G_1_0081	Germany	1	194	195		what is the reason to have country specific approaches to define organic soils?		Accepted	Accepted. Has been addressed in the revised text of chapter 1.2
G_1_0082	Canada	1	196	198		The % peatlands is given for tropical regions but it would be better if areas/% for all biomes were provided. This could be summarized in a table.		Accepted	Accepted. This part has now been deleted.
G_1_0083	Finland	1	199	201		Give explanation to the legend title 'OC Density'		Accepted	Accepted. This part has now been deleted.
G_1_0084	USA	1	201	201		What does "highest three classes" refer to? Is it top soil layers?		Accepted	Accepted. This part has now been deleted.
G_1_0085	Germany	1	202	202		As organic soils through all Land use categories are discussed wouldn't it be better to name the subchapter "1.6 Managed Wetlands and (MANAGED?) Organic Soils IN GENERAL"		Partially accepted	accept with modification. See response to G_1_0086 (next comment).
G_1_0086	Germany	1	202	202		the title of the chapter is unclear: why is it called "wetlands and organic soils"? Does it mean that organic soils are a kind of extra category and not included under wetlands. This could also imply that unmaged organic soils are even included here. Perhaps this could be rephrased as "Managed and drained wetlands on mineral and organic soils" or simply "managed wetlands".		Partially accepted	accept with modification. We agree the current title is confusing therefore we changed the title to "Application of the managed land proxy to wetlands".

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0087	USA	1	203	209		Suggest adding a sentence somewhere in paragraph that whatever method is chosen, it is good practice to consistently apply the definition of land use for the whole nation.		Rejected	Rejected. This aspect has been mentioned in the 2006 GL (Volume 4, section 1.1) and given that this is a supplement to the 2006GL it is an unnecessary repetition.
G_1_0088	Australia	1	212	213		This statement requires further scrutiny and explanation. Experience suggests that natural disturbance events may have significant impacts on wetlands that do not average suggests that cyclones have significant impact on coastal mangroves and seagrass environments.		Rejected	Rejected. We are quoting directly from the section of the 2006GL (Volume 4, Chapter 1; 1.4-1.5) discussing the managed land proxy, see also response to comment E_1_0153.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0089	Canada	1	215	215		The "managed land proxy" is referred to without a definition here. Readers from non-expert backgrounds would require more elaboration to understand this concept.		Accepted	Accept with modification. The sentence in line 218-219 has been amended to provide a clearer definition. It reads now: "The Managed Land Proxy (MLP) is used in the IPCC Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance Reports as a means to estimate anthropogenic emissions and removals because anthropogenic emissions and removals cannot be factored out from natural emissions or removals at the country level. According to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Volume 4, Chapter 3, Section 3.2) 'managed land is land where human interventions and practices have been applied to perform production, ecological or social functions' and all emissions and removals from this managed land are to be reported regardless of whether they are anthropogenic or non-anthropogenic."
G_1_0090	Germany	1	217	222		again "natural rivers" and "lakes" are classified and included as unmanaged wetlands after excluding them before		Noted	noted. The paragraph has been removed in FD.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0091	Germany	1	221	221		after "reservoirs as a managed subdivision" please add "not dealt with in this supplement"			Accepted with modification. The text has been deleted but the point has been addressed earlier in the overview section. Part 1 Introduction line 22-23 states, "the wetlands supplement does not provide guidance on permanently flooded lands such as reservoirs." Therefore, there is no need to mention it here.
G_1_0092	Germany	1	222	222		add at the end "therefore the area of managed wetlands differs significantly from the areas given in table 1.2.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. In the interest of making the text more user-friendly, the text which is referred to in this comment has been deleted.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0093	Finland	1	223	247		Although we agree in general with the use of the "managed land" proxy in reporting of greenhouse gas emissions, this text addresses areas where the human impact on the emissions are in many cases minor compared to the "natural" impacts, e.g. hunting and fishing have seldom a significant impact on the greenhouse gas emissions on the land areas where they take place. Table 1.3 includes also other activities and practices for which no guidance how they are linked to the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions is given, in the 2006 IPCC GLs or in this Supplement, e.g. tourism, pest control. We would be reluctant to extend the "managed land proxy" to cover all lands where human activities occur, but have insignificant or no measureable impact on the emissions. Also, the text in this section is partly policy prescriptive in that it does not allow for reporting of "purely" anthropogenic emissions where this can be done. Therefore, we would like to see the text starting in line 228 ("Table 1.3 ...") until line 231 (...land base."), Table 1.3, and also the text in lines 241 to 246, deleted.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. Table 1.3., the reference to the table (lines 229-232) and lines 238-248 have been deleted. See also response to comment E_1_0163.
G_1_0094	USA	1	224	224		Unclear sentence structure after "or". What is the definition of a wetland that has not been created? What year counts as the baseline year?		Partially accepted	Accept with modification. the text was unclear and has been revised.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0095	Germany	1	227	234		The phrasing "wetland mineral soils or organic soils" implies that, when it comes to "organic soils", not only "wetlands" and "drained wetlands" are being considered in this supplement, but also some other type of land (that never involved the draining of a wetland). This may cause confusion in reporting as well as in determining land use categories. If "organic soils" also implies "drained wetlands" that are now being managed under another land use (which it seems to, according to the scope in lines 70-73), then an explanation of this relationship would be helpful somewhere in the overview or at the beginning of this first chapter. Perhaps a more detailed explanation of how certain terms fit together can be written in the scope where certain terms are already being explained (79-121).		Partially accepted	accept with modification. We agree that this phrasing can cause confusion. Therefore we deleted lines 228-234, see also response to comment G_1_0093.
G_1_0096	Canada	1	235	236		Table 1.3 begins with the benefits before the actual intervention and practice is defined. Does the reader not need to understand first the intervention and practice before the benefit? Or is the benefit described for the production function, ecological function, or social function? This is not very clear and should be clarified.		Noted	noted. Having considered it we feel the table is too complex and is unnecessary given the revisions made in the text and therefore has been deleted. See also response to comment E_1_0163.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0097	Australia	1	237	247		The discussion on the managed land proxy doesnt give much guidance and is merely apologetic about why it is applied. In the case of seagrass, for example, what does the managed land proxy mean? Does it mean that the entire area of seagrass should be monitored such that any changes in the condition of seagrass area are attributed to anthropogenic causes (and should be reported in the national greenhouse gas inventory)? Alternatively could it mean that areas of seagrass should be stratified into areas affected by human activity (eg from dredging) and areas unaffected by the designated activities and that only the sub categories affected by human activity should be monitored and subject to the managed land proxy? The IPCC needs to provide practical guidance to be useful.		Accepted	Accepted. The text has been revised to a more user-friendly version. The text now reads: "The MLP continues to be generally applied to this Supplement. However, for coastal wetlands (Chapter 4), this Supplement provides guidance to estimate and report countries' emissions and removals from specific management activities (e.g., [Table 4.1]/[aquaculture, salt production, dredging])."
G_1_0098	Germany	1	237	247		the managed "land proxy" is used for capturing "anthropogenic emissions", does this lead to a general overestimation of emissions?		Noted	noted. It is possible to under- and overestimate anthropogenic emissions because "...the proportion of natural and indirect emissions to the managed land proxy fluxes can be large and highly variable in some countries". IPCC. (2010). Revisiting the Use of Managed Land as a Proxy for Estimating National Anthropogenic Emissions and Removals, eds: Eggleston H.S., Srivastava N., Tanabe K., Baasansuren J. Meeting Report, 5 -7 May, 2009, INPE, São José dos Campos, Brazil, Pub. IGES, Japan 2010 http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/meeting/pdfiles/0905_MLP_Report.pdf . However, MLP is still applicable in general in this supplement.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0099	USA	1	237			The term "managed land proxy" is introduced here with little or no definition. Has this been used earlier in the document and, if so, what is it referring to?		Rejected	Reject. It is addressed in Section 4 of Overview Chapter (Managed land and anthropogenic emissions). We also feel that the definition of managed land proxy has been provided elsewhere (e.g. Section 1.1, Chapter 1, Volume 1 and Section 1.1, Chapter 1, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines).
G_1_0100	USA	1	238	239		unclear what is meant by "occurred regardless of anthropogenic influences". Do you mean natural emissions or removals that happen to occur on managed lands?		Noted	noted. Correct, see response to comment G_1_0097.
G_1_0101	Canada	1	246	247		The managed land proxy may not be consistent with new approaches being considered for accounting emissions and removals from forest management (i.e., reference level approaches) which aim to exclude emissions from non-human-induced events (i.e., wildfire). The authors may want to consider adding a reference to the new approaches.		Noted	noted. Reference level approaches are being considered for special purposes such as REDD and KP reporting, not for general national GHG inventory.
G_1_0102	USA	1	246	247		Be more specific for "these". Do you mean estimating natural emissions and removals on managed lands?		Noted	noted. see response to comment E_1_178 and G_1_0093

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0103	Netherlands	1	249	252		CH4 emissions from drainage ditches related to forest management and cropland and grassland management should be included in figure 1.3		Rejected	Rejected. Figure has been edited extensively--all arrows in the figure are removed, see response to comment E_1_0179. Figure 1.3. is moved to section 1.7.2.
G_1_0104	Germany	1	250	251		Figure 1.3. To avoid confusion with KP it should say "Some typical LAND-USE PRACTICES..." instead of "...management activities..." and further "...wetland MINERAL SOILS and organic soils", to be consistent with line 231; instead of "Forest Management" "MANAGED FORESTS" and further "Cropland, MANAGED Grassland, SETTLEMENT" (line 207 states that Cropland is always managed)		Accepted	Accepted. Suggested wording is good thus we write: "some typical land-use practices.
G_1_0105	Germany	1	251	253		This figure gives a nice qualitative picture of emissions associated with different management of wetlands, however the removals of gases could also be displayed under those examples which show some form of restoration or rewetting. (For example a CO2 arrow facing downwards). Otherwise it gives the heartbreaking impression that emissions increase no matter what management activity is taken and that net removals are quite impossible.		Noted	noted. see response to G_1_0103. Figure 1.3. is moved to section 1.7.2

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0106	Australia	1	254	403		Section 1.7.1 summarises the key reporting approaches from 2006 Guidelines and section 1.7.2 summaries by chapter what the supplement covers. Suggest expanding and clarifying to provide clear evidence of the coherence and compatability with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.		Accepted	Accepted. This section will be revised to provide additional clarity
G_1_0107	USA	1	256	401		This section seemed like random assortment of items at first glance. I would suggest adding an overview section at the beginning of Section 1.7.1 to state by land use or land type (soils, biomass burning, rice, etc.) and by gas (CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O), what guidance is available in the 2006 Guidelines. Similarly, it would be good to have an overview by land use or land cover and by gas what is newly covered in this supplement at the beginning of Section 1.7.2		Accepted	Accepted. This section will be revised to provide additional clarity.
G_1_0108	Germany	1	257	265		Here the terminology switches to "mineral soils and/or drained organic soils", therefore it is unclear if mineral soils in question are drained or wet. Implied is that the wet organic soils are not addressed here. Again, this might be clearer if in the scope of the introduction more clarification as to the relationship between various terminology is provided.		Accepted	Accepted. This issue will be address with revised defintions and greater consistency in language.
G_1_0109	USA	1	257	290		Suggest organizing these three sections so that they fall under one main heading of "emissions and removals for managed soils" or something similar.		Rejected	Rejected. The suggestion is noted, however the present structure of this section lends itself to indicating where the Supplement will address these areas (or not address them whichever is the case).

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0110	Canada	1	281	290		This text repeats what is already in Chapter 11 of the 2006 GL and could be deleted.		Accepted	Accept with modification. The text will be condensed to avoid unnecessary repetition
G_1_0111	USA	1	286			After "Chapter 5" insert "Volume 4"		Noted	Noted, however this specific text will be deleted as it is an unnecessary detail.
G_1_0112	USA	1	286	290		Although the scientific information being conveyed in these few sentences is clear, it seems a little scientifically dense in terms of presentation. Can this be broken out into a separate equation like a few of the other chapters?		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. This will be addressed with more concise language, and will avoid unnecessary detail.
G_1_0113	USA	1	292	310		Be explicit about the exact gases covered in each section (CH ₄ , N ₂ O), not non-CO ₂ for ex.		Accepted	Accepted. Gases will be explicitly mentioned in revised text.
G_1_0114	Finland	1	296	299		The update (?) of default emission factor for rice cultivation in Chapter 2 should be addressed here.		Noted	Noted. Please refer to Chapter 2.
G_1_0115	Finland	1	305	305		Clarify what is meant with "peat extraction without drainage"? Would not all peat extraction lands cause emissions during the extraction phase?		Noted	Noted. No guidance is provided on this topic either in 2006 GLs or this supplement.
G_1_0116	Spain	1	306	307		What about the reservoirs or impoundments for water supply? I haven't seen any of these mentioned in the document. At least a mention should be done about what methodologies are better to be used.		Noted	Noted. Impoundment for water supply is not explicitly addressed in the 2006 IPCC GLs, or in this Supplement.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0117	USA	1	318	336		Should this also include mention of the CH ₄ /N ₂ O emissions from drained organic soils in rice production?		Accepted	Accept with modification. No additional guidance is provided for N ₂ O emissions.
G_1_0118	Germany	1	319	319		As it is an emphasized Land-Use-Subcategory it could be explicitly named "...inland drained organic soils... Wetlands (INCL. PEAT EXTRACTION SIDES), ..."		Rejected	Reject. The suggest change would place too great an emphasis in this general overview.
G_1_0119	Finland	1	320	321		The text gives an impression that for all LU categories Tier 1 EFs are given by drainage depht. In Table 2.1 different EFs are only for Grasslands. Change text accordingly.		Partially accepted	Accept with modification. It is noted that T1 EF with water depth have been provide for grassland only, and the text is misleading in this regard. The text is be revised.
G_1_0120	Finland	1	344	344		Chapter 3 covers but only provides generic guidance...' Something missing? Please clarify the text.		Accepted	Accept, the text has been edit for clarity.
G_1_0121	Germany	1	344	346		This sentence would be easier to understand if it was structured like the following "Chapter 3 covers undrained inland organic soils, and peatlands undergoing wet management or restoration not necessitating rewetting, but it only provides generic guidance for higher tiered methodology."		Partially accepted	Accept with modification. Will create the clarity required with slightly differed wording.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0122	USA	1	348	350		Does this have implications on the MLP as shown in section 1.6? Does the MLP appl differently for managed land area in coastal region because only the emissions from specific management activities are estimated rather than all the emissions from that land (anthropogenic and non-anthropogenic) that is considered managed due to some human activity? Perhaps this could be clarified.		Noted	Noted. This issue will be addressed explictly in revised text in Section 1.6
G_1_0123	Finland	1	381	388		Make the text consitent with the methodologies in chapters 2 to 5 - address for which categories SOM, below ground biomass and litter pools are aggregates and for which not.		Accepted	Accepted, this text has been revised for clarity and placed in section 1.7.1 where it is of immediate relevance.
G_1_0124	USA	1	388			remove extra period at end of line.		Accepted	Accept, edit made.
G_1_0125	Australia	1	397			What is meant by "waterbourne carbon" ?		Accepted	Agreed, need cross reference to chpter 2. suggest text "Chapter 2 in this supplement provide guidance on waterbourne carbon (DOC, DIC and PIC). Delete "Furthermore" replace with "However", add, it is good pratice to avoid double counting in this situation".
G_1_0126	Canada	1	402	403		Table 1.4 specific references to IPCC 2006 AFOLU tables can cause confusion as these tables are different in structure than the reporting tables. Recommend footnote explanation or removal of references.		Accepted	Accept, Table 1.4 will be revised for clarity and moved to Chapter 7 where it is of immediate relevance.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0127	Australia	1	404	422		This is significantly understating of the significant difficulties countries are likely to have in identifying data on things such as water table depths, extent of sea grass, areas effected by nutrient enrichment etc.		Noted	noted. this section is focused on land cover data only. The other chapters discuss issues related to emission factors, and other types of activity data.
G_1_0128	Germany	1	405	434		Again the same questions in this terminology arise: why is it called "wetlands and organic soils"? Does it mean that organic soils are not included under wetlands ?		Noted	noted. Section 1.2 has elaborately provided the definitions of "organic soil" and "wet soil".
G_1_0129	Finland	1	413	416		Term 'peat type' is used widely in the WL Supplement. Please descibe clearly what is meant by 'peat type' and is the meaning the same in all contexts in chapters.		Rejected	Rejected. we don't see the words "peat type" used in lines 413-416
G_1_0130	Germany	1	418	418		interest groups as possible deliverer of data on lands of interest are probably not the most reliable resource		Accepted	
G_1_0131	USA	1	418	419		"Data on wetland rewetting or restoration, in particular, are likely to be available through conservation organizations." This sentence strikes me as discordant. Conservation organizations have information on a wide range of relevant topics. At the same time, it seems probably this type of information is just as likely to be found in public or private sources as is other land use management activity. Lines 432-433 seem also to imply this information is more widely held: "The type of management activity on each wetland (e.g. drainage, restoration) is typically tracked by natural resource agencies within individual countries."		Accepted	

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0132	USA	1	431	432		Be more specific about how database could be used to find proxy data for areas known to be similar. Similar to what?		Accepted	
G_1_0133	Canada	1	433	433		Wetlands International is italicized, which could be confusing for the reader, as only the IPCC supplements and reports are italicized in such a format.		Accepted	
G_1_0134	USA	1	490	581		We recommend that the authors clean up the references (e.g. include doi where applicable). In addition, suggest adding website link for all open access journals. Currently this is done for some references, but not all.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. Reference section has been aligned with citations in the chapter.
G_1_0135	USA	1	Figure 1.1			Second box from the top reads "Is the soil organic or wet?" The term "wet" is subject to interpretation. Although "wet" is defined on the next page (5) perhaps this term used could be saturated or inundated.		Rejected	Reject. The term "Wet Soils" has been clearly defined in L98- L102 of SOD and further improved in FD lines 150-166.
G_1_0136	USA	1	Figure 1.1			Change "Is this a "flooded land"? to "Are these "flooded lands"?"		Rejected	Rejected. Land identification should go through land by land, rather than by a group of lands.
G_1_0137	USA	1	Figure 1.1			Change "Is this an inland mineral soil wetland" to "Are these wetland mineral soils"? Don't need the word "inland" unless trying to be consistent with Chapter 5 title. Suggest referencing footnote 2) where wetland mineral soils are first defined in the text.		Noted	Noted. The term "inland mineral soil" has been presented in new revised figure 1.1.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0138	USA	1	Figure 1.2			Figure 1.2 would be nice if this could be bigger since it is really hard to see any detail at this scale.		Noted	Noted. The figure has been deleted.
G_1_0139	USA	1	Figure 1.2			Footnote 2 seems important enough to highlight in the main text		Noted	Noted. The figure has been deleted.
G_1_0140	USA	1	Figure 1.3			We suggest changing the title to "Wetland Organic and Mineral Soils" from "Wetland and Organic Soils" for consistency.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The revised figure 1.23 has changed as "organic and wet soils".
G_1_0141	USA	1	Figure 1.3			Seems like th CO2, CH4 arrows should indicate both emissions or removals as a possibility. The "Coastal Wetlands" picture should also try to demonstrate dredging and aquaculture if possible For the three pictures shown for Chapter 2, I don't see anything representing the draining of tropical peatlands and conversion to something like a palm oil plantation. Since this seems like an important aspect of this wetlands supplement it might be useful to include some picture showing this activity. The pictures should be shown in the order the chapters are presented in the supplement		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. All arrows in revised figure have been deleted.
G_1_0142	USA	1	Figure 1.3			Good figure to convey typical management activities on GHG emissions and removals from wetlands and organic soils. It stands in marked contrast to most of the figures used elsewhere in the chapters.		Noted	Noted. The figure has been revised with typical land use managements.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0143	USA	1	Figure 1.3			The figure title state that both emissions and removals are demonstrated, but removals don't seem to be represented in any of the graphics. Revisit these graphics and the title to ensure accuracy and consistency between the graphic, title, and text body.		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The figure has been revised with removal of all arrows and emphase on the land use management.
G_1_0144	USA	1	Figure 1.3			This figure is great, but I only see one reference to this figure in the text (in section 1.6). It seems like it might be helpful to the reader to reference this figure in sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.6, and 1.7.		Accepted	Accepted. Figure 1.3 is referenced repeatedly in section 1.4.2 of the chapter.
G_1_0145	USA	1	Figure 1.3			<p>Page 1.11 Figure 1.3</p> <p>This is a useful figure, but the use or misuse of arrows can provide a distorted view of the total carbon emissions from the various land use categories represented. Some thoughts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the arrows for coastal wetlands be of the same size? - More thought should go into the carbon flux arrow sizes for all land use categories. - For inland drained organic soils it is likely that the CO2 arrow should be considerably larger than that for CH4. - CO2 emission arrows are missing from the rewetted organic soil images. - A CO2 emission arrow is missing from the constructed wetlands figure. 		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. All arrows in the figure have been removed.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0146	USA	1	Table 1.1			We suggest deleting this table for several reasons. First, the table provides too many estimates without explaining the difference in methodologies between the studies. If the point of the table is to give the reader a sense of how wetland area differs between geographic regions, this can be done qualitatively in the text. The table provides conflicting views for several regions on how large the wetland area is in that region relative to other regions (e.g. area for Europe is larger than for Africa in some estimates and smaller in others). There is a wealth of underlying discussion that this table brings up, such as why the estimates differ, which is not addressed in the text and probably shouldn't be. Leaving the table unexplained in the text runs the risk of signaling to the reader that published estimates differ so widely that it doesn't matter how well the inventory compiler characterizes his or her nation's wetland area because not even the experts can agree. I think that is a dangerous message. In conclusion, I feel there are two options: either explain the complexity of Table 1.1. and why the estimates do not agree or leave the table out and do a qualitative explanation of how wetland area differs by region. I,Äöd vote for the second option for the reasons expressed above.		Accepted	Accepted. Table has been deleted in FD.
G_1_0147	USA	1	Table 1.2			ID is not explained, suggest deleting it from Table		Partially accepted	Accepted with modification. The table has been deleted.

<Review comments by governments on Chapter 1 of the Second Order Draft of Wetlands Supplement>

ID	Government	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action	Authors' note
G_1_0148	USA	1	Table 1.2			Suggest adding footnote to Table 1.2 that this is just one representation of wetland distribution. There are many other versions, both satellite and model derived, which would give different total area and percentage estimates.		Partially accepted	Accpted with modification. The table has been deleted.