

# 2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol

## Reports of Review Editors Compilation

### **Note by Technical Support Unit for the IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (28 February 2014):**

As defined in the Procedures for the Preparation, Review, Acceptance, Adoption, Approval and Publication of IPCC Reports, the role of the Review Editors in production of an IPCC Report is, among others, to ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration, advise lead authors on how to handle contentious/controversial issues and ensure genuine controversies are reflected adequately in the text of the Report.

This document is a compilation of reports submitted by the Review Editors of the *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement)* in accordance with the IPCC Procedures. The signatures of Review Editors have been removed in this document for data protection reasons.

The Review Editors' reports are part of the quality control of the review process of the IPCC Report. They are not intended to be additional reviews of the content of the drafts of the *KP Supplement*.

## Report by Review Editors of the Overview Chapter of the *KP Supplement to the IPCC*

We acted as Review Editors for the Overview Chapter of *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement)*. The Overview Chapter received 37 comments from expert reviewers and 33 comments from governments in the Review by Governments and Experts as mandated by the IPCC principles and procedures. Also, there were 97 other comments from expert reviewers and 21 other comments from governments that are relevant to the entire *KP Supplement*<sup>1</sup>.

We assisted in the process of handling of comments by the authors in order to ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration as well as to advise Lead Authors on handling contentious/controversial issues. We are satisfied that the Lead Authors have given appropriate consideration to all the comments received in the review process to produce a balanced text that reflects the range of views on the topics covered.

We understand that a table containing all the comments received and responses by the authors will be made available on the IPCC website by the final publication of the Report.

The Lead Authors addressed the comments appropriately in the text of the Final Draft of the *KP Supplement*.

Lingxi, Zhou

[signature removed]

William N. Irving

[signature removed]

---

<sup>1</sup> These review comments include those on Glossary as well as general comments on the entire *KP Supplement*.

## Report by Review Editors of Cluster 1<sup>1</sup> of the *KP Supplement to the IPCC*

We acted as Review Editors for Cluster 1 of the *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement)*. These sections received 1372 comments from expert reviewers and 325 comments from governments over the two rounds of review as mandated by the IPCC principles and procedures.

We assisted in the process of handling of comments by the authors of Cluster 1 in order to ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration as well as to advise Lead Authors of Cluster 1 on handling contentious/controversial issues. We are satisfied that the Lead Authors of Cluster 1 have given appropriate consideration to all the comments received in the review process to produce a balanced text that reflects the range of views on the topics covered.

We understand that a table containing all the comments received and responses by the authors will be made available on the IPCC website by the final publication of the Report.

The following are some of the important features of the review comments on Cluster 1:

- a) A number of comments sought changes to specific points of guidance, where these were in clear contradiction to actual decision text, or where decision text required careful interpretation.
- b) Many comments requested refinements and clarification to the guidance on classifying land under KP activities.
- c) A number of comments sought better explanation and improved guidance on interpretation and application of forest definitions as part of classifying land.
- d) It was requested that the KP activity of Wetland Drainage and Rewetting (WDR) should be covered better in the guidance.
- e) Many comments sought clarifications about how to represent transitions in land previously not covered by KP activities subsequently entering KP activities, and land making transitions between KP activities.
- f) Several comments request better distinction between QA/QC and Verification processes.

The Lead Authors addressed the above mentioned appropriately in the text of the Final Draft of Cluster 1 of the *KP Supplement*. This was achieved through constructive discussions amongst the Cluster 1 Lead Authors and several cross-Cluster meetings.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cluster 1 includes Chapter 1, Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 (except 2.3.9), 2.4 and Annex 2A.1.

We were particularly impressed by the open and dynamic discussions amongst the Lead Authors, with all members of the Cluster 1 team making substantive contributions during working meetings. In addition, all of the Lead Authors, without exception, contributed conscientiously to the subsequent preparation of the Final Draft.

We must congratulate the Cluster 1 Coordinating Lead Authors, Werner Kurz and Chengyi Zhang, in leading the discussions and contributing significantly to the responses to comments and redrafting. In particular, Werner is to be applauded for his chairing of several very constructive and successful cross-Cluster meetings.

Finally, we should note the excellent work of the TSU, in particular Maya Fukuda, in facilitating the deliberations of Cluster 1, ensuring that progress on responding to comments was properly tracked and comments sheets were kept up to date.

*[signature removed]*

Robert Matthews

11 October 2013

*[signature removed]*

Emmanuel Mpeta

## **Report by Review Editors of Section 2.3.9 of the *KP Supplement* to the IPCC**

We acted as Review Editors for Section 2.3.9 of the *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement)*. The section received 456 comments from expert reviewers and 91 comments from governments over the two rounds of review as mandated by the IPCC principles and procedures.

We assisted in the process of handling of comments by the authors of Section 2.3.9 in order to ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration as well as to advise Lead Authors of Section 2.3.9 on handling contentious/controversial issues. We are satisfied that the Lead Authors of Section 2.3.9 have given appropriate consideration to all the comments received in the review process to produce a balanced text that reflects the range of views on the topics covered.

We understand that a table containing all the comments received and responses by the authors will be made available on the IPCC website by the final publication of the Report.

The Lead Authors addressed the abovementioned appropriately in the text of the Final Draft of Section 2.3.9 of the *KP Supplement*.

Jennifer Jenkins

[signature removed]

Junsheng LI

[signature removed]

## **Report by Review Editors of Sections 2.5 through 2.7 of the *KP Supplement to the IPCC***

We acted as Review Editors for Sections 2.5 through 2.7 of the *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement)*. These sections received 610 comments from expert reviewers and 150 comments from governments over the two rounds of review as mandated by the IPCC principles and procedures.

We assisted in the process of handling of comments by the authors of Sections 2.5 through 2.7 in order to ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration as well as to advise Lead Authors of Sections 2.5 through 2.7 on handling contentious/controversial issues. We are satisfied that the Lead Authors of Sections 2.5 through 2.7 have given appropriate consideration to all the comments received in the review process to produce a balanced text that reflects the range of views on the topics covered.

We understand that a table containing all the comments received and responses by the authors will be made available on the IPCC website by the final publication of the Report.

The following are some of the important features of the review comments on Sections 2.5 through 2.7:

- a) Comments relating to the definition and identification of afforestation, reforestation and deforestation areas were received for all sections of the KP-LULUCF supplement. This issue was resolved by providing all definitions in section 1.2 of the supplement and to refer to these in subsequent sections of the document. Modification to definitions specifically applied to forest management was made in the FM section in response to reviewer comments.
- b) There was extensive revision of methodological elements and criteria which would trigger a technical correction. In particular, the use of climate data in models for constructing a FMRL was considered. There was also considerable reassessment of the need to apply a technical correction if CEFC provisions are implemented. Clarification was also provided regarding the implication of policy assumptions and changes in relation to the requirement for a technical correction to the FMRL.

The Lead Authors addressed the abovementioned appropriately in the text of the Final Draft of Sections 2.5 through 2.7 of the *KP Supplement*.

[signature removed]

[Kevin, Black]

[signature removed]

[Rizaldi, Boer]

## **Report by Review Editors of Section 2.8 of the *KP Supplement* to the IPCC**

We acted as Review Editors for Section 2.8 of the *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement)*. The section received 407 comments from expert reviewers and 92 comments from governments over the two rounds of review as mandated by the IPCC principles and procedures.

We assisted in the process of handling of comments by the authors of Section 2.8 in order to ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration as well as to advise Lead Authors of Section 2.8 on handling contentious/controversial issues. We are satisfied that the Lead Authors of Section 2.8 have given appropriate consideration to all the comments received in the review process to produce a balanced text that reflects the range of views on the topics covered.

We understand that a table containing all the comments received and responses by the authors will be made available on the IPCC website by the final publication of the Report.

The Lead Authors addressed the abovementioned appropriately in the text of the Final Draft of Section 2.8 of the *KP Supplement*.

Jennifer Jenkins

[signature removed]

Junsheng LI

[signature removed]

## **Report by Review Editors of Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 of *KP Supplement to the IPCC***

We acted as Review Editors for Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 of the *2013 Revised Supplementary Methods and Good Practice Guidance Arising from the Kyoto Protocol (KP Supplement)*. Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 of the KP Supplement received 391 comments from expert reviewers and 115 from governments over the two rounds of review as mandated by the IPCC principles and procedures.

We assisted in the process of handling of comments by the authors of Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 in order to ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration as well as to advise Lead Authors of Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 on handling contentious/controversial issues. We are satisfied that the Lead Authors of Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 of *KP Supplement* have given appropriate consideration to all the comments received in the review process to produce a balanced text that reflects the range of views on the topics covered.

We understand that a table containing all the comments received and responses by the authors will be made available on the IPCC website by the final publication of the Report.

The following are some of the important features of the review comments on Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12:

- a) How to keep consistency with wetland supplement (WDR).
- b) Harmonize how to deal with link to Agriculture sector (liming, Non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases).
- c) Comments to Box2.9.1 and 2.10.2 in which areas in 1990 and in the commitment period are explained for CM and GM, respectively, in SOD review round

The Lead Authors addressed the abovementioned appropriately in the text of the Final Draft of Sections 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12 of *KP Supplement*.

[Yasuhito Shirato]

[signature removed]

[Lingxi Zhou]

[signature removed]