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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0001	Lundin, Lars	General	1	1		My intention was to review several chapters but did only manage with Chapter 3 in my time slot		Noted
E_Ge_0002	Ogilvie, James	General	1	4		Title - Definitions are important. Not all readers will define ‘wetlands’ in an agreed manner.		Noted
E_Ge_0003	Schmilewski, Gerald	General	1	4	Title	Definitions are important. Not all readers will define 'wetlands' in an agreed manner.		Noted

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0004	Brown, Sandra	General	general			A lot of hard work has obviously gone into these chapters but in many of them I find they missed the target. I had many problems with these chapters as my comments attached will show. My biggest concern is the apparent limited regard for the user of these materials. Most chapters are written like academic scientific reviews—all such material should be moved to annexes in each chapter. Also I read about CH4 in practically all chapters—could this not have been said once and then added as an annex to Ch 1. It seems a lot of the updates are in relation to CH4. Also it seems that even including these other sources of GHGs will hardly ever be that significant in the grander scheme of things within the AFOLU sector. And even as someone who knows a little about such inventories I did not find these chapters too helpful—but then maybe I missed a key section—perhaps this is in one of earlier chapters. But I would hate to be an inventory person in a country who had to wade through all this detail to find the punchlines.		Accept with modification. The entire document has been streamlined to ensure a more user-friendly presentation. Chapter 1 is not intended to provide new methodological guidance but to primarily aid the invnetory compiler in the use of the Supplement. Other concerns are noted.
E_Ge_0005	Garcia-Diaz, Cristina	general				It would be helpful if, at the begining of every chapter, a very simple table is provided on what type of wetlands, what activities and what GHG and pools are considered.		Accept with modification. Chapters 2-6 provide either a clearly identified paragraph, bulleted list, or table of this information.

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0006	Nair, Malini	General				The problem that I as an agricultural economist finds is that the document is not stand alone. Thus it is difficult for the reviewer to understand this document without referring to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Is this the intention of the document?		Noted. The intention of the document is to be a companion guide to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Because some methods draw directly from the 2006 IPCC GLs, it was decided not to repeat the guidance provided there, also in the interest of reducing the length of the document.
E_Ge_0007	Penman, Jim	General				I noticed in CH 4 especially that some of the equations referred to are in the present document and some in the 2006 GL. I wonder if it would be possible to adopt a convention to easily distinguish between the two. One could for example italicise all 2006 GL equation references.		Accept with modification. All equations are intended to have clear reference to either the 2006 IPCC GLs or the Supplement (presented as new equations).

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0008	Radunsky, Klaus	General				The authors prepared a quite comprehensive good practice guidance for wetlands. However, it adds significantly to the workload for the review teams/the review process. It might be useful to consider a second, condensed version for the whole LULUCF IPCC GPG following the format of proven International Standards that have been developed for various industrial branches (e.g. the ISO format, that covers more than 50.000 standards!). The sentence on page 2.9 in line 233 is an example reflecting the challenge in implementation (The sentence reads: The general considerations of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, Volume 4, Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3 also apply here). Either such format could be prepared by the IPCC or ISO or by ISO in co-operation with the IPCC. But the current version of GPG seems to be not really workable and it seems very difficult if not impossible to guarentee for consistency.		Noted
E_Ge_0009	Radunsky, Klaus	General				The chapters 2 to 6 should be better linked to chapter 1, in particular to figure 1.1. In order to enhance user-friendlyness at the very beginning of each of the chapters 2 to 6 reference should be included to link to figure 1.1.		Accept
E_Ge_0010	Rock, Joachim	General				Please do not link internet sources in the text. The URL should be given in the references' section.		Accept

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0011	Blujdea, Viorel	General				If new accounting tables will be available, then they should allow matches with CRF table of all sourecs ans sinks (i.e. GHG sources on Wetlands are agregated with other land categories, while WDR is subject to voluntary election). CRF tables need special attention in order to avoid double or missing from accounting of, especially, N2O emisisons. Aditionally, quantitative checks for C/N emissions between tables should be mentioned in the tables footnotes. Based on 1st KP CP experience there are risks to over/undersatimte N2O emissions under the inventory (on organic soils, i.e. missing N2O emisions if the country report “cultivation of histosoils ” in a narrow sense only as tilt soils). It is also very important to keep an eye on accounting rules in order to allow split between accounted/non-accounted emisions (i.e. N2O emissions from FL to CL have to be reported separately under Table 5(III) and 5(KP-II)3 since they have to accounted under AR, while N2O emissions from CL to/from GL should be reported under 4Ds1 in rder to ensure completness)		Reject. Comment lies outside the scope of IPCC methodological guidance.
E_Ge_0012	Blujdea, Viorel	General				CRF time series since 1990 has to be filled in, so maybe this has to be clearly stated		Accept. It is stated on line 596-597, chapter 7
E_Ge_0013	Blujdea, Viorel	General				Conversion to unmanaged is covered!, but clarification if restoration is equal to conversion to unmanaged has to be discussed		Reject. There is no conversion to unmanaged in IPCC 2006 Gls and that has not changed.

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0014	Blujdea, Viorel	General				I see an unbalanced emission estimation vs. mineral soils in providing a method to estimate the off-site CO2 emissions from organic soils. Magnitude of loss is much smaller for mieral soils, apparently		Accept with modification. Subject to availability of scientific evidence to support default method.
E_Ge_0015	Blujdea, Viorel	General				Irrigation may generate secondary processess in soils, locally or remote		Noted
E_Ge_0016	Blujdea, Viorel	General			All tables across the text	Statement on “95% confidence interval” for deafult emission factors may be too optimistic (although original studies apparently provide SE for the mean estimtes, as mentioned in box 2.1). Under heterogenous measurement and data pooled together probably a “95% probability range” is more realistic. In any case, 95%CI does not look adequate at all for some factors, e.g. CH4 emission factor in Table 5.4 in 5.2.2.4.		Reject. 95% CL is just the convention for consistency in defining uncertainty ranges. In addition, some data points are indeed the mean values from multi-year studies on the same sites.
E_Ge_0017	Blujdea, Viorel	General				(D) is used to denote default factors. This might be confused with “D – deforestation” under KP suplmentary reporting		Reject. This is not KP reporting.
E_Ge_0018	Wiseman, Michael	General				I would like to see the explanation of terms (acronyms) either as the first page of the chapter or an Apendix to each chapter this can avoid confusion and not having to explain the acronym on each occasion used.		Accept with modification. Acronyms are provided in glossary but are retained in the text as well.

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0019	Villamizar, Alicia	General				I would like to express my congratulations to all colleagues that has been worked (so hard) to built this document. I read all chapters and they sound coherent, exhaustive and complete.		Noted
E_Ge_0020	Brown, Sandra	General				curious as to how this will be combined with existing guidelines--it seems new text will need to be added to AFOLU GL alerting that if…..etc….need to also see Supplement--but the main GL need to cross reference this supplement--the main GL are those likely to be used and the task is to make sure all the material in this supplmental report is x-referenced		Noted
E_Ge_0021	Batisha, Ayman	General				Please see attachement	E_Ge_0021.pdf	Noted
E_Ge_0022	Brandon, Andrea	General				I found the linkages between this supplement and the mineral and organic soil methods in the 2006 GL were not obvious, the references to the wetland chapter were confusing. Should the 2006 GL mineral or organic soils methods be used in all situations other than those explicitly provided in the wetlands chapter of the 2006 GL or this wetlands supplement?		Accept with modification. The entire document has been streamlined to ensure a more user-friendly presentation which included more clearly presented cross-references.
E_Ge_0023	Lyde, Gund	General				Please see attachement	E_Ge_0023.pdf	Noted

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0024	Federici, Sandro	1	1	1		This is a general comment. The equations of chapter 2 and 3 are not specular while should be. This does not mean that equations are wrong, but simply that the absence of "specularity" may generate confusion.		Accept with modification. The equations in chapters 2 and 3 were harmonized to the extent possible.
E_Ge_0025	Federici, Sandro	1	1	1		general comment. Chapter 2 and 3 should be further harmonized; maybe having a common section about variables that determine emissions and removals and their stratification at tier 1,2 and 3. Same for the calculation of emissions factors		Accept with modification. Chapters 2 and 3 were harmonized to the extent possible.
E_Ge_0026	Federici, Sandro	1	1	1		An effort to remove duplications across all chapters should be done with the aim of: 1) reduce the number of pages of the whole report (to make it more user friendly); 2) to avoid repetitions, since repetitions are prone to inconsistencies.		Accept.

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

ID	Expert (Last Name, First Name)	Chapter /Section	Start Line	End Line	Sub-section	Comment	supplementary documents	Authors' Action & Note
E_Ge_0027	Mutka, Kari	1	general			General comment: Mistakes, inappropriate data and wrong references exist in this chapter. The process of calculation of emission factors should be transparent. At a moment in many cases it is not possible to check if the calculations behind the emission factors is correctly made, i.e. original data is not given. Authors are recommend to check the validity of each original study and indicate the used quality criteria for data selection somewhere in this chapter. Especially for the chapter two, I would recommend a second review before the acceptance.		Noted
E_Ge_0028	Ogilvie, James	1	general			General comment: This Chapter is long and repetitive. Mistakes, inappropriate data and wrong references exist in this chapter. The process of calculation of emission factors should be transparent. At a moment in many cases it is not possible to check if the calculations behind the emission factors is correctly made, i.e. original data is not given. Authors are recommend to check the validity of each original study and indicate the used quality criteria for data selection somewhere in this chapter. Especially for the chapter two, I would recommend a second review before the acceptance.		Duplicate of E_Ge_0027