


# **2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands**

## **Methodological Guidance on Lands with Wet and Drained Soils, and Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment**

Edited by  
Takahiko Hiraishi, Thelma Krug, Kiyoto Tanabe, Nalin Srivastava,  
Baasansuren Jamsranjav, Maya Fukuda and Tiffany Troxler



**Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories**

A report prepared by the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories of the IPCC and accepted by the Panel but not approved in detail.

Whilst the information in this IPCC Report is believed to be true and accurate at the date of going to press, neither the authors nor the publishers can accept any legal responsibility or liability for any errors or omissions. Neither the authors nor the publishers have any responsibility for the persistence of any URLs referred to in this report and cannot guarantee that any content of such web sites is or will remain accurate or appropriate.

Published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

© The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2014.

When using this report please cite as:

IPCC 2014, 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands, Hiraishi, T., Krug, T., Tanabe, K., Srivastava, N., Baasansuren, J., Fukuda, M. and Troxler, T.G. (eds).  
Published: IPCC, Switzerland.

IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories  
Technical Support Unit

% Institute for Global Environmental Strategies  
2108 -11, Kamiyamaguchi  
Hayama, Kanagawa  
JAPAN, 240-0115

Fax: (81 46) 855 3808  
<http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp>

Printed in Switzerland

ISBN 978-92-9169-139-5

The designations employed and the presentation of material on maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

## Contents

Foreword

Preface

Overview

Chapter 1      Introduction

Chapter 2      Drained Inland Organic Soils

Chapter 3      Rewetted Organic Soils

Chapter 4      Coastal Wetlands

Chapter 5      Inland Wetland Mineral Soils

Chapter 6      Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment

Chapter 7      Cross-cutting Issues and Reporting

Glossary

List of Contributors

## Foreword

Recognizing the problem of global climate change, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) co-established in 1988 the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). One of the IPCC's activities is to support the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) through its work on methodologies for national greenhouse gas inventories.

This report, the *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands (Wetlands Supplement)*, is the culmination of over two years of work by the IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) to supplement the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*<sup>1</sup> (*2006 IPCC Guidelines*). The *Wetlands Supplement* has been produced in response to the conclusions of *IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O*<sup>2</sup> and to an invitation from the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) of the UNFCCC at its 33<sup>rd</sup> Session in Cancun (December 2010) to prepare additional guidance on wetlands.

In response to this invitation by the SBSTA, the IPCC held a scoping meeting in Geneva (30 March - 1 April, 2011). This meeting produced a draft Terms of Reference, including annotated chapter outline, and a draft work plan which were approved by the IPCC at its 33<sup>rd</sup> Session in Abu Dhabi (May 2011). This work plan was revised by the IPCC at its 35<sup>th</sup> Session in Geneva (June 2012) so that it aimed to complete the task by October 2013. According to this work plan, the work on the production of the *Wetlands Supplement* was carried out by the TFI from 2011 to 2013. The Overview Chapter of the *Wetlands Supplement* was adopted and the entire report was accepted at the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of IPCC held in Batumi, Georgia (October 2013).

The *Wetlands Supplement* extends the content of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* by filling gaps in the coverage and providing updated information reflecting scientific advances, including updating of emission factors. It covers inland organic soils and wetlands on mineral soils, coastal wetlands including mangrove forests, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows and constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment. The coverage of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* on wetlands was restricted to peatlands drained and managed for peat extraction, conversion to flooded lands, and limited guidance for drained organic soils.

The development of this report has depended on the expertise, knowledge and cooperation of the Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Contributing Authors – a total of 90 authors worldwide. A total of 15 Review Editors oversaw the IPCC review process. We wish to thank them for their commitment, time and efforts in preparing this report. As with all the IPCC Methodology Reports, this report has built upon the work of the previous IPCC Methodology Reports including, among others, the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* without which the task would have been much more demanding. We are pleased to acknowledge our debt with all those who contributed to those reports.

The Steering Group, consisting of IPCC TFI Co-Chairs Takahiko Hiraishi (Japan) and Thelma Krug (Brazil) together with Dominique Blain (Canada), Rizaldi Boer (Indonesia), Simon Eggleston (TFI Technical Support Unit (TFI-TSU), until January 2013), Sergio González Martineaux (Chile), William Irving (USA), Alex Krusche (Brazil), Emmanuel Jonathan Mpeti (Tanzania), Jim Penman (UK), Riitta Pipatti (Finland), Robert Sturgiss (Australia), Kiyoto Tanabe (TFI-TSU) and Sirintornthep Towprayoon (Thailand), has guided the development of the *Wetlands Supplement*, ensuring consistency across all chapters and continuity with the guidance it supplements. We therefore wish to thank them for their valuable and considerable efforts in leading and guiding the preparation of this report. We express a high appreciation to the IPCC Task Force Bureau on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFB) for their overall guidance and oversight.

Author and expert meetings were held in Hayama (Japan), Edinburgh (Scotland), Victoria Falls (Zimbabwe), Dublin (Ireland), Freising (Germany) twice and Manaus (Brazil). We would therefore like to thank the host countries and agencies for organizing these meetings. We would also like to thank all governments that

---

<sup>1</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2006). *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (eds). Published: IGES, Japan.

<sup>2</sup> IPCC 2011, *IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O*. Eggleston H.S., Srivastava N., Tanabe K., Baasansuren J., and Fukuda M. (eds). Meeting Report of the IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O, Geneva, Switzerland, 19-21 October, 2010, Published: IGES, Japan 2011.

supported authors and reviewers for their contributions, without which the production of this report would not have been possible.

A comprehensive review is an important element of the IPCC process. The *Wetlands Supplement* underwent two rounds of review, followed by a round of submission of written comments by governments in 2012 and 2013. The first, expert review of the First Order Draft, produced over 5000 comments from 128 expert reviewers. The second, government and expert review of the Second Order Draft, resulted in an additional 3740 comments from 112 expert reviewers and 14 governments. The Final Draft received over 300 comments from 14 governments. The efforts of the reviewers and their comments have contributed greatly to the quality of the final report and we wish to thank them accordingly.


In addition, the TFI-TSU (Head: Kiyoto Tanabe; Deputy Head: Nalin Srivastava; Programme Officers: Baasansuren Jamsranjav, Maya Fukuda and Tiffany Troxler; Administrative Assistant: Koh Mikuni; Secretary: Eriko Nakamura; and IT Officer: Toru Matsumoto) has made an invaluable contribution to the development of the *Wetlands Supplement* by providing guidance and assistance as well as technical and organisational support for the project. Apart from working tirelessly to organise meetings and reviews, they worked extensively with the authors especially in the editing of the various drafts and preparation of the final version, and we wish to congratulate them for their exemplary work. Thanks are also due to the former TSU Head, Simon Eggleston, who led the TSU work on the development of the *Wetlands Supplement* in its early stages. We would also like to express our gratitude to the Government of Japan, for its generous support of the TFI-TSU, without which this report might not have been completed. We would also like to thank the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) for hosting the TFI-TSU.

We would also like to thank the IPCC Secretariat, led by the Secretary, Renate Christ, for their assistance and support in enabling this project to meet its tight deadlines.

Finally we would like to thank the IPCC Chair Rajendra Pachauri for his support and guidance.



Michel Jarraud  
Secretary-General  
World Meteorological Organization



Achim Steiner  
Executive Director  
United Nations Environment Programme

## Preface

The *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands (Wetlands Supplement)*, extends the content of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006 IPCC Guidelines)* by filling gaps in the coverage and providing updated information reflecting scientific advances.

This report assists countries in compiling complete national inventories of greenhouse gases to include significant land-use and management activities occurring in lands with wet and drained soils, and constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment. The guidance has been structured so that any country, regardless of experience or resources, should be able to produce reliable estimates of emissions and removals of these gases. In particular, default values of various parameters and emission factors required are supplied, so that, at its simplest, a country need only supply national activity data. Following the approach of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, the *Wetlands Supplement* also allows countries with more information and resources to use more detailed country-specific methodologies and country-specific data while retaining comparability and consistency between countries. The *Wetlands Supplement* guidance also integrates *good practice* to include augmented coverage of wetlands in inventory compilation so that the final estimates are neither over- nor under-estimates as far as can be judged and uncertainties are reduced as far as practicable.

The IPCC Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) also manages the *IPCC Emission Factor Database (EFDB)*. The EFDB was launched in 2002, and is continuously updated as a resource for inventory compilers to use to assist them by providing a repository of emission factors and other relevant parameters that may be suitable for use in more country-specific methodologies.

The *Wetlands Supplement* is the latest step in the IPCC development of guidelines for national greenhouse gas inventories. In the opinion of the authors, the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* supplemented by this report provide the best, widely applicable default methodologies and, as such, are suitable for global use in compiling national greenhouse gas inventories. They may also be of use in more narrowly-defined project-based estimates, although here they should be used with caution to ensure they correctly include just the emissions and removals from within the system boundaries and with particular attention to applicability and representativeness of those project conditions.

We would like to thank all the authors as well as reviewers, Review Editors, the Steering Group and the Task Force Bureau for their contributions and experience. We would also like to thank all the governments who contributed by hosting meetings (Hayama, Japan; Edinburgh, Scotland; Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe; Dublin, Ireland; Freising, Germany - twice; and Manaus, Brazil) as well as those who supported authors and other contributors. Finally we would like to express our gratitude to the TFI Technical Support Unit and the IPCC Secretariat for their invaluable support throughout the entire process of drafting and producing this report.



Taka Hiraishi (Japan)  
IPCC TFI Co-Chair



Thelma Krug (Brazil)  
IPCC TFI Co-Chair

# **2013 SUPPLEMENT TO THE 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES: WETLANDS**

---

Methodological Guidance on Lands with Wet and  
Drained Soils, and Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater  
Treatment

## **OVERVIEW**

## Authors

Dominique Blain (Canada), Rizaldi Boer (Indonesia), Simon Eggleston (IPCC TFI TSU<sup>1</sup>), Sergio Gonzalez (Chile), Takahiko Hiraishi (Japan), William Irving (USA), Thelma Krug (Brazil), Alex Krusche (Brazil), Emmanuel Jonathan Mpeta (Tanzania), Jim Penman (UK), Riitta Pipatti (Finland), Robert Sturgiss (Australia), Kiyoto Tanabe (IPCC TFI TSU) and Sirintornthep Towprayoon (Thailand)

## Review Editors

Steen Gyldenkerne (Denmark) and Erda Lin (China)

---

<sup>1</sup> Until February, 2013.



## Contents

1	Introduction .....	O.4
2	Background.....	O.5
3	Coverage of the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> .....	O.6
4	Managed Land and Anthropogenic Emissions .....	O.8
5	The <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines .....	O.9

## Tables

Table 1	Coverage of the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> .....	O.6
---------	--	-----

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands (Wetlands Supplement)* provides methods for estimating anthropogenic emissions and removals of greenhouse gases from wetlands and drained soils. The scope of the *Wetlands Supplement* is broader than the coverage of Wetlands in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*<sup>2</sup> (*2006 IPCC Guidelines*), where managed wetlands are defined as lands where the water table is artificially changed (i.e. lowered or raised) or those created through human activity (e.g. damming a river) and that do not fall into Forest Land, Cropland, or Grassland categories. The emissions and removals from wetlands and drained soils addressed in the *Wetlands Supplement* can occur under any land-use category or other relevant category of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The guidance in the *Wetlands Supplement* is not intended to change the allocation of wetlands for reporting purposes.

The guidance provided is supplementary to that contained in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, which provide methodologies for estimating national anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol<sup>3</sup>. The content of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* on wetlands is restricted to peatlands drained and managed for peat extraction, conversion to flooded lands, and some guidance for drained organic soils. It is therefore incomplete; it does not cover all wetland types and does not characterize all of the significant activities occurring on wetlands that are covered (e.g. rewetting of peatlands is not included).

This *Wetlands Supplement* supplements the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* by filling in gaps in the coverage and providing updated information reflecting scientific advances. This includes updating of emission factors. It covers inland organic soils and wetlands on mineral soils, coastal wetlands including mangrove forests, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows, and constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment. For the reasons described subsequently, the *Wetlands Supplement* does not provide guidance on permanently flooded lands such as reservoirs.

---

<sup>2</sup> IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (eds). Published: IGES, Japan.

<sup>3</sup> Greenhouse gases addressed in the *Wetlands Supplement* are: CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O.

## 2 BACKGROUND

The *IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O* held on 19-21 October, 2010 in Geneva<sup>4</sup>, concluded that:

*Since the 2006 IPCC Guidelines were completed much new scientific information is now available about various wetlands that enable emissions and removals to be estimated from wetland restoration and rewetting especially for peat lands. The meeting recommended that the IPCC provide additional methodological guidelines for the rewetting and restoration of peat land; emissions from fires, ditches and waterborne carbon; and constructed wetlands for waste water disposal, to fill gaps in the existing guidelines.*

The *Wetlands Supplement* has been produced in response to the conclusions of this expert meeting, and in response to an invitation from the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) at its 33<sup>rd</sup> session, held in December, 2010 in Cancun, which invited the IPCC to prepare additional guidance on wetlands, focusing on the rewetting and restoration of peatlands. Document FCCC/SBSTA/2010/13, paragraph 72 states:

*...the SBSTA invited the IPCC to undertake further methodological work on wetlands, focusing on the rewetting and restoration of peatland, with a view to filling in the gaps in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (hereinafter referred to as the 2006 IPCC Guidelines) in these areas and to complete this work for the thirty-ninth session of the SBSTA.*

In response to this invitation, the IPCC held a scoping meeting in Geneva from 30 March to 1 April, 2011. This meeting produced a draft Terms of Reference (ToR), including annotated chapter outline, which was approved by the IPCC at its 33<sup>rd</sup> Session in Abu Dhabi (10-13 May 2011).

<sup>4</sup> IPCC (2011) *IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O*. Eggleston H.S., Srivastava N., Tanabe K., Baasansuren J., and Fukuda M. (eds). Meeting Report of the IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O, Geneva, Switzerland, 19-21 October, 2010, Published: IGES, Japan 2011.

### 3 COVERAGE OF THE *WETLANDS SUPPLEMENT*

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* classify all land area into six broad land-use categories: Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements, and Other Land (see Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). The lands covered in the *Wetlands Supplement* may occur in any of the IPCC land-use categories. The land-use category under which land is reported depends on national land-use category definitions, data collection systems and tracking of land transitions. For example, forested peatland can be classified as Forest Land, plantations on peatland may be classified as Forest Land or Cropland depending on national forest definitions, and mangrove forests may be classified as Forest Land or Wetlands. Due to their function, constructed wetlands are not considered as a land-use category. The coverage of the *Wetlands Supplement* is summarised in Table 1.

TABLE 1 COVERAGE OF THE <i>WETLANDS SUPPLEMENT</i>	
Chapter	Coverage
1. Introduction	Guidance on the use of the report and generic information on the linkages between the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> and the supplementary guidance that it presents.
2. Drained Inland Organic Soils	Guidance on managed inland organic soils including land drained for forestry, croplands, grazing, and settlements across climate zones.
3. Rewetted Organic Soils	Guidance on rewetted organic soils including boreal, temperate, and tropical wetlands occurring in any land-use category.
4. Coastal Wetlands	Guidance on specified management activities in coastal areas of mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows.
5. Inland Wetland Mineral Soils	Guidance on managed inland wetland mineral soils, including lands used for forestry, cropland, grazing, and settlements, and rewetted mineral soils.
6. Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment	Guidance on wetlands constructed for wastewater treatment.
7. Cross-cutting Issues and Reporting	Overall guidance on how to report anthropogenic emissions and removals from wetlands in the framework of the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> . Also gives general <i>good practice</i> guidance on cross-cutting issues ( <i>key category</i> and uncertainty analysis, times series consistency and quality assurance/quality control) to supplement that given in Volume 1 of the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .

A summary of the main methodological updates to the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* is provided below. Chapter 1 provides a decision tree to help inventory compilers determine which chapters of this supplement to apply and describes the coverage and definitions of the wetland types.

**Peatlands and organic soils.** The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* included some guidance on drainage (Chapter 4, Volume 4) and peat extraction (Chapter 7, Volume 4), but not on rewetting. In this supplement, peatlands are included along with organic soils and both drainage and rewetting are covered. Updated emission factors and methods are provided for both drained and rewetted organic soils including for off-site carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions via waterborne carbon losses. Guidance on methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions from rewetting of organic soils (Chapter 3 of the *Wetlands Supplement*), ditches on drained inland organic soils and CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from peat fires are also provided (Chapter 2 of the *Wetlands Supplement*).

**Peatland managed for peat production.** Peat production is covered in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Chapter 7, Volume 4) and no additional guidance is given here except some updated emission factors in Chapter 2.

**Rice cultivation.** Rice cultivation is covered in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Chapter 5, Volume 4) and additional emission factors for lowland rice production are given in Chapter 2.

**Coastal wetlands.** The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provide no specific guidance for coastal wetlands, and new guidance is given in Chapter 4 of this supplement on how to treat anthropogenic emissions and removals associated with

specified human activities that affect them. Coastal wetlands in this supplement include mangrove forests, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows. Emissions factors and methodologies are provided for management of mangrove forests (including harvesting), rewetting, revegetation and creation, aquaculture and drainage.

**Inland wetland mineral soils (IWMS).** The 2006 IPCC Guidelines provided limited data on soil carbon in wetland mineral soils. Chapter 5 provides updated default soil carbon factors and covers methodologies for quantifying emissions and removals of CO<sub>2</sub> and emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> from (i) artificial drainage of IWMS (ii) subsequently rewetting of artificially drained IWMS and (iii) the artificial flooding of mineral soils for the purposes of wetland creation. Mineral soil wetlands<sup>5</sup> include riparian wetlands, forested swamps and marshes and can occur in all climate zones.

**Saline inland wetlands.** Saline wetlands are important parts of otherwise arid landscapes across the globe but little information is available in the literature to assess potential greenhouse gas emissions or removals from these lands. Thus emission or removal factors cannot be given and no guidance is provided for these wetland types. These are also known as playas, pans, salt lakes, brackish wetlands, salinas, and sabkhas.

**Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.** The guidance supplements Volume 5 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on Waste (Chapter 6). These are wetlands that have been designed and constructed to use natural processes involving vegetation, soils, and associated microbial assemblages to treat wastewater. New guidance is also provided on semi-natural treatment wetlands.

**Permanently flooded lands.** No new guidance on permanently flooded lands is provided. The *Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O*<sup>6</sup> did not agree that there was sufficient new information available to produce new and additional guidance based on the latest literature<sup>7</sup>. The *IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Mitigation of Climate Change*<sup>8</sup> also noted that it was not possible to make global estimates of the size of emissions from reservoirs.

<sup>5</sup> Wetlands do not all have organic soils. Wetland Mineral Soils are classified as Aquic soil (USDA) or Gleysols (World Reference Base), and are described as having restricted drainage leading to periodic flooding and anaerobic conditions (Table 2.3, Chapter 2 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines).

<sup>6</sup> IPCC (2011) *IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O*. Eggleston H.S., Srivastava N., Tanabe K., Baasansuren J., and Fukuda M. (eds). Meeting Report of the IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O, Geneva, Switzerland, 19-21 October, 2010, Published: IGES, Japan 2011.

<sup>7</sup> The attendees of the *Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O* agreed on the need to discuss a range of issues such as the impact of reservoirs on total emissions from watersheds, allocation of emissions to specific drivers, and how emissions may be related to specific reservoir typologies.

<sup>8</sup> IPCC (2011) *IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation*. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. O. Edenhofer, R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, K. Seyboth, P. Matschoss, S. Kadner, T. Zwickel, P. Eickemeier, G. Hansen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow (eds). Published: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1075 pp.

## 4 MANAGED LAND AND ANTHROPOGENIC EMISSIONS

Parties to the UNFCCC are committed to report anthropogenic emissions and removals of greenhouse gases not covered by the Montreal Protocol<sup>9</sup>. In practice, it is difficult to separate anthropogenic and natural emissions in Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). Thus, the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provides that it is *good practice* to report emissions and removals from managed land as a proxy for anthropogenic emissions and removals (Pages 1.4-1.5, Chapter 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). An expert meeting<sup>10</sup> held in May 2009 in Brazil, reconsidered the issue and concluded that, although suitable methods for a better quantification of anthropogenic emissions and removals had been demonstrated in specific circumstances, there was no suitable, globally applicable alternative to the use of managed land as a proxy for anthropogenic emissions and removals.

The *Wetlands Supplement* continues to use managed land as a proxy for estimation of anthropogenic emissions and removals. The *Wetlands Supplement* notes that many wetlands on managed land have significant non-anthropogenic fluxes of greenhouse gases. The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* restricted managed wetlands to those lands where the water table is artificially changed (i.e. lowered or raised). This *Wetlands Supplement* extends this coverage also to include wetlands created (e.g. constructed), or where emissions and removals from coastal wetlands are attributed to specified human activities. The focus on human activities such as drainage or construction of aquaculture ponds maintains the justification for the managed land proxy. In the case of seagrass meadows the guidance estimates emissions and removals associated with changes linked to a specific human activity, rather than estimating emissions and removals from that coastal wetland type as a whole. Application of the supplement will maintain consistency with previous estimates so long as these activities can be recognised as subsets within the broader definition of managed land. The application of new emission factors will not introduce inconsistency so long as the historical time series is updated, consistent with long-standing IPCC guidance.

---

<sup>9</sup> UNFCCC Article 4.1 (a).

[http://unfccc.int/files/essential\\_background/background\\_publications\\_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> IPCC 2010, *Revisiting the Use of Managed Land as a Proxy for Estimating National Anthropogenic Emissions and Removals*, Eggleston H.S., Srivastava N., Tanabe K., Baasansuren J. (eds). Meeting Report, 5-7 May, 2009, INPE, São José dos Campos, Brazil, Published: IGES, Japan 2010.

## 5 THE WETLANDS SUPPLEMENT AND THE 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES

The *Wetlands Supplement* follows the same approach to estimating emissions and removals as the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines themselves are an evolutionary development starting from the 1996 IPCC Guidelines, 2000 IPCC Good Practice Guidance (GPG2000) and Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-use Change and Forestry (GPG-LULUCF). This evolutionary approach helps ensure continuity, and allows for the incorporation of experiences with the existing guidelines, new scientific information, and the results of the UNFCCC inventory review process. An important structural change occurred in Volume 4, of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, which consolidated the guidance for LULUCF in GPG-LULUCF and the Agriculture sector in GPG2000 into a single Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Volume. This *Wetlands Supplement* adds to the guidance given in Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, and provides updates where science has advanced, but does not replace it. This *Wetlands Supplement* also adds to the guidance given in Volume 5 (Waste). Where the *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance that updates emission factors for land areas, categories, gases, and pools covered directly by Volumes 4 and 5, the guidance in the *Wetlands Supplement* should take precedence.

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines retained the definition of *good practice* that was introduced with GPG2000. This definition has gained general acceptance amongst countries as the basis for inventory development. According to this definition, national inventories of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and removals consistent with *good practice* are those, which contain neither over- nor under-estimates so far as can be judged, and in which uncertainties are reduced as far as practicable. These requirements are intended to ensure that estimates of emissions by sources and removals by sinks, even if uncertain, are *bona fide* estimates, in the sense of not containing any biases that could have been identified and eliminated.

The *Wetlands Supplement*, like the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, generally provides guidance, usually with decision trees, on estimation methods at three levels of detail, from Tier 1 (the default method) to Tier 3 (the most detailed method; Chapter 1, Volume 1). The Tier 1 guidance generally consists of mathematical specification of the methods and equations for estimating emissions/removals, information on emission factors or other parameters to use in generating the estimates, and sources of activity data to estimate the overall level of net emissions (emission by sources minus removals by sinks). Properly implemented, all tiers are intended to provide unbiased estimates, and accuracy and precision are expected to improve from Tier 1 to Tier 3. The provision of different tiers enables inventory compilers to use methods consistent with their resources and to focus their efforts on those categories of emissions and removals that contribute most significantly to national emission totals and trends.

National circumstances include the availability of data and knowledge, and contribution made by the category to total national emissions and removals and to their trend over time. The most important categories, in terms of total national emissions and the trend, are called *key categories*<sup>11</sup>. The decision trees generally require Tier 2 or Tier 3 methods for *key categories*. This approach to the use of different tiers allows limited resources to be focused on those areas of the inventory that contribute significantly to the overall total or trend in emissions.

Within Chapter 7 of the *Wetlands Supplement* advice is also provided on:

- (i) ensuring time series are consistent,
- (ii) estimation of uncertainties,
- (iii) guidance on quality assurance and quality control procedures to provide cross-checks during inventory compilation,
- (iv) information to be documented to achieve transparent reporting, avoiding double-counting and omissions, to facilitate review and assessment of inventory estimates, and
- (v) reporting tables and worksheets for Tier 1 methods are provided as well as mapping between the categories and guidance in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the changes to those introduced by the *Wetlands Supplement*.

<sup>11</sup> In the GPG2000 and GPG-LULUCF these were called *key sources* or *key categories* where there could be removals.

# **CHAPTER 1**

---

## **INTRODUCTION**



## **Coordinating Lead Authors**

Tom Wirth (USA) and Chengyi Zhang (China)

## **Lead Authors**

Gusti Zakaria Anshari (Indonesia), Kenneth Byrne (Ireland), Elke Hodson (Switzerland/USA), Hans Joosten (EC/WI/FAO), J. Boone Kauffman (IUCN/UNESCO), Leif Klemedtsson (Sweden), Tuija Elina Lapvetelainen<sup>†</sup> (Finland), Christoph Mueller (Germany), Phillip O'Brien (Ireland) and Mitsuru Osaki (Japan)

## **Contributing Authors**

Tonya Del Sontro (Switzerland), Mark Flugge (USA), Stephen Ogle (USA), Riitta Pipatti (Finland), Rachel Steele (USA), Victoria Thompson (USA) and Kiyoto Tanabe (IPCC TFI TSU)

## **Review Editors**

Fatih Evrendilek (Turkey) and Steen Gyldenkærne (Denmark)

<sup>†</sup> Ms. Tuija Elina Lapvetelainen, a close colleague, passed away in July 2013. She greatly contributed to the development of Chapter 1.

## Contents

1	Introduction .....	4
1.1	Background .....	4
1.2	Guidance for using this supplement.....	4
1.3	Application of the Managed Land Proxy to wetlands .....	9
1.4	Coherence and compatibility with <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .....	11
1.4.1	Guidance on activities in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> that are also covered in the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> .....	11
1.4.2	Supplementary guidance in this report .....	12
1.5	Relevant databases for wetlands and organic soils .....	16
References	.....	17

## Figures

Figure 1.1	Decision tree for finding the appropriate guidance chapter within the Wetlands Supplement or the 2006 IPCC Guidelines .....	5
Figure 1.2	Soil based subcategories that are being addressed in the Wetlands Supplement.....	6
Figure 1.3	Typical management practices on organic and wet soils .....	10

## Tables

Table 1.1	Look-up table for Wetlands Supplement by land-use categories, soil type and condition and inland or coastal location.....	15
Table 1.2	Global and regional on-line resources providing metadata sets for developing an inventory of greenhouse gas emissions and removals from wetlands and organic soils.....	16

## Box

Box 1.1	Greenhouse gas emissions and removals of managed organic and wet soils .....	9
---------	--	---

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories* (2006 IPCC Guidelines) acknowledged that the methodological guidance for the land-use category Wetlands in Volume 4 (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use—AFOLU), Chapter 7 (Wetlands) is incomplete and limited to estimating emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) from *peatlands cleared and drained for production of peat for energy, horticultural and other uses* (Section 7.2, Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines), and to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from land converted to flooded land such as *reservoirs for production of hydroelectricity, irrigation and navigation* (Section 7.2, Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines). In October 2010, an IPCC expert meeting on harvested wood products, wetlands, and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soils concluded that there was sufficient new scientific information available to provide additional methodological guidance and fill gaps in the existing 2006 IPCC Guidelines for the rewetting and restoration of peatlands; emissions from fires, ditches, and waterborne carbon; and constructed wetlands for waste water disposal (IPCC, 2011). In December 2010, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) invited the IPCC *to undertake further methodological work on wetlands, focusing on the rewetting and restoration of peatland, with the objective of filling in the gaps in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines in these areas*.

In response to the invitation of SBSTA, this *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands - Methodological Guidance on Lands with Wet and Drained Soils, and Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment - (Wetlands Supplement)* provides new and supplementary guidance on estimating and reporting greenhouse gas emissions and removals from lands with organic soils and wet and drained mineral soils in Wetlands and all the other IPCC land-use categories with these soil types that are subject to human activities ('managed'). The *Wetlands Supplement* is organised into the following chapters:

- Chapter 2: Drained Inland Organic Soils
- Chapter 3: Rewetted Organic Soils
- Chapter 4: Coastal Wetlands
- Chapter 5: Inland Wetland Mineral Soils
- Chapter 6: Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment
- Chapter 7: Cross-Cutting Issues and Reporting


## 1.2 GUIDANCE FOR USING THIS SUPPLEMENT

This introductory chapter provides guidance on the way to use the *Wetlands Supplement* in conjunction with the existing *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, for the preparation of a greenhouse gas inventory that includes lands with organic soils and wet and drained mineral soils across all the IPCC land-use categories.

Inventory compilers can use the decision tree (Figure 1.1) as a guide to the relevant chapters within this *Wetlands Supplement* and/or the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The numbers located near the 'start' box and the diamonds in the decision tree refer to the guidance notes listed below, which explain and illustrate the terms used in the decision tree and within this document (see also the glossary).

The terms are for the purpose of this document, and their definitions are not intended to pre-empt other definitions of these terms in any other context. For example, except for the use of the term 'Wetlands' in the name of this supplement, this guidance uses the term 'Wetlands' (with a capital 'W' and always plural) solely to refer to the IPCC land-use category Wetlands. The term 'wetland' or 'wetlands' (with a lowercase 'w' and singular or plural) is used to refer to land with wet soil as defined in note 4 below. Other articulations of the concept of 'wetland' are possible, for example that used by the Ramsar Convention ([www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-texts-convention-on/main/ramsar/1-31-38%5E20671\\_4000\\_0\\_](http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-texts-convention-on/main/ramsar/1-31-38%5E20671_4000_0_)) but this does not affect the applicability of the methodological guidance.

**Figure 1.1**      **Decision tree for finding the appropriate guidance chapter within the *Wetlands Supplement* or the 2006 IPCC Guidelines**



**Note 1: Determine land-use category**

The *Wetlands Supplement* covers land with organic soils, and wet and drained mineral soils (see notes 2, 3, and 4 for the definition of these terms) across all the IPCC land-use categories (Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland,

Wetlands, Settlements, and Other Land, see Figure 1.2). The *Wetlands Supplement* is consistent with Chapter 3 (Consistent Representation of Lands) in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* in that it does not change the assignment of land to a category. If using Approach two or three for land representation<sup>1</sup>, land-use conversions should also be identified (e.g. Forest Land converted to Cropland, Cropland converted to Settlements).

In comparison with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, the *Wetlands Supplement* identifies relevant subcategories (see Figure 1.2 below) and specifies emission factors for all land-use categories with organic soils and wet and drained mineral soils (including drained 'wetland mineral soils' (see Note 4 below) subject to rewetting; inland wetland mineral soils subject to long-term cultivation; inland dry mineral soils that have been wetted; coastal drained mineral soils subject to rewetting and coastal mineral soils subject to other management practices<sup>2</sup>). The *Wetlands Supplement* differentiates between coastal land and inland land, because water salinity and dynamics (e.g. tides) may, for the same land-use category, modify emission factors compared to inland land. .

**Figure 1.2** Soil based subcategories addressed in the *Wetlands Supplement*

	Forest Land		Crop-land		Grass-land		Wet-lands		Settle-ments		Other Land	
	inland	coastal	inland	coastal	inland	coastal	inland	coastal	inland	coastal	inland	coastal
mineral soil	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained	mineral drained
	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet	mineral wet
organic soil	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained	organic drained
	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet	organic wet

Notes on Figure 1.2: Guidance for all the soils shown in this figure is included in the *Wetlands Supplement*. Guidance for 'mineral dry' soils except for those drained for long-term cultivation and drained coastal wetlands (see Note 5) is provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

It is *good practice* to subdivide each land use/conversion category into subcategories with similar characteristics. The *Wetlands Supplement* proposes to use - in addition to the dry mineral soils covered by the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* - a division into four soil subcategories<sup>3</sup>; all with a coastal and inland subdivision where appropriate (see Figure 1.2 above):

- 1) drained mineral soil
- 2) wet mineral soil
- 3) wet organic soil
- 4) drained organic soil.

In the case of dry mineral soil, the guidance in the Forest Land, Cropland or Grassland Chapters in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should be used as appropriate. Chapter 4 of the *Wetlands Supplement* provides new guidance for drained coastal mineral soils, and Chapter 5 presents new guidance for drained inland wetland mineral soils

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Section 3.3.1, Chapter 3 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*

<sup>2</sup> Other management activities on coastal wetland mineral soils covered in the Supplement include extraction, revegetation and aquaculture.

<sup>3</sup> The guidance for rice cultivation provided in Chapters 2 and 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement* should be used in conjunction with Chapters 5 and 11 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

(see Note 4 below) that have been continuously managed for > 20 years to cultivate predominantly annual crops. In all other cases, the decision tree should be used (see Figure 1.1 above) to identify the appropriate guidance chapter within this *Wetlands Supplement* or within the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are used for estimating and reporting anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and removals only. With respect to ‘land’ inventory compilers are required to differentiate between ‘managed’ and ‘unmanaged’ land for all land-use categories besides Cropland and Settlements, which are inherently managed land. The *Wetlands Supplement* continues to apply the Managed Land Proxy (see Section 1.3 of this supplement) to estimate anthropogenic greenhouse gases. In the case of coastal wetlands, guidance is provided to estimate and report anthropogenic emissions and removals from specific management activities.

**Note 2: Is the soil used for rice cultivation?**

Guidance on rice cultivation is provided in Chapters 2 and 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement*, and Chapters 5 and 11 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

**Note 3: Is the soil organic?**

An organic soil is a soil with a high concentration of organic matter (see below). Every soil that is not an organic soil is classified as a mineral soil, following the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Annex 3A.5, Chapter 3 in Volume 4). The *Wetlands Supplement* follows the definition of organic soils in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Annex 3A.5, Chapter 3 in Volume 4):

*Organic soils are identified on the basis of criteria 1 and 2, or 1 and 3 listed below (FAO 1998):*

1. *Thickness of organic horizon greater than or equal to 10 cm. A horizon of less than 20 cm must have 12 percent or more organic carbon when mixed to a depth of 20 cm.*
2. *Soils that are never saturated with water for more than a few days must contain more than 20 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e., about 35 percent organic matter).*
3. *Soils are subject to water saturation episodes and has either:*
  - a. *At least 12 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e., about 20 percent organic matter) if the soil has no clay; or*
  - b. *At least 18 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e., about 30 percent organic matter) if the soil has 60% or more clay; or*
  - c. *An intermediate proportional amount of organic carbon for intermediate amounts of clay.*

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* largely follow the definition of Histosols by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), but have omitted the thickness criterion from the FAO definition to allow for often historically determined, country-specific definitions of organic soils.

There are no IPCC definitions for peat and peatland. Definitions of peatland and peat soil differ between countries in relation to the thickness of the peat layer required to be determined as a peatland or a peat soil. In addition, the definition of peat varies among countries and disciplines, especially with respect to the minimum percentage of organic matter the material is required to contain (Joosten and Clarke, 2002). In the *Wetlands Supplement* the concept of peatland is considered to be included in ‘(land with) organic soil’.

It is *good practice* that, when a country uses another definition of organic soil in accordance with its national circumstances, the concept of organic soil (and its possible subdivisions) applied is clearly defined, and that the definition is applied consistently both across the entire national land area and over time.

**Note 4: Is the soil wet?**

A wet soil is a soil that is inundated or saturated by water for all or part of the year to the extent that biota, adapted to anaerobic conditions, particularly soil microbes and rooted plants, control the quality and quantity of the net annual greenhouse gas emissions and removals. Every soil that is not a wet soil is in this supplement classified as a dry soil.

Drainage is the process of artificial lowering of the soil water table. In this supplement, the term is used to describe the act of changing a soil from wet into dry. A drained soil is a soil that has formerly been a wet soil, but as a result of human intervention has become a dry soil. All organic soils are assumed to have originally been wet, therefore a dry organic soil is always also a drained organic soil.

Rewetting is the process of changing a drained soil into a wet soil. A rewetted soil is a soil that has formerly been a drained soil but as a result of human intervention has become a wet soil. Similarly, wetting is the process of changing an originally dry soil into a wet soil as a result of human intervention, as in wetland creation. Restoration (adjective restored) is the process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. In the case of drained former wetlands, restoration always has to include rewetting.

With respect to inland wet mineral soils the *Wetlands Supplement* only provides Tier 1 guidance for ‘wetland mineral soils’ and mineral soils that have been wetted by human intervention for the purpose of wetland creation.

‘Wetland mineral soils’ include the ‘wetland soils’ as defined in footnote 6 to Table 2.3, Chapter 2 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* as *Soils with restricted drainage leading to periodic flooding and anaerobic conditions (in WRB classification Gleysols; in USDA classification Aquic suborders)*. Sandy soils (as defined by footnote 3 to Table 2.3, Chapter 2 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*) that are wet are not included.

Chapter 3 of the *Wetlands Supplement* covers organic soils that are rewetted and wet organic soils that are subject to other management practices such as paludicultures. Chapter 4 covers coastal wetland soils that are subject to rewetting (after drainage) and to other management practices such as extraction, revegetation and aquaculture. Chapter 5 covers rewetting of drained inland wetland mineral soils and wetting of originally dry mineral soils.

**Note 5: New guidance for drained coastal mineral soils and ‘inland wetland mineral soils’**

Dry mineral soils in inland lands that are subject to management activities other than rewetting or wetting respectively are covered in Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Chapter 4 of the *Wetlands Supplement* provides new guidance for drained coastal mineral soils, and Chapter 5 presents new guidance on ‘inland wetland mineral soils’ (see Note 4 above) that have been continuously cultivated (by default for > 20 years) with predominantly annual crops. Tier 1 methods for both mineral and organic soils do not differentiate between recently and long-time drained soils.’

Drained mineral soils may have a high organic matter content that gives them different greenhouse gas emission characteristics from those of mineral soils that have never been wet, or which were originally wet, but have been in a dry state for a long time. These differences fade with time after drainage, but so long as they persist, the soil is described in this supplement as being ‘drained’.

**Note 6: Is this a ‘Flooded Land’?**

Flooded Land is defined in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* as *water bodies where human activities have caused changes in the amount of surface area covered by water, typically through water level regulation. Examples of Flooded Land include reservoirs for the production of hydroelectricity, irrigation, and navigation. Regulated lakes and rivers that do not have substantial changes in water area in comparison with the pre-flooded ecosystem are not considered as Flooded Lands. Some rice paddies are cultivated through flooding of land, but because of the unique characteristics of rice cultivation, rice paddies are addressed in Chapter 5 (Cropland) of the Guidelines* (Section 7.3, Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*).

This *Wetlands Supplement* does not include additional guidance for Flooded Land. Estimating emissions from this category of land use is discussed in Section 7.3, Chapter 7 of Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Reservoirs constructed as wetlands for wastewater treatment are covered in Chapter 6 of the *Wetlands Supplement*.

**Note 7: Is this a wetland for wastewater treatment?**

A wetland for wastewater treatment is a wetland that is used for or influenced by waste water treatment. Chapter 6 of the *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance for wetlands for wastewater treatment, both for wetlands that are constructed for such a purpose (constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment) and for natural wetlands that are used for, or influenced by, wastewater treatment. The emissions are reported under the Waste Sector. Other constructed (i.e. man-made, engineered or artificially created) wetlands are included in Chapter 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement*.

**Note 8: Is this coastal land?**

Coastal land is land at or near the coast. It is *good practice* for a country to clearly define the concept of ‘coastal land’ and its sea- and landward limits in accordance with its national circumstances, and to apply that definition consistently across the entire national land area and over time. All land that is not coastal is inland.

A coastal wetland is a wetland (see Note 4) at or near the coast that is influenced by brackish/saline water and/or astronomical tides. Coastal wetland may occur on both organic and mineral soils. Brackish/saline water is water that normally contains more than 0.5 or more parts per thousand (ppt) of dissolved salts. Every mineral soil wetland that is neither a coastal wetland, a Flooded Land (see Note 6) nor a constructed wetland for waste water treatment (see Note 7) is classified as inland wetland (cf. Chapter 5).

**Note 9: Is this inland mineral soil?**

Inland mineral soil is all mineral soil (see Note 3) that is not on coastal land (see Note 8).

**Note 10: Is this organic soil wet?**

Chapter 3 of the *Wetlands Supplement* focuses on rewetted organic soils and peatlands. While Chapter 3 of the *Wetlands Supplement* does not provide Tier 1 methods for management practices such as paludicultures, these

are discussed in the general discussion and in the higher tier sections of that chapter. Chapter 2 of the *Wetlands Supplement* covers drained organic soils.

#### Box 1.1

##### GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS OF MANAGED ORGANIC AND WET SOILS

Lands with organic and wet soils are crucial in maintaining the Earth's carbon balance as they contain soils with high organic carbon content (Mitra *et al.*, 2005; Joosten and Couwenberg, 2008; Donato *et al.*, 2011). Human activities on wetlands (e.g. drainage, agriculture, forestry, peat extraction, aquaculture) and their effects (e.g. oxidation of soil organic matter) may significantly affect the carbon and nitrogen balance and, thus, the greenhouse gas emissions and removals from these lands. The actual magnitude of human-induced emissions and removals from lands with organic and wet soils depends on numerous variables, including soil type, type of land use/conversion, wetland type, wetland size, management practice, vegetation composition, water table depth, growing season length, salinity, precipitation, and temperature and is discussed in greater detail within this *Wetlands Supplement*.


Draining inland organic soils lowers the water table and increases the oxygen content of the soil, thus increasing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions from drained inland organic soils are generally negligible because the soil carbon is then preferentially oxidized to CO<sub>2</sub>. However, methanogenesis may take place in drainage ditches with a higher water table causing significant emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> to the atmosphere. Drained organic soils can also emit significant amounts of N<sub>2</sub>O from nitrogen in the organic matter or nitrogen added by fertilization. Losses of particulate and dissolved organic carbon in drainage waters from organic soil are also included in this *Wetlands Supplement* (Chapter 2). Rewetting inland organic soils raises the water table again, decreases CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, rapidly decreases N<sub>2</sub>O emissions to almost zero, and increases CH<sub>4</sub> emissions compared to the drained state, as the oxygen level in the soil drops and methanogenesis starts again. Rewetting can also restore wetlands to a state where net CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are greatly reduced or even become negative, causing the wetlands to function as a net remover of greenhouse gases from the atmosphere (Chapter 3 of this supplement). CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from coastal wetlands can be significant, especially during the construction phase of aquaculture and salt production/extraction. CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from coastal wetlands are not significant except when the wetlands are enriched with nutrients from agricultural run-off or sewage (Chapter 4 of this supplement). Restoring and creating wetlands on mineral soils, similar to rewetting organic soils, creates anoxic conditions and increases CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Chapter 5 of this supplement). Constructed and semi-natural wetlands used for wastewater treatment emit CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O (Chapter 6 of this supplement).

## 1.3 APPLICATION OF THE MANAGED LAND PROXY TO WETLANDS

The Managed Land Proxy is used in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (GPG-LULUCF)* as a pragmatic way to estimate anthropogenic emissions and removals because detailed factoring out of natural emissions or removals is impractical at the country level. According to the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Section 3.2, Chapter 3 in Volume 4), *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 managed land are to be reported regardless of whether they are anthropogenic or non-anthropogenic.

The Managed Land Proxy continues to be applied in the *Wetlands Supplement*. For coastal wetlands (Chapter 4 of this supplement), this *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance to estimate and report countries' emissions and removals from specific management activities such as aquaculture, salt production, and dredging. See Figure 1.3 below for some typical management practices on wetlands.



**Figure 1.3** Typical management practices on organic and wet soils

(Figure by Riikka Turunen, Statistics Finland)

## 1.4 COHERENCE AND COMPATIBILITY WITH 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES

This section provides an overview of the links between the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and the information presented in this *Wetlands Supplement*. Section 1.4.1 presents an outline of the activities in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* that are topics of additional guidance in this supplement. Section 1.4.2, highlights guidance in this supplement that was not previously included in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and which may need to be considered by inventory compilers.

### 1.4.1 Guidance on activities in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* that are also covered in the *Wetlands Supplement*

#### CARBON STOCK CHANGES AND CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS IN MINERAL AND ORGANIC SOILS

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provide guidance for estimating carbon stock changes in mineral soils and drained organic soils within the land-use categories Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land. In Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, complete guidance is provided at the Tier 1 level, with additional guidance for Tiers 2 and 3. For mineral soils, the default method is based on changes in soil carbon stocks over a finite period of time. The change is computed based on the carbon stock after the management change relative to the carbon stock in a reference condition. To estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils an area-based annual emission factor differentiated by climate region and land use is applied. The *Wetlands Supplement* provides additional guidance for both organic and mineral soils (subdivided into wet and drained) and the information with respect to organic soils is expanded to include activities on wet (undrained, rewetted) organic soils. The information in Table 4.6 in Chapter 4 (Forest Land), Table 5.6 in Chapter 5 (Cropland), and Table 6.3 in Chapter 6 (Grassland) in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, which provides CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors for drained organic soils, is updated in Table 2.1 in the *Wetlands Supplement*.

#### CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS

Section 2.3.3.1, Chapter 2 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* assumes that CH<sub>4</sub> emissions due to the drainage of organic soils are negligible. The *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance on estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils and drainage ditches, including default emission factors in Tables 2.3 and 2.4 in Chapter 2, respectively.

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* do not provide guidance on estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from mineral soils except for in relation to rice cultivation. The *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance on this potential source in Table 5.4 in Chapter 5, based upon a review of the available scientific literature.

#### BIOMASS AND DEAD ORGANIC MATTER CARBON STOCK CHANGES

Generic methodologies for estimating above-ground and below-ground biomass carbon stock changes for all land-use categories are available in Section 2.3.1, Chapter 2 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Guidance to estimate the dead organic matter pool is provided in Section 2.3.2, Chapter 2 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. More specific guidance by land-use categories can be found in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* under the specific land-use category Chapters: 4 (Forest Land), 5 (Cropland), 6 (Grassland), 7 (Wetlands), 8 (Settlements), and 9 (Other Land). The *Wetlands Supplement* provides additional guidance for these carbon pools with respect to coastal wetlands in Section 4.2, Chapter 4.

The *Wetlands Supplement* does not provide additional guidance for these pools in Chapters 2, 3 and 5.

#### DIRECT AND INDIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED SOILS

Methodologies are provided in Section 11.2, Chapter 11 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, for the estimation of both direct and indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils. Generic equations are presented for application to all land areas in aggregate or to specific land-use categories if the activity data are available. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drained organic soils are estimated using an area-based annual emission factor differentiated by climate region. The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* caution the risk of double counting indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions that are reported elsewhere, e.g. under Agriculture (Chapter 11, Volume 4). This caution is reiterated here in relation to the use of the additional information about N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

Certain Tier 1 N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors provided in Tables 11.1 (direct emissions), Chapter 11 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are updated in Table 2.5, Chapter 2 in the *Wetlands Supplement*.

## NON-CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS FROM BIOMASS BURNING

Generic guidance for non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the burning of live and dead biomass on managed lands (Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land) is provided under Section 2.4, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The existing guidance does not include the burning of peat and other organic soils, which is a large emission source for some countries. The *Wetlands Supplement* addresses CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions associated with the burning of organic soils.

## RICE CULTIVATION

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rice cultivation are included in Section 5.5, Chapter 5 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Soil carbon stock changes are accounted for using guidance as described above in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Chapter 2 of the *Wetlands Supplement* provides emission factors for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O for rice cultivation on tropical drained organic soils.

## WETLANDS

Methodologies are provided in the Wetlands chapter of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Chapter 7 in Volume 4) to estimate greenhouse gas emissions and removals from peatlands cleared and drained for extracting peat for energy, horticulture and other uses (Section 7.2, Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). Emissions from the use of horticultural peat are accounted for in Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, while emissions from peat used for energy generation are estimated under the Energy Sector (Volume 2 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). In the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, guidance for peat extraction that does not include drainage is not provided; this remains the case in the *Wetlands Supplement*. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from land converted to flooded land such as reservoirs for production of hydroelectricity, irrigation and navigation are provided in Section 7.2, Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*; no further guidance is provided for flooded lands in the *Wetlands Supplement*.

## WASTEWATER TREATMENT

Chapter 6 in Volume 5 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (wastewater treatment and discharge) provides a methodology to estimate CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from domestic and industrial wastewater treatment. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from wastewater are not considered in the *IPCC Guidelines* and should not be included in the national total emissions because of their biogenic origin. The *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance on CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions associated with constructed and natural wetlands used for wastewater treatment.

## 1.4.2 Supplementary guidance in this report

Figure 1.3 shows schematic representations of typical generic management practices covered in each of the chapters of the *Wetlands Supplement*. The illustrations are not intended to be comprehensive; rather they are a visual guide to the landscapes and ecosystem types to be considered when using this supplement.

### CHAPTER 2—DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

Chapter 2 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides an updated summary of emission factors and supplementary guidance to Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for use in the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils in all land-use categories: Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land, (see Figure 1.3, Frame B in this chapter).

Additional Tier 1 guidance is provided to include the impact of drainage depth (water-table level) on emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O. New emission factors to estimate the release of CH<sub>4</sub> from drainage ditches are also provided.

Chapter 2 in the *Wetlands Supplement* also identifies additional pathways by which carbon is lost from the soil, namely: carbon loss as Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC), as Particulate Organic Carbon (POC), and as Dissolved Inorganic Carbon (DIC). Guidance is provided to estimate these carbon losses separately from the direct emissions. The loss of carbon from managed organic soils via DOC can be estimated using the Tier 1 methodology and the emission factors provided. Chapter 2 does not, however, provide Tier 1 methodologies for emissions associated with POC or DIC. However, Annex 2A.1, Chapter 2 in the *Wetlands Supplement* sets out the basis for the future methodological development for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with waterborne carbon loss from POC. Fire on drained organic soils causes not only on-site CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions directly from burning, but also has a high potential to increase off-site carbon loss from waterborne organic matter. Chapter 2 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides supplementary methodological guidance to estimate CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO emissions from fires on drained organic soils.

## CHAPTER 3—REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS

Chapter 3 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides new guidance and emission factors for organic soils that have been drained for forestry, crop production, grazing, peat extraction or other purposes, and have subsequently been rewetted to re-establish water saturation (see Figure 1.3, Frame C in this chapter). Rewetting may have several objectives such as emission reduction, restoration for nature conservation or enabling other management practices on saturated organic soils (paludicultures). While restoration may take place on undrained sites (e.g. the restoration of damaged vegetation cover), in the majority of cases restoration will include rewetting.

Chapter 3 provides Tier 1 guidance for assessing greenhouse gas (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions and removals from rewetted organic soils by climate region and general guidance for utilizing higher tier methodologies.

## CHAPTER 4—COASTAL WETLANDS

Chapter 4 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance on estimating emissions and removals of greenhouse gases (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O) associated with specific activities on managed coastal wetlands that may or may not result in a land use change. Coastal wetlands are wetlands near the coast that are influenced by tidal and/or saline or brackish water. They may consist of mangrove, tidal marsh and seagrass vegetation and can have organic and mineral soils (see Figure 1.3, Frame A in this chapter). Management practices included in the guidance are aquaculture, salt production, extraction, drainage, rewetting, revegetation and creation, and forest management practice in mangroves.

## CHAPTER 5—INLAND WETLAND MINERAL SOILS

Chapter 5 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance for managed inland wetland mineral soils, including drained soils subject to rewetting and those under long term cultivation; and any other mineral soils that have been wetted by human intervention (e.g. inundation for the purpose of wetland creation) not included in Chapter 4 (coastal wetlands) or Chapter 6 (constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment) in the *Wetlands Supplement* (see Figure 1.3, Frame E in this chapter). The chapter provides methodologies for estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals, delivers updated default reference values for soil organic carbon stocks and offers a default stock change factor for land-use for long term cultivation of croplands on inland wetland mineral soils. It also gives guidance that is not contained in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, including a default stock change factor for land use for rewetted croplands, and methodologies and emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for mineral soils in any land-use category that have been rewetted or inundated for the purpose of wetland creation.

Chapter 5 in the *Wetlands Supplement* does not provide guidance on the application of the methodology given in Chapter 11 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, for estimating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions associated with loss of soil carbon as a result of changes in land use and/or management on inland wetland mineral soils based on estimates of the loss of soil carbon in relation to updated and new defaults for SOC<sub>REF</sub> and SOC stock change factors. However the chapter suggests a future development on the issue.

## CHAPTER 6—CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT

Chapter 6 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance on estimating CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from constructed wetlands and semi-natural treatment wetlands used for wastewater treatment (see Figure 1.3, Frame D in this chapter). The guidance supplements Chapter 6 in Volume 5 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* in relation to wastewater treatment. Default emission factors for different types of constructed wetlands (e.g. those with surface, subsurface vertical or subsurface horizontal flows) are provided for the Tier 1 method. The types of wastewater include domestic, industrial wastewater, collected runoff from agricultural land and leachate from landfill. To avoid double-counting, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from wetlands managed for the filtration of non-point source agricultural effluents, such as fertilizers, are included in indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils (Chapter 11 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*) as part of the leaching/runoff and volatilization components of indirect emissions, and are not considered within this supplement. No specific guidance for estimating potential changes in carbon pools associated with constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment is presented in Chapter 6 in the *Wetlands Supplement*. Inventory compilers are encouraged to consider the guidance given in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and in the *Wetlands Supplement* for possible approaches to reporting these carbon pools.

## CHAPTER 7—CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND REPORTING

Chapter 7 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance on reporting and cross-cutting issues, including uncertainties, *key category* analysis, completeness, time series consistency, quality control, and quality assurance. The chapter summarises the *good practice* guidance on these cross-cutting issues found in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and addresses the cross-cutting issues specific to Chapters 2 to 6 of this *Wetlands Supplement*. Worksheets that can be used for estimating emissions and removals for each category using the Tier 1 guidance, and revised background tables, are included in the annex of the chapter.

## OVERVIEW OF GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS IN USING THE WETLANDS SUPPLEMENT AND THE 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES

It is *good practice* for countries to avoid double-counting emissions that have already been estimated elsewhere in the greenhouse gas inventory. This is especially relevant because lands with organic soils or with wet soils can be included under various land categories.

In particular, there is a risk that using the guidance provided in Chapters 4 and 6 of the *Wetlands Supplement* could result in double-accounting of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from wetlands that result from non-point source agricultural effluents already addressed as indirect emissions from soil amendments (e.g. nitrogen fertilizers) within Chapter 11 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Double-counting can be avoided by considering only those management practices that result in direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

Chapter 2 of this supplement provides guidance on waterborne carbon (DOC, DIC and PIC). However, if the country uses a methodology in which soil carbon stock changes are measured in situ (e.g. soil sampling associated with forest inventories), it is possible that the waterborne carbon has already been included in a country's emission estimates.

Table 1.1 below provides guidance for inventory compilers on which chapters of this *Wetlands Supplement* are relevant when considering methods for particular combinations of land use, soil type and soil condition. Where no guidance is provided in this *Wetlands Supplement*, the table is blank. To estimate total greenhouse gas emissions from organic and wet soils correctly, this *Wetlands Supplement* should be used together with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

**TABLE 1.1**  
**LOOK-UP TABLE FOR WETLANDS SUPPLEMENT BY LAND-USE CATEGORIES, SOIL TYPE AND CONDITION AND INLAND OR COASTAL LOCATION**

Soil Type		Gas	Forest land		Cropland		Grassland		Wetlands		Settlements		Other Land	
			Inland	Coastal	Inland	Coastal	Inland	Coastal	Inland	Coastal	Inland	Coastal	Inland	Coastal
Mineral	Mineral Dry	CO <sub>2</sub>	Refer to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines											
		CH <sub>4</sub>												
		N <sub>2</sub> O												
	Mineral Drained <sup>4</sup>	CO <sub>2</sub>	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
		CH <sub>4</sub>	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
		N <sub>2</sub> O		4		4		4		4		4		4
	Mineral Wet	CO <sub>2</sub>	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
		CH <sub>4</sub>	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
		N <sub>2</sub> O	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4
Organic	Organic Wet	CO <sub>2</sub>	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4
		CH <sub>4</sub>	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4
		N <sub>2</sub> O	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4
	Organic Drained	CO <sub>2</sub>	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4
		CH <sub>4</sub>	2		2		2		2		2		2	
		N <sub>2</sub> O	2		2		2		2		2		2	
	Constructed and Natural Wetlands for Wastewater treatment	The emission sources discussed in the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> Chapter 6 provide guidance for the Waste Sector and do not impact on estimates of emissions and removals within AFOLU. However, the area of constructed wetlands should be reported as Wetlands, Settlements, or other land-use categories as appropriate, and the impact on biomass, soil carbon and other pools may be considered. Care is required to avoid double-counting of emissions.												
	Emissions due to burning of organic soils	Chapter 2 in the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> provides guidance for estimation of greenhouse gas emissions due to burning of organic soils. This guidance can be applied across all land use categories as appropriate where burning is reported as occurring.												
	DOC, DIC, PIC, POC	Chapter 2 in the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> provides a discussion and guidance on carbon loss from organic soils through water pathways. This information is relevant to all land-use categories.												

<sup>4</sup> Here 'Mineral Drained' refers to drained inland wetland mineral soils that are subject to rewetting and drained coastal wetland mineral soils.

## 1.5 RELEVANT DATABASES FOR WETLANDS AND ORGANIC SOILS

To generate estimates of emissions and removals from wetlands and organic soils, inventory compilers will need to gather activity data and secondary data, such as soil type (organic or mineral), climate zone, wetland type, size, water table level, vegetation composition, and management practices. Guidance on data collection is provided in Chapter 2 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. It is *good practice* to focus these efforts on collecting data needed to improve estimates of *key categories*, which will vary by country depending on which emission sources are the largest, have the largest potential to change or have the greatest uncertainty. Chapters 2-6 of the *Wetlands Supplement* provide specific guidance on assembling the necessary activity data for implementation of the Tier 1 methodology as well as general guidance on activity data that may be necessary for implementation of higher tiers. Chapter 7 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides general guidance for producing consistent times series when activity data are not available for all years.

Inventory compilers may be able to collect activity data from in-country natural resource agencies or from national experts. To supplement in-country data, or if in-country data are not readily available, inventory compilers may use internationally available data. Table 1.2 below presents a list of online resources that may prove useful to inventory compilers in obtaining activity data for estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals from the wetlands and organic soils included in this *Wetlands Supplement*. The most notable wetlands dataset is the Ramsar database of the Ramsar Convention. For most 'wetlands of international importance,' the Ramsar database provides relevant characteristics, including: wetland type, area, elevation, persistence of water, salinity, soil type, land use inside and adjacent to the wetland, and vegetation types. In addition, the FAO provides a variety of metadata sets, including forestry, agriculture, and carbon emissions on a country scale. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), in collaboration with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), has a collection of wetland atlases and offers open source geospatial data. Wetlands International is the only global non-governmental organisation (NGO) that focuses on wetland best practices, restoration and conservation. It has regional offices in all continents and has compiled a variety of data on wetlands and organic soils.

TABLE 1.2 GLOBAL AND REGIONAL ON-LINE RESOURCES PROVIDING METADATA SETS FOR DEVELOPING AN INVENTORY OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS FROM WETLANDS AND ORGANIC SOILS	
Online Resources	Description
The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands <a href="http://www.ramsar.org">http://www.ramsar.org</a>	The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (the Ramsar Convention) is an intergovernmental treaty that provides the framework for national action and international cooperation for the conservation and wise use of wetlands and their resources. In 2013, this convention consisted of 167 Contracting Parties, 2,122 wetlands of International Importance, and 205,366,160 hectares of wetlands designated as Ramsar sites.
FAOSTAT <a href="http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html">http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html</a>	A large time series and cross section of data relating to hunger, commodity prices, foods, forestry, agriculture, and emissions for 245 countries and territories and 35 regional areas, from 1961 to the most recent year
United Nations Environment Programme and World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) <a href="http://www.unep-wcmc.org/datasets-tools--reports_15.html">http://www.unep-wcmc.org/datasets-tools--reports_15.html</a>	This site provides a set of metadata related to conservation in general. It also contains several atlases of wetlands, e.g. the World Mangrove Atlas and the World Atlas of Seagrass.
GeoNetwork Open Source Geographic data sharing for everyone <a href="http://geonetwork.grid.unep.ch/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home">http://geonetwork.grid.unep.ch/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home</a>	This site is managed by UNEP. It contains geographic metadata that can be freely requested.
Wetlands International <a href="http://www.wetlands.org/">http://www.wetlands.org/</a>	Wetlands International is the only global not-for-profit organisation dedicated to the conservation and restoration of wetlands. This NGO also has several regional metadatasets, e.g. South Asia Wetlands, Australia Wetlands, etc.



## References

- Donato, D.C., Kauffman, J.B., Murdiyarso, D., Kurnianto, S., Stidham, M. & Kanninen, M. (2011) Mangroves among the most carbon-rich forests in the tropics. *Nature Geosciences* **4**: 293-297. [http://mangroveactionproject.org/files/resources/Donato.etal\\_2011\\_NatureGeo\\_MangroveCarbonStorage.pdf](http://mangroveactionproject.org/files/resources/Donato.etal_2011_NatureGeo_MangroveCarbonStorage.pdf)
- IPCC (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (eds). Published: IGES, Japan.
- IPCC (2011) *IPCC Expert Meeting on HWP, Wetlands and Soil N<sub>2</sub>O. Geneva, Switzerland*: eds: Eggleston, H.S., Srivastava, N., Tanabe, K., Baasansuren, J. and Fukuda, M. IGES, Japan 2011.
- Joosten, H. & Clarke, D. (2002) *Wise use of mires and peatlands – Background and principles including a framework for decision-making*. International Mire Conservation Group / International Peat Society, 304 p. [http://www.peatociety.org/sites/default/files/files/WUMP\\_Wise\\_Use\\_of\\_Mires\\_and\\_Peatlands\\_book.pdf](http://www.peatociety.org/sites/default/files/files/WUMP_Wise_Use_of_Mires_and_Peatlands_book.pdf)
- Joosten, H. & Couwenberg, J. (2008) Peatlands and carbon. In: Parish, F., Sirin, A., Charman, D., Joosten, H., Minaeva, T. and Silvius, M. (eds). *Assessment on peatlands, biodiversity and climate change*. Global Environment Centre, Kuala Lumpur and Wetlands International Wageningen, pp. 99-117.
- Mitra, S., Wassmann, R. & Vlek, L.G. (2005) An appraisal of global wetland area and its organic carbon stock. *Current Science* **88**: 25–35.
- The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. The Convention on Wetlands text, as amended in 1982 and 1987. [http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-texts-convention-on/main/ramsar/1-31-38%5E20671\\_4000\\_0](http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-texts-convention-on/main/ramsar/1-31-38%5E20671_4000_0)



# **CHAPTER 2**

---

## **DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS**

### **Coordinating Lead Authors**

Matthias Drösler (Germany), Louis V. Verchot (USA), Annette Freibauer (Germany) and Genxing Pan (China)

### **Lead Authors**

Christopher David Evans (UK), Richard A. Bourbonniere (Canada), Jukka P. Alm (Finland), Susan Page (UK), Fahmuddin Agus (Indonesia), Kristell Hergoualc'h (France), John Couwenberg (EC/WI/Germany/Netherlands), Jyrki Jauhiainen (Finland), Supiandi Sabiham (Indonesia) and Changke Wang (China)

### **Contributing Authors**

Nalin Srivastava (IPCC TFI TSU), Laura Bourgeau-Chavez (USA), Aljosja Hooijer (The Netherlands), Kari Minkinen (Finland), Nancy French (USA), Tara Strand (USA/New Zealand), Andrey Sirin (Russian Federation), Robert Mickler (USA), Kevin Tansey (UK) and Narasimhan Larkin (USA)

### **Review Editors**

David Pare (Canada), Bernard Siska (Slovakia) and Iman Rusmana (Indonesia)

## Contents

2	Drained Inland Organic Soils.....	6
2.1	Introduction.....	6
2.2	Land Remaining in a Land-use Category.....	7
2.2.1	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils .....	7
2.2.1.1	On-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from drained inland organic soils (CO <sub>2</sub> -C <sub>on-site</sub> ).....	8
2.2.1.2	Off-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions via waterborne carbon losses from drained inland organic soils.....	18
2.2.2	Non-CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils.....	21
2.2.2.1	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils .....	21
2.2.2.2	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from drained inland organic soils .....	31
2.2.2.3	CO <sub>2</sub> and non-CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from fires on drained inland organic soils .....	36
2.3	Land Converted to a New Land-use Category .....	44
2.3.1	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils .....	44
2.3.1.1	On-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from drained inland organic soils (CO <sub>2</sub> -C <sub>on-site</sub> ).....	44
2.3.1.2	Off-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions via waterborne carbon losses from drained inland organic soils (CO <sub>2</sub> -C <sub>soil-onsite</sub> ).....	45
2.3.2	Non-CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils.....	46
2.3.2.1	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions/removals from drained inland organic soils.....	46
2.3.2.2	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from drained inland organic soils .....	47
2.3.2.3	Non-CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from burning on drained organic soils .....	47
2.4	Completeness, time series consistency, QA/QC and reporting and documentation .....	47
2.4.1	Completeness.....	47
2.4.2	Time series consistency .....	47
2.4.3	Quality Assurance and Quality Control.....	48
2.4.4	Reporting and documentation .....	48
Annex 2A.1	Scientific background for developing CO <sub>2</sub> -C emission/removal factors for drained inland organic soil from the scientific literature in Table 2.1.....	49
Annex 2A.2	Derivation of ditch CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors.....	52
Annex 2A.3	Derivation of DOC emission factors.....	54
Annex 2A.4	Derivation of CO <sub>2</sub> -C and non-CO <sub>2</sub> emission factors for emissions from burning of drained inland organic soils from the scientific literature in Tables 2.6 and 2.7 .....	59
Appendix 2a.1	Estimation of Particulate Organic Carbon (POC) and Dissolved Inorganic Carbon (DIC) loss from peatlands and drained organic soils: Basis for future methodological development.....	61
References	.....	63

## Equations

Equation 2.1	Annual carbon stock changes for a stratum of a land-use category as a sum of changes in all pools (Equation 2.3 in Chapter 2, Volume 4, <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> ).....	7
Equation 2.2	CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions/removals by drained organic soils.....	8
Equation 2.3	Annual on-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions/removals from drained organic soils excluding emissions from fires .....	9
Equation 2.4	Annual off-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions due to DOC loss from drained organic soils (CO <sub>2</sub> ) .....	19
Equation 2.5	Emission factor for annual CO <sub>2</sub> emissions due to DOC export from drained organic soils .....	19
Equation 2.6	Annual CH <sub>4</sub> emission from drained organic soils.....	22
Equation 2.7	Direct N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from managed/drained organic soils.....	31
Equation 2.8	Annual CO <sub>2</sub> -C and non-CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from organic soil fire .....	37
Equation 2a.1	Calculation of POC export from drained organic soils .....	61

## Figures

Figure 2.1	Summary of fluxes from drained organic soils.....	7
Figure 2.2	Generic decision tree for identification of the appropriate tier to estimate greenhouse gas emissions from fires on organic soils.....	38

## Tables

Table 2.1	Tier 1 CO <sub>2</sub> emission/removal factors for drained organic soils in all land-use categories .....	11
Table 2.2	Default DOC emission factors for drained organic soils.....	20
Table 2.3	Tier 1 CH <sub>4</sub> emission/removal factors for drained organic soils (EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub>-land</sub> ) in all land-use categories .....	25
Table 2.4	Default CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors for drainage ditches.....	30
Table 2.5	Tier 1 Direct N <sub>2</sub> O emission/removal factors for drained organic soils in all land-use categories .....	33
Table 2.6	Organic soil fuel consumption values .....	40
Table 2.7	Emission factors (g kg <sup>-1</sup> dry matter burnt) for organic soil fires.....	41
Table 2A.1	Collated data on ditch CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from drained and rewetted organic soils .....	53
Table 2A.2	Annual DOC flux estimates from natural or semi-natural peatlands used to derive default values for DOC <sub>flux-natural</sub> .....	55

Table 2A.3	DOC concentration (above) or flux (below) comparisons between drained and undrained organic soils, used to derive default value for $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$ .....	57
------------	--	----

## **Boxes**

Box 2.1	Recent advances in satellite-derived fire products.....	42
---------	---	----

## 2 DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

Organic soils are defined in Annex 3A.5, Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006 IPCC Guidelines)* and Section 1.2, Chapter 1 of this *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands (Wetlands Supplement)*. The guidance in this Chapter applies to all inland organic soils that have been drained, i.e. drainage of lands that started in the past and that still persists, or newly drained lands within the reporting period. This means that the water table level is at least temporarily below natural levels. Natural levels mean that the mean annual water table is near the soil surface but can experience seasonal fluctuations. Within each land-use category, water table level is manipulated to varying degrees depending on land-use purpose, e.g. for cultivating cereals, rice or for aquaculture, which can be reflected by different drainage classes.

This Chapter deals with inland organic soils that do not meet the definition of “coastal” given in Chapter 4 of this *Wetlands Supplement*. In this Chapter, the term “organic soils” refers to “inland organic soils” in this Chapter.

This Chapter provides supplementary guidance on estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils in the following land-use categories, as defined in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*: Chapter 4 (Forest Land), Chapter 5 (Cropland), Chapter 6 (Grassland), Chapter 7 (Wetlands), Chapter 8 (Settlements) and Chapter 9 (Other Land). Managed coastal organic soils are covered in Chapter 4 of this *Wetlands Supplement*. Rewetted organic soils are considered in Chapter 3 of this *Wetlands Supplement*.

This Chapter clarifies Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* by summarising all emission factors and harmonising methods for organic soils across all land-use types. On the basis of recent advances in scientific information, this Chapter also updates, improves and completes methodologies and emission factors for greenhouse gas emissions and removals in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and fills gaps where new scientific knowledge allows implementation of robust methodologies and use of better emission factors at the Tier 1 level.


This Chapter updates the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for:

- carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions and removals from drained organic soils (referring to Chapters 4 to 9, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*);
- methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions from drained organic soils (referring to Chapter 7, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*); and
- nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions from drained organic soils (referring to Chapter 11, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*).

This Chapter gives new guidance not contained in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* by:

- providing methodologies and emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches (referring to Chapters 4 to 9, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*);
- providing methodologies and emission factors for off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with dissolved organic carbon (DOC) release from organic soils to drainage waters (referring to Chapters 4 to 9, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*);
- providing methodologies and emission factors for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from peat fires.

This Chapter also contains an Appendix that provides the basis for future methodological development for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with other forms of waterborne carbon loss, specifically particulate organic carbon (POC) and dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) (referring to Chapters 4 to 9, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). All fluxes are summarised in Figure 2.1.

**Figure 2.1** Summary of fluxes from drained organic soils

## 2.2 LAND REMAINING IN A LAND-USE CATEGORY

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provide guidance for carbon stock changes in five carbon pools, namely above-ground and below-ground biomass, dead wood, litter and soil for managed land on organic soils. This Chapter updates the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for the soil organic carbon pool in organic soils.

### 2.2.1 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils

This section deals with the impacts of drainage and management on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from organic soils due to organic matter decomposition and loss of DOC in drainage waters. DOC losses lead to off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. There are also erosional losses of POC, as well as waterborne transport of DIC (primarily dissolved CO<sub>2</sub>) derived from autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration within the organic soil. At present, the science and available data are insufficient to provide guidance on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions or removals associated with these waterborne carbon fluxes; Appendix 2a.1 provides a basis for future methodological development in this area. General information and guidance for estimating changes in soil carbon stocks are provided in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*; this should be read before proceeding with the guidance provided here. This guidance is based on the observation that in drained organic soils, emissions persist as long as the soil remains drained or as long as organic matter remains (Wösten *et al.*, 1997; Deverel & Leighton, 2010).

Equation 2.3 in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* refers to annual carbon stock changes for a stratum of a land-use category as a sum of changes in all pools. This section addresses the stratum of a land-use category on drained organic soils. The equation is repeated here as Equation 2.1 to demonstrate how the guidance in this *Wetlands Supplement* links to the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

**EQUATION 2.1**  
**ANNUAL CARBON STOCK CHANGES FOR A STRATUM OF A LAND-USE CATEGORY AS A SUM OF**  
**CHANGES IN ALL POOLS**  
**(EQUATION 2.3 IN CHAPTER 2, VOLUME 4, 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES)**

$$\Delta C_{LU_i} = \Delta C_{AB} + \Delta C_{BB} + \Delta C_{DW} + \Delta C_{LI} + \Delta C_{SO} + \Delta C_{HWP}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{LU_i}$  = carbon stock changes for a stratum of a land-use category

Subscripts denote the following carbon pools:

AB	= above-ground biomass
BB	= below-ground biomass
DW	= dead wood
LI	= litter
SO	= soils
HWP	= harvested wood products

Guidance for the carbon pools above-ground biomass, below-ground biomass, dead wood, litter and harvested wood products in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* is not dealt with further in these guidelines.

This section of the *Wetlands Supplement* updates and complements the guidance on the drained organic soils component of  $\Delta C_{SO}$ , referred to as  $L_{organic}$  in Equation 2.24, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. For transparent distinction between drained and rewetted organic soils, the term is further specified as  $CO_2-C_{organic, drained}$  in Equation 2.2.  $CO_2-C_{organic, drained}$  consists of on-site  $CO_2$  emissions/removals of the organic soil from mineralisation and sequestration processes ( $CO_2-C_{on-site}$ ), off-site  $CO_2$  emissions from leached carbon from the organic soil ( $CO_2-C_{DOC}$ ) and anthropogenic peat fires ( $L_{fire}$ ). Countries are encouraged to consider POC when using higher tier methodologies (see Appendix 2a.1).  $CO_2$  emissions from peat fires are not explicitly addressed in Equation 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, but can be important on drained organic soils.  $CO_2$  emissions from peat fires are therefore included in Equation 2.2 as  $L_{fire}$  (Section 2.2.2.3).

#### EQUATION 2.2

##### $CO_2-C$ EMISSIONS/REMOVALS BY DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS

$$CO_2 - C_{organic, drained} = CO_2 - C_{on-site} + CO_2 - C_{DOC} + L_{fire} - CO_2 - C$$

Where:

$CO_2-C_{organic, drained}$  =  $CO_2-C$  emissions/removals by drained organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$CO_2-C_{on-site}$  = on-site  $CO_2-C$  emissions/removals by drained organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$CO_2-C_{DOC}$  =  $CO_2-C$  emissions from dissolved organic carbon exported from drained organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$L_{fire}-CO_2-C$  =  $CO_2-C$  emissions from burning of drained organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

### 2.2.1.1 ON-SITE $CO_2$ EMISSIONS/REMOVALS FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS ( $CO_2-C_{ON-SITE}$ )

This section gives supplementary guidance for  $CO_2$  emissions and removals from drained organic soils in all land-use categories as defined in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The IPCC land-use categories are discussed in Chapter 4 (Forest Land), Chapter 5 (Cropland), Chapter 6 (Grassland), Chapter 7 (Wetlands), Chapter 8 (Settlements) and Chapter 9 (Other Land). Flooded Lands (Chapter 7) are not included in this *Wetlands Supplement*.

Guidance is given for  $CO_2$  emissions from the soil carbon pool in drained organic soils in line with Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Guidance for changes in the carbon pools in above-ground and below-ground biomass, dead wood and litter on these lands is provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and remains unchanged.

#### CHOICE OF METHOD

The most important factors considered for estimating on-site  $CO_2$  emissions and removals from drained organic soils are land use and climate. Other factors such as nutrient status (or fertility) of the soil and drainage level affect emissions and can be considered where appropriate and with higher tier methods. It is *good practice* to stratify land-use categories by climate domain (Table 4.1, Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), nutrient status (*Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (GPG-LULUCF)*) and Section 7.2.1.1, Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*) and drainage class (shallow or deep) according to the stratification given in Table 2.1.



Nutrient status is defined in the *GPG-LULUCF* and the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Section 7.2.1.1, Chapter 7, Volume 4). Generally, ombrogenic organic soils are characterised as nutrient-poor, while minerogenic organic soils are characterised as nutrient-rich. This broad characterisation may vary by peatland type or national circumstances.

Drainage class is defined as the mean annual water table averaged over a period of several years; the shallow-drained class is defined as the mean annual water table depth of less than 30 cm below the surface; the deep-drained class is defined as the mean annual water table depth of 30 cm and deeper below the surface.

For Tier 1 methods, if the typical range of mean annual water table levels of drained organic soils for each land-use category is unknown - water table depth is specific for land-use categories and climate domains - the default assumption is that the organic soil is deep-drained because deep-drained conditions are the most widespread and suitable for a wide range of management intensities. Higher tier methods could further differentiate the drainage intensity within land-use categories if there are significant areas that differ from the default deep-drained conditions.

Figure 2.5 in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provides a decision tree for identification of the appropriate tier to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils by land-use category.

### Tier 1

The basic methodology for estimating annual carbon loss from drained organic soils is presented in Section 2.3.3 and Equation 2.26 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, as further specified in Equation 2.2. Equation 2.3 refers to CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>on-site</sub> in Equation 2.2 with stratification of land-use categories by climate domain and nutrient status. Nutrient status and drainage classes only need to be differentiated for those land-use categories and climate domains for which emission factors are differentiated in Table 2.1.

At Tier 1, there is no differentiation between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from long-term drained organic soils and organic soils after initial drainage or where drainage is deepened. High carbon loss from drained organic soils can occur immediately after initial drainage of organic soils (Stephens *et al.*, 1984; Wösten *et al.*, 1997; Hooijer *et al.*, 2012) even if land use does not change. These CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>on-site</sub> emissions in the transitional phase are not captured by the Tier 1 default emission factors shown in Table 2.1, which were derived from data representing long-term land uses present for decades in the boreal and temperate climate zones, and land uses drained for more than six years in the tropical climate zone. A transitional phase is thus not captured by Tier 1 methodology due to lack of data for deriving default emission factors. After initial drainage of organic soils and if a transitional phase occurs, this should be addressed by higher tier methods.

**EQUATION 2.3**  
**ANNUAL ON-SITE CO<sub>2</sub>-C EMISSIONS/REMOVALS FROM DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS EXCLUDING EMISSIONS FROM FIRES**

$$CO_2-C_{on-site} = \sum_{c,n,d} (A \bullet EF)_{c,n,d}$$

Where:

CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>on-site</sub> = annual on-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions/removals from drained organic soils in a land-use category, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

A = land area of drained organic soils in a land-use category in climate domain c, nutrient status n and drainage class d, ha

EF = emission factors for drained organic soils, by climate domain c, nutrient status n and drainage class d, tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>

### Tier 2

The Tier 2 approach for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from drained organic soils incorporates country-specific information into Equations 2.2 and 2.3 to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals. Tier 2 uses the same procedural steps for calculations as provided for Tier 1. Improvements to the Tier 1 approach may include: 1) a derivation of country-specific emission factors; 2) specification of climate sub-domains considered suitable for refinement of emission factors; 3) a finer, more detailed classification of management systems with a differentiation of land-use intensity classes; 4) a differentiation by drainage classes; 5) differentiation of emission factors by time since drainage or the time since changes in drainage class, e.g. between emission factors reflecting additional emissions after deepening of drainage or new drainage and long-term stable water tables, or 6) a finer, more detailed classification of nutrient status, e.g. by nitrogen, phosphorus or pH.

It is *good practice* to derive country-specific emission factors if measurements representing the national circumstances are available. Countries need to document that methodologies and measurement techniques are

compatible with the scientific background for Tier 1 emission factors in Annex 2A.1. Moreover, it is *good practice* for countries to use a finer classification for climate and management systems, in particular for drainage classes, if there are significant differences in measured carbon loss rates among these classes. Note that any country-specific emission factor must be accompanied by sufficient national or regional land-use/management activity and environmental data to represent the appropriate climate sub-domains and management systems for the spatial domain for which the country-specific emission factor is applied.

The general guidance provided in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* also applies here.

### **Tier 3**

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from drained organic soils can be estimated using modelling and/or measurement approaches. Dynamic, mechanistic models will typically be used to simulate underlying processes while capturing the influence of land use and management, particularly the effect of seasonally variable levels of drainage on decomposition (van Huissteden *et al.*, 2006). General considerations for organic soils given in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* also apply here. It is *good practice* to describe methodologies and models transparently, to document considerations for the choice and application of the model in the inventory, and to provide evidence that this represents the national circumstances according to the guidance in Section 2.5, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

## **CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS**

### **Tier 1**

All Tier 1 emission factors have been updated from the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* based on a large number of new measurement data from all land-use categories and climate zones. This new evidence allows for stratification of more land-use categories and climate domains by nutrient status than in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. In addition, temperate, nutrient-rich Grassland is further stratified into shallow-drained (less than approximately 30 cm below the surface) and deep-drained. Within each land-use category, drained organic soils can experience a wide range of mean annual water table levels that depend upon regional climatic characteristics and specific land-use activity or intensity. Emission factors for temperate Grassland are given for shallow-drained and deep-drained soils. Shallow-drained and deep-drained Grassland emission factors differ significantly. In the absence of additional national information about mean annual water table and/or land-use intensity as a proxy, countries should choose deep-drained factors as default.

The *GPG-LULUCF* and the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Section 7.2.1.1, Chapter 7, Volume 4) distinguish between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor organic soils in some land-use categories and climate zones. This approach is maintained here, in line with the guidance given in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Two alternative emission/removal factors are given in Table 2.1 for boreal nutrient-poor Forest Land; countries need to choose the one that matches their national land-use definition.

Default Tier 1 emission/removal factors for drained organic soils (Table 2.1) were generated using a combination of subsidence and flux data found in the literature, as described in Annex 2A.1. CO<sub>2</sub>-C losses occur predominantly in the drained, oxic soil layer and thus reflect human-induced CO<sub>2</sub>-C fluxes. The part of the soil profile affected by drainage can be deeper or shallower than the default 0 to 30 cm layer considered in the Tier 1 default methodology for soil organic carbon (SOC) pools in mineral soils.

**TABLE 2.1**  
**TIER 1 CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES<sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category		Climate / vegetation zone	Emission factor <sup>a</sup> (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% Confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		No. of sites	Citations/comments
Forest Land, drained, including shrubland and drained land that may not be classified as forest <sup>c</sup>	Nutrient-poor	Boreal	0.37	-0.11	0.84	63	Lohila <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Minkkinen & Laine, 1998; Minkkinen <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Ojanen <i>et al.</i> , 2010, 2013; Simola <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Forest Land, drained <sup>d</sup>	Nutrient-poor	Boreal	0.25	-0.23	0.73	59	Lohila <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Minkkinen & Laine, 1998; Minkkinen <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Ojanen <i>et al.</i> , 2010, 2013; Simola <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	Nutrient-rich	Boreal	0.93	0.54	1.3	62	Laurila <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Lohila <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Minkkinen & Laine, 1998; Minkkinen <i>et al.</i> , 1999, 2007b; Ojanen <i>et al.</i> , 2010, 2013; Simola <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Forest Land, drained		Temperate	2.6	2.0	3.3	8	Glenn <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Minkkinen <i>et al.</i> , 2007b; von Arnold <i>et al.</i> , 2005a, b; Yamulki <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Forest Land and cleared Forest Land (shrubland <sup>e</sup> ), drained		Tropical	5.3	-0.7	9.5	21	Ali <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Brady, 1997; Chimner & Ewel, 2005; Comeau <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Dariah <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Darung <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Hadi <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Harrison <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Hergoualc'h & Verchot, 2011; Hertel <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Hirano <i>et al.</i> , 2009, 2012; Inubushi <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Ishida <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2008, 2012a; Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2005a, 2007a; Rahaoje <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Shimamura & Momose, 2005; Sulistiyanto, 2004; Sundari <i>et al.</i> , 2012

**TABLE 2.1 (CONTINUED)**  
**TIER 1 CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES <sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category	Climate / vegetation zone	Emission factor <sup>a</sup> (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% Confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		No. of sites	Citations/comments
Plantations, drained, unknown or long rotations <sup>f</sup>	Tropical	15	10	21	n.a.	Average of emission factors for acacia and oil palm
Plantations, drained, short rotations, e.g. acacia <sup>f, g</sup>	Tropical	20	16	24	13	Basuki <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Hooijer <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2012a; Nouvellon <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Warren <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Plantations, drained, oil palm <sup>f</sup>	Tropical	11	5.6	17	10	Comeau <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Couwenberg & Hooijer, 2013; Dariah <i>et al.</i> , 2013; DID & LAWO, 1996; Henson & Dolmat, 2003; Hooijer <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Lamade & Bouillet, 2005; Marwanto & Agus, 2013; Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2005a, 2007a, 2013; Warren <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Plantations, shallow-drained (typically less than 0.3 m), typically used for agriculture, e.g. sago palm <sup>f</sup>	Tropical	1.5	-2.3	5.4	5	Dariah <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Hairiah <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Ishida <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Lamade & Bouillet, 2005; Matthews <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2005a, 2007a; Watanabe <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Cropland, drained	Boreal and Temperate	7.9	6.5	9.4	39	Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Elsgaard <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Grønlund <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Kasimir-Klemedtsson <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Leifeld <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2001a, 2003a, 2004, 2007; Morrison <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Petersen <i>et al.</i> , 2012

**TABLE 2.1 (CONTINUED)**  
**TIER 1 CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES <sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category	Climate / vegetation zone	Emission factor <sup>a</sup> (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% Confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		No. of sites	Citations/comments
Cropland and fallow, drained	Tropical	14	6.6	26	10	Ali <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Chimner, 2004; Chimner & Ewel, 2004; Dariah <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Darung <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Gill & Jackson, 2000; Hairiah <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Hirano <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Ishida <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2012a; Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2007a
Cropland, drained, paddy rice	Tropical	9.4	-0.2	20	6	Dariah <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Hadi <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Hairiah <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Inubushi <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Ishida <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Matthews <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2007a
Grassland, drained	Boreal	5.7	2.9	8.6	8	Grønlund <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Kreshtapova & Maslov, 2004; Lohila <i>et al.</i> , 2004; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2001a, 2004; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Shurpali <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Grassland, drained, nutrient-poor	Temperate	5.3	3.7	6.9	7	Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Kuntze, 1992
Grassland, deep-drained, nutrient-rich	Temperate	6.1	5.0	7.3	39	Augustin, 2003; Augustin <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Czaplak & Dembek, 2000; Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Elsgaard <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Höper, 2002; Jacobs <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Kasimir-Klemedtsson <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Langeveld <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Leifeld <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Lorenz <i>et al.</i> , 1992; Meyer <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Nieveen <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Okruszko, 1989; Schothorst, 1977; Schrier-Uijl <i>et al.</i> , 2010a, c; Veenendaal <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Weinzierl, 1997

**TABLE 2.1 (CONTINUED)**  
**TIER 1 CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES<sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category	Climate / vegetation zone	Emission factor <sup>a</sup> (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% Confidence interval <sup>b</sup>		No. of sites	Citations/comments
Grassland, shallow-drained, nutrient-rich	Temperate	3.6	1.8	5.4	13	Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Jacobs <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Lloyd, 2006
Grassland, drained	Tropical	9.6	4.5	17	n.a.	Updated from Table 6.3, Chapter 6, Volume 4, 2006 IPCC Guidelines <sup>h</sup>
Peatland Managed for Extraction <sup>i</sup>	Boreal and Temperate	2.8	1.1	4.2	20	Ahlholm & Silvola, 1990; Glatzel <i>et al.</i> , 2003; McNeil & Waddington, 2003; Shurpali <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Strack & Zuback, 2013; Sundh <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Tuittila & Komulainen, 1995; Tuittila <i>et al.</i> , 2000, 2004; Waddington <i>et al.</i> , 2010
Peatland Managed for Extraction <sup>i</sup>	Tropical	2.0	0.06	7.0	n.a.	Table 7.4, Chapter 7, Volume 4, 2006 IPCC Guidelines
Settlements	All climate zones	There is no fixed default emission/removal factor for Settlements. For this category, it is <i>good practice</i> to take the default emission/removal factor from Table 2.1 of the land-use category that is closest to national conditions of drained organic soils under Settlements. Information about national conditions could include drainage level, vegetation cover, or other management activities. For example, drained organic soils in urban green areas, parks or gardens could use the default Tier 1 emission/removal factor for Grassland, deep-drained given in Table 2.1.				
Other Land	All climate zones	<i>Other Land Remaining Other Land</i> : 0 <i>Land Converted to Other Land</i> : maintain emission factor of previous land-use category				

<sup>a</sup> Mean<sup>b</sup> Some confidence intervals contain negative values. These were mathematically calculated based on error propagation of uncertainties. However, all underlying CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes were positive.<sup>c</sup> Forest broader than FAO definition<sup>d</sup> Forest according to FAO definition<sup>e</sup> Shrubland refers to any type of land sparsely or fully covered with shrubs or trees that may fulfil the national forest definition. It extends to degraded lands that cannot be clearly classified as forest or non-forest.<sup>f</sup> Plantations are reported under land-use categories according to national land-use definitions.

<sup>g</sup> Number derived solely from Acacia plantation data

<sup>h</sup> The emission factor for Cropland for tropical zone was multiplied by the ratio between the emission factors for Grassland, drained, nutrient-poor and Cropland for temperate zone; the same applies to the confidence interval. This new ratio updates the ratio applied to derive the emission factor for Grassland in the tropical zone in Table 6.3, Chapter 6, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

<sup>i</sup> On-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions from drained peat deposits only. For off-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions from peat extracted for horticultural or energy use, see Chapter 7, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Common tropical plantations include oil palm, sago and *Acacia crassicaarpa*. In Table 2.1, plantations are not allocated to a specific land-use category. It is *good practice* to report plantations in the appropriate national land-use category according to national land-use definitions. National land-use definitions commonly classify timber and fibre plantations as Forest Land and oil palm or sago palm plantations as Cropland.

## **Tier 2**

The Tier 2 approach for carbon loss from drained organic soils incorporates country-specific information into Equation 2.2 to estimate emissions. Tier 2 also uses the same procedural steps for calculations as provided for Tier 1. Tier 2 emission factors by land-use category can, in general, be developed depending on a) climate, b) drainage layout and intensity, c) nutrient status and, d) land-use intensity and practices.

Tier 2 emission factors could include the following refinements:

- use of country-specific emission factors measured or calculated locally taking into account climatic factors that provide for wetter or drier drainage classes than those defined here;
- use of country-specific emission factors measured or calculated locally taking into account slope factors (e.g. blanket bogs) that may promote wetter or drier drainage classes than those defined here;
- derivation of emission factors for boreal Forest Land by nutrient status (rich/poor) if the two emission factors are significantly different (see Table 2.1);
- development of boreal and temperate Grassland emission factors according to land-use intensity, e.g. to distinguish high-intensity (fertilised, ploughed and reseeded) Grassland from low-intensity permanent Grassland, or from moorland rough grazing (grazing by hardier breeds of sheep) on drained blanket bogs; and
- integration of temporal dynamics associated with changes in decomposition rates that may be related to drainage, management or to the physical and chemical changes to peat over time, including a possible transition period of high emissions associated with drainage or deepening of drainage in lands remaining in a land-use category.

CO<sub>2</sub> measurements derived through methods described in Annex 2A.1 and disaggregated by management practices should be used to develop more precise, locally appropriate emission factors. CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurements do not take account of waterborne carbon losses, which must therefore be considered separately. In contrast, subsidence-based measurements effectively incorporate waterborne carbon losses into the estimated stock change. This methodological difference has to be considered when developing higher tier methods in order to avoid double-counting.

## **Tier 3**

A Tier 3 approach allows for a variety of methods and may use measurements or process-based models or other more elaborate approaches, adequately validated using observation data that take into account temporal and spatial variations. Tier 3 should involve a comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained organic soils, including the effects of management practices, site characteristics, peat type and depth and drainage depth, among other factors. Tier 3 approaches could start by developing relationships between drainage or nutrient status and heterotrophic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which can be further refined by land-use category and fertilisation. Furthermore, organic soils in Forest Land undergo a cycle related to rotation of the tree cohorts and carbon losses associated with harvesting and site preparation should be accounted for. Models could describe the rotational variation in water tables.

When peat is extracted, the peatland surface is disturbed by machinery and may be fertilised afterwards or otherwise amended for regeneration. Moreover, drainage systems may be renewed and dredging of ditches may cause disturbances that alter greenhouse gas emissions and removals. These measures result in emission/removal rates that vary predictably over time, which may in Tier 3 methods be captured by models used. Emissions from stockpiles of drying peat are much more uncertain. Higher temperatures may cause stockpiles to release more CO<sub>2</sub> than the excavation field but data are at present insufficient to provide guidance. Methods for estimating this emission may be developed at Tier 3.

## **CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA**

All management practices for land remaining in a land-use category are assumed to result in persistent emissions from soils as long as the management system remains in place or as long as the land falls under the definition of organic soils. Activity data consist of areas of land remaining in a land-use category on organic soils stratified by climate domain, soil nutrient status, drainage class or additional criteria such as management practices. Total areas should be determined according to the Approaches laid out in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and should be consistent with those reported under other sections of the inventory. The estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from drained organic soils will be greatly facilitated if this information can be used in



conjunction with national soils and climate data, vegetation inventories and other biophysical data. Stratification of land-use categories according to climate domains, based on default or country-specific classifications, can be accomplished with overlays of land use on suitable climate and soil maps.

Under most circumstances, the area of organic soils will remain constant over time. However, the area of organic soils may change as organic soil disappears following drainage.

### Tier 1

The Tier 1 approach requires area data on drained organic soils for each land-use category, disaggregated by appropriate climate domains, nutrient status and drainage class as applicable. Classification systems for activity data that form the basis of a Tier 1 inventory are provided in the respective land-use chapters of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Several institutions, including ISRIC and FAO, have country-specific and global maps that include organic soils (<http://www.fao.org/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home> or <http://www.isric.org/>). A global consortium has been formed to make a new fine resolution digital soil map of the world (<http://www.globalsoilmap.net/>).

The *GPG-LULUCF* and the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Section 7.2.1.1, Chapter 7, Volume 4) distinguish between nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor organic soils in some land-use categories and climate zones. This approach is maintained here, in line with guidance given in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Nutrient-poor organic soils predominate in boreal regions, while in temperate regions nutrient-rich organic soils are more common. It is *good practice* for boreal countries that do not have information on areas of nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor organic soils to use the emission factor for nutrient-poor organic soils. It is *good practice* for temperate countries that do not have such data to use the emission factor for nutrient-rich organic soils. Only one default factor is provided for tropical regions, and disaggregation by soil fertility is therefore not necessary in the tropical climate zone when using the Tier 1 method. Due to lack of data, rice fields on tropical organic soils are not disaggregated by water management regimes.

Areas of shallow-drained and deep-drained organic soils with Grasslands need to be derived from national data. Data from water management plans, such as target water table levels, can serve as a source of information. Land-use intensity, e.g. the time of the first cut of Grassland, grazing intensity, or animal production levels, can serve as a proxy, as can restrictions imposed by water management or biodiversity management (e.g. riparian zones, buffer zones, or nature conservation for species or habitats with a typical water regime).

Without additional national information about mean annual water table and/or land-use intensity as proxy, countries should choose deep-drained as the default.

### Tiers 2 and 3

Activity data for higher tier estimates are generally derived following the methods presented in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Activity data may be spatially explicit and could be disaggregated by type of management, drainage depth and/or nutrient status to improve the accuracy of the inventory if different land-management systems use different drainage depths and/or nutrient levels, and if appropriate emission factors are available. In general, practices that increase carbon stocks in mineral soils by increased organic material input (e.g. fertilisation, liming, etc.) do not have a sequestration effect in drained organic soils.

The combination of land-use databases and soil maps or spatially explicit data allows delineation of combinations of land-use categories, climate domains, drainage classes and management systems and their changes over time on organic soils. Data and their documentation could combine information from a land-use transition matrix specifically made for organic soils. Stratification needs to be consistently applied across the entire time series.

Information sources about drainage with adequate disaggregation may include:

- national land-use statistics, land-use maps and soil maps, maps of water and nature conservation zones with restrictions for water management, wetlands;
- national water management statistics: in most countries, the agricultural land base including Cropland is usually surveyed regularly, providing data on distribution of different land uses, crops, tillage practices and other aspects of management, often at sub-national regional level; these statistics may originate, in part, from remote sensing methods, from which additional information about wetness or periods with seasonal flooding could be extracted;
- inventory data from a statistically based, plot-sampling system of water table wells, ditches and surface waters on organic soils: the water table is monitored at specific permanent sample plots either continuously or on plots that are revisited on a regular basis; it has to be documented that the water data represent the water table in the organic soil and for what land use and drainage stratum and that the data cover a representative period, which represents a multi-year mean annual water table;

- water management plans and documentation from water management installations;
- drainage maps;
- maps of drainage or (partial) rewetting projects including remote sensing;

## CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

The steps for estimating the direct loss of soil carbon from drained organic soils are as follows:

**Step 1:** Determine areas with drained organic soils under each land-use category, disaggregated by climate domain and other appropriate factors as outlined above. In the case of Tier 1 emission factors, where necessary land areas are further stratified into nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor organic soils. Temperate nutrient-rich Grassland is further stratified into shallow-drained and deep-drained classes.

**Step 2:** Assign the appropriate emission factor from Table 2.1 for annual losses of CO<sub>2</sub> to each land-use category, climate domain, nutrient status and drainage class stratum.

**Step 3:** Multiply each area by the appropriate emission factor using Equation 2.3.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Three broad sources of uncertainty exist in estimating emissions and removals in organic soils: 1) uncertainties in land-use and management activity and environmental data; 2) uncertainties in the emission/removal factors for Tier 1 or 2 approaches; and 3) model structure/parameter error for Tier 3 model-based approaches, or measurement error/sampling variability associated with Tier 3 measurement-based inventories. In general, precision of an inventory is increased and confidence ranges are smaller with more sampling to estimate values for land-use categories, while accuracy is more likely to be increased through implementation of higher tier methods that incorporate country-specific information.

For Tier 1, the default uncertainty level of emission/removal factors is the 95% confidence interval given in Table 2.1. Countries developing specific emission factors for their inventories at higher tiers should assess the uncertainty of these factors.

If using aggregate land-use area statistics for activity data (e.g. FAO data), the inventory compiler may have to apply a default level of uncertainty for land area estimates on organic soils ( $\pm 20\%$ ; twice the uncertainty estimate given in Table 3.7 for mineral soils in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). It is *good practice* for the inventory compiler to derive uncertainties from country-specific activity data instead of using a default level of uncertainty. Uncertainties in activity data may be reduced through a better monitoring system, such as developing or extending a ground-based survey with additional sample locations and/or incorporating remote sensing to provide additional coverage. Uncertainties in activity data and emission/removal factors need to be combined using an appropriate method, such as simple error propagation equations. Details are given in Chapter 3, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and in Chapter 5 of the *GPG-LULUCF*.

Accuracy can be increased by deriving country-specific factors using a Tier 2 method or by developing a Tier 3 country-specific estimation system. The underlying basis for higher tier approaches will be measurements in the country or neighbouring regions that address the effect of land use and management on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from drained organic soils. In addition, uncertainties can be reduced through stratification by significant factors responsible for within-country differences in land-use and management impacts, such as variation among climate domains and/or organic soil types.

### 2.2.1.2 OFF-SITE CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS VIA WATERBORNE CARBON LOSSES FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

Waterborne carbon comprises DOC, POC, the dissolved gases CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>, and the dissolved carbonate species HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>. Particulate inorganic carbon (PIC) losses from organic soils are negligible. Collectively, waterborne carbon export can represent a major part of the overall carbon budget of an organic soil and in some cases can exceed net land-atmosphere CO<sub>2</sub> exchange (e.g. Billett *et al.*, 2004; Rowson *et al.*, 2010). It is therefore important that waterborne carbon be included in flux-based (i.e. gain-loss) approaches for soil carbon estimation, to avoid systematic under-estimation of soil carbon losses. Airborne (erosional) POC loss may also be significant where land use leads to bare soil exposure, but little data exist to quantify this (see Appendix 2a.1).

Different forms of waterborne carbon have different sources, behaviour and fate, and different approaches are therefore required to quantify off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with each form. In most peatlands and organic soils, DOC forms the largest component of waterborne carbon export (e.g. Urban *et al.*, 1989; Dawson *et al.*, 2004; Jonsson *et al.*, 2007; Dinsmore *et al.*, 2010). DOC export can be affected by land use, in particular drainage (Wallage *et al.*, 2006; Strack *et al.*, 2008; Urbanová *et al.*, 2011; Moore *et al.*, 2013). It is reactive

within aquatic ecosystems and most DOC is thought to ultimately be converted to CO<sub>2</sub> and emitted to the atmosphere (see Annex 2A.2 for supporting discussion). It is therefore *good practice* to include DOC export in CO<sub>2</sub> reporting, and a Tier 1 methodology for this purpose is described below.

Of the other forms of waterborne carbon, POC fluxes are typically very low from vegetated peatlands and organic soils, but can become very large where bare organic soil becomes exposed, e.g. due to erosion, peat extraction, burning and conversion to Cropland. Although it may be possible to estimate POC loss fluxes as a function of bare soil exposure, high uncertainty remains regarding the reactivity and fate of POC exported from organic soils. Some POC is likely to be converted to CO<sub>2</sub>, but POC that is simply translocated from the soil profile to other stable carbon stores, such as freshwater or marine sediments, may not lead to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Due to the uncertain fate of POC export, an estimation method is not presented at this time; current knowledge and data needed to support POC estimation in future are described in Appendix 2a.1.

Gaseous CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> dissolved in water transported laterally from the organic soil matrix represent indirectly emitted components of the total emission of these gases from the land surface. Dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> in excess of atmospheric pressure will also be degassed from drainage waters, while some DIC may be transported downstream. At present, available data are insufficient (particularly for drained organic soils) to permit default emission factors to be derived. Additional information and future methodological requirements needed to support full accounting of emissions associated with waterborne inorganic carbon are included in Appendix 2a.1.

### CHOICE OF METHOD

The basic methodology for estimating annual off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with waterborne carbon loss from drained organic soils is presented in Equation 2.4:

**EQUATION 2.4**  
**ANNUAL OFF-SITE CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS DUE TO DOC LOSS FROM DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS (CO<sub>2</sub>)**

$$CO_2 - C_{DOC} = \sum_{c,n} (A \cdot EF_{DOC})_{c,n}$$

Where:

CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>DOC</sub> = annual off-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions due to DOC loss from drained organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

A<sub>c,n</sub> = land area of drained organic soils in a land-use category in climate zone c and nutrient status n, ha

EF<sub>DOC,c,n</sub> = emission factors for annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to DOC loss from drained organic soils, by climate zone c and nutrient status n, tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>

EF<sub>DOC</sub> can be calculated from Equation 2.5:

**EQUATION 2.5**  
**EMISSION FACTOR FOR ANNUAL CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS DUE TO DOC EXPORT FROM DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$EF_{DOC} = DOC_{FLUX\_NATURAL} \cdot (1 + \Delta DOC_{DRAINAGE}) \cdot Frac_{DOC-CO_2}$$

Where:

EF<sub>DOC</sub> = emission factor for DOC from a drained site, tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>

DOC<sub>FLUX\_NATURAL</sub> = flux of DOC from natural (undrained) organic soil, tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>

ΔDOC<sub>DRAINAGE</sub> = proportional increase in DOC flux from drained sites relative to undrained sites

Frac<sub>DOC-CO<sub>2</sub></sub> = conversion factor for proportion of DOC converted to CO<sub>2</sub> following export from site

Because of the lack of data for other components of waterborne carbon fluxes and due to uncertainty about their sources and/or fate, off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with waterborne carbon are only represented by DOC losses at this stage. However, if in the future adequate data become available or if adequate data are available for higher tiers, inventory compilers can expand Equation 2.4 to include POC and/or DIC (see section on methodological requirements in Appendix 2a.1).

## CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

### Tier 1

A detailed description of the derivation of default values for Tier 1 is provided in Annex 2A.2. In summary, measurements show clear differentiation of natural DOC fluxes between boreal, temperate and tropical organic soils, and Tier 1 emission factors therefore follow a broad classification based on climate zones. Annex 2A.2 provides details and data sources for the derivation of parameter values. Note that a single default value for  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  is currently proposed for all organic soil/land-use types, based on data from a range of studies undertaken in different climate zones. A substantial body of scientific evidence indicates a high conversion of organic soil-derived DOC to  $\text{CO}_2$  in aquatic systems, on which basis a default  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$  value of 0.9 ( $\pm 0.1$ ) is proposed (see Annex 2A.2).

TABLE 2.2 DEFAULT DOC EMISSION FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS				
Climate zone	DOC <sub>FLUX_NATURAL</sub> (t C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	ΔDOC <sub>DRAINAGE</sub> <sup>a</sup>	Frac <sub>DOC-CO<sub>2</sub></sub>	EF <sub>DOC_DRAINED</sub> (t C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
Boreal	0.08 (0.06–0.11)	0.60 (0.43–0.78)	0.9 (± 0.1)	0.12 (0.07–0.19)
Temperate	0.21 (0.17–0.26)			0.31 (0.19–0.46)
Tropical	0.57 (0.49–0.64)			0.82 (0.56–1.14)
Values shown in parentheses represent 95% confidence intervals. For data sources and supporting references, see Tables 2A.2 and 2A.3.				
<sup>a</sup> Due to the limited number of available studies, a single Tier 1 value for ΔDOC <sub>DRAINAGE</sub> has been assigned to all soil types based on all available comparisons of drained and undrained sites. In the case of fens, there is more uncertainty associated with the estimation of DOC flux changes after drainage; countries may therefore choose to apply the values of DOC <sub>FLUX_NATURAL</sub> given above (multiplied by Frac <sub>DOC-CO<sub>2</sub></sub> but assuming ΔDOC <sub>DRAINAGE</sub> = 0) or to obtain direct measurements of the DOC flux from drained sites.				

### Tier 2

A Tier 2 approach for estimation of DOC may follow the Tier 1 methodology provided above, but should use country-specific information where possible to refine the emission factors used. Possible refinements where supporting data are available could include:

- use of country-level measurements from natural (undrained) organic soils to obtain accurate values of  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX\_NATURAL}}$  for that country, for example by developing specific values for raised bogs versus fens, or for blanket bogs;
- use of country-level data on the impacts of organic soil drainage on DOC flux to derive specific values of  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  that reflect local organic soil types, and the nature of drainage practices and subsequent land use - if sufficient, robust, direct measurements are available from representative drained sites, these may be used to estimate DOC fluxes from drained sites, replacing  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX\_NATURAL}}$  in Equation 2.5; specific DOC flux estimates from drained organic soils in different land-use categories could also be considered where data support this level of stratification; and
- use of alternative values for  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$  where evidence is available to estimate the proportion of DOC exported from drained organic soils that is transferred to stable long-term carbon stores, such as lake or marine sediments.

### Tier 3

A Tier 3 approach might include the use of more detailed data to develop and apply process models that describe DOC release as a function of vegetation composition, nutrient levels, land-use category, water table level and hydrology, as well as temporal variability in DOC release in the years following land-use change (e.g. initial drainage) and ongoing management activities (e.g. drain maintenance, forest management) (see Annex 3A.2, Chapter 3 of the *Wetlands Supplement*).

Guidance is not currently presented for the effects of land use other than drainage on DOC loss from peatlands and organic soils, such as the effects of managed burning or of intensity of agricultural use. However, these may be included in higher tier methods if sufficient evidence can be obtained to develop the associated emission factors.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

### Tier 1

Activity data consist of areas of land remaining in a land-use category on drained organic soils summarised by organic soil type, climate zones and land-use type (specifically occurrence of drainage). Total areas should be determined according to the Approaches laid out in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and should be consistent with those reported under other sections of the inventory. They also need to be consistent with activity data for on-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. For boreal and temperate raised bogs and fens, additional data on annual mean precipitation may be used to refine emission estimates, as shown in Table 2.2.

### Tiers 2 and 3

For higher tier approaches, additional activity data requirements may include specific information on the land-use type associated with drained organic soils, and intensity of drainage. Use of a variable  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$  value at a country level, or within a country, would require information on the characteristics of downstream river networks (e.g. water residence time, extent of lakes and reservoirs, lake sedimentation rates). A Tier 3 modelling approach could include additional information on the timing of drainage, drain maintenance and land management (e.g. forest management, influence of fertiliser application rates on DOC production).

## CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

The steps for estimating off-site emissions from soil carbon on drained organic soils are as follows:

**Step 1:** Determine areas with drained organic soils under each land-use category for land remaining in a land-use category, disaggregated by climate domain and other appropriate factors as outlined above.

**Step 2:** Assign the appropriate values for  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX\_NATURAL}}$ ,  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  and  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$  from Table 2.2 for each land-use category and climate domain.

**Step 3:** Calculate  $\text{EF}_{\text{DOC}}$  for each land-use category using Equation 2.5.

**Step 4:** Multiply activity data by the emission factor for each land-use category and sum across land-use categories.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Three broad sources of uncertainty exist in estimating off-site emissions and removals: 1) uncertainties in land-use and management activity and environmental data; 2) uncertainties in the emission/removal factors for Tier 1 or 2 approaches; and 3) uncertainties in the fraction of DOC that is emitted as CO<sub>2</sub>. In general, precision of an inventory is increased and confidence ranges are smaller with more sampling to estimate values for these categories, while accuracy is more likely to be increased through implementation of higher tier methods that incorporate country-specific information.

Uncertainties for land use and management activities are the same as for on-site emissions and will not be repeated here. Uncertainty ranges (95% confidence intervals) are provided for DOC emission factors in Table 2.2. These ranges are calculated based on: 1) literature data in Annex 2A.2 based on observations from natural peatlands used to derive values of  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX\_NATURAL}}$  in each of the peat classes used (Table 2A.2); 2) observations of  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  from published studies (Table 2A.3); and 3) an uncertainty range for the  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$  value of 0.8-1.0 as described above. These uncertainty ranges may be adapted or refined under Tier 2 if further sub-classification according to land-use type or intensity is undertaken, based on additional measurement data.

## 2.2.2 Non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils

In the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are assumed to be negligible from all drained organic soils. Here, new methodologies and emission factors are provided for soil CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils and drainage ditches (Section 2.2.2.1).

### 2.2.2.1 CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

In the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are assumed to be negligible from all drained organic soils. However, recent evidence suggests that some CH<sub>4</sub> emissions can occur from the drained land surface, and also

from the ditch networks constructed during drainage. Each of these emission pathways is considered here (Best & Jacobs, 1997; Minkinen & Laine, 2006; Schrier-Uijl *et al.*, 2011; Hyvönen *et al.*, 2013).

Drainage lowers the water table, exposes formerly saturated organic soil layers to oxidation and, as described above, increases CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the land surface. Drainage alters environmental factors such as temperature, reduction–oxidation potential, and the amount of easily decomposable organic matter. Drainage also affects the activity of methanogens and methanotrophs (Blodau, 2002; Treat *et al.*, 2007). Drainage increases plant root respiration and mitigates CH<sub>4</sub> emission dramatically (Martikainen *et al.*, 1995a; Strack *et al.*, 2004; Hergoualc'h & Verchot, 2012) as methanogenic bacteria thrive only in anoxic conditions. Shifts in vegetation with dominant aerenchymous species to other vegetation types will also reduce the transfer of CH<sub>4</sub> from the soil profile to the atmosphere (e.g. Tuittila *et al.*, 2000). In general, when organic soil is drained, natural production of CH<sub>4</sub> is reduced and organic soils may even become a CH<sub>4</sub> sink, once methanotrophs dominate the CH<sub>4</sub> cycle.

Ditch networks provide a further source of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils. This occurs due to a combination of lateral CH<sub>4</sub> transfer from the organic soil matrix, and *in situ* CH<sub>4</sub> production within the ditches themselves (e.g. Roulet & Moore, 1995; van den Pol-van Dasselaar *et al.*, 1999a; Sundh *et al.*, 2000; Minkinen & Laine, 2006; Teh *et al.*, 2011; Vermaat *et al.*, 2011). These emissions may approach, or even exceed, the CH<sub>4</sub> flux from an undrained organic soil when averaged over the land surface (Roulet & Moore, 1995; Schrier-Uijl *et al.*, 2011). Emission/removal factors for ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions were compiled from available published literature (see Annex 2A.1). We present only general factors for ditches because of limited data. Effects of ditch maintenance, deepening and other factors may be addressed at higher tiers.

## CHOICE OF METHOD

### Tier 1

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from the land surface are estimated using a simple emission factor approach (see Equation 2.6), depending on climate and type of land use. The default methodology considers boreal, temperate and tropical climate zones, and nutrient-rich/nutrient-poor organic soils. Different land uses imply drainage to different depths. The CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors depend on gas flux measurements, either from closed chambers or (for land-surface emissions) from eddy covariance.

Ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions should be quantified for any area of drained organic soil where there are ditches or drainage canals (note that CH<sub>4</sub> may also be emitted from ditches within rewetted organic soils where ditches remain present, although at Tier 1 it is assumed that this flux equates to that from the remainder of the rewetted site; see Chapter 3 of the *Wetlands Supplement*). Estimation of ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions requires information on the land-use class and on the area of the landscape occupied by the drainage ditch network,  $Frac_{ditch}$ .

**EQUATION 2.6**

**ANNUAL CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$CH_{4\_organic} = \sum_{c,n,p} \left( A_{c,n,p} \cdot \left( (1 - Frac_{ditch}) \cdot EF_{CH_4\_land_{c,n}} + Frac_{ditch} \cdot EF_{CH_4\_ditch_{c,p}} \right) \right)$$

Where:

- $CH_{4\_organic}$  = annual CH<sub>4</sub> loss from drained organic soils, kg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>
- $A_{c,n,p}$  = land area of drained organic soils in a land-use category in climate zone c, nutrient status n and soil type p, ha
- $EF_{CH_4\_land_{c,n}}$  = emission factors for direct CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils, by climate zone c and nutrient status n, kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>
- $EF_{CH_4\_ditch_{c,p}}$  = emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches, by climate zone c and soil type p, kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>
- $Frac_{ditch}$  = fraction of the total area of drained organic soil which is occupied by ditches (where “ditches” are considered to be any area of manmade channel cut into the peatland). The ditch area may be calculated as the width of ditches multiplied by their total length. Where ditches are cut vertically, ditch width can be calculated as the average distance from bank to bank. Where ditch banks are sloping, ditch width should be calculated as the average width of open water plus any saturated fringing vegetation.

## Tier 2

The Tier 2 approach for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils incorporates country-specific information into Equation 2.6. Tier 2 uses the same procedural steps for calculations as provided for Tier 1. Under Tier 2, the emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> from the surface of drained organic soils can be further differentiated by drainage depth, land-use subcategories or vegetation type (such as presence or absence of plant species that act as transporters of CH<sub>4</sub> from the soil to the atmosphere). Guidance for further stratification follows the principles given in Section 2.2.1.1 of this Chapter.

Tier 2 approaches for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches generally follow the Tier 1 approach described above, with country-specific measurements or estimates of annual mean ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, and national or regional estimates of fractional ditch area that reflect local drainage practices. The land-use sub-categories in Table 2.4 may be expanded or subdivided where appropriate to reflect the range of observed land use on drained organic soils.

## Tier 3

Tier 3 methods for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils involve a comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and removals on managed peatlands and organic soils, including the effect of site characteristics, peat/soil type, peat degradation and depth, land-use intensity, drainage depth, management systems, and the level and kinds of fresh organic matter inputs. Emission spikes may also occur, for example during spring thaw or strong rains or when debris from ditch dredging is deposited on adjacent land.

For CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches, development of a Tier 3 approach could take account of the influence of land-management activities (e.g. organic matter additions to agricultural land) on substrate supply for methane production in ditches, of possible short-term pulses of ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions associated with land-use change, and of the legacy effects of past land use (e.g. nutrient-enriched soils). Information on drainage ditch characteristics and maintenance may be used to refine ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emission estimates, for example taking account of: 1) the potential effects of plant or algal growth within ditches; 2) presence of subsurface drainage in Cropland and Grassland; 3) water flow rates, transport length of water and oxygen status; 4) ditch maintenance activities; and 5) the deposition of organic material removed from ditches onto adjacent land areas.

## CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

### Tier 1

Default emission factors for the Tier 1 method are provided in Table 2.3 for EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_land</sub> and Table 2.4 for EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_ditch</sub>. EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_land</sub> were derived from the mean of all data within each land-use class, typically from chamber measurements, and uncertainty ranges were calculated as 95% confidence intervals. References are given in Table 2.3.

At present, data from literature are sufficient to provide Tier 1 default values of EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_ditch</sub> for each of the four major land-use classes on drained organic soils (Forest Land, Grassland, Cropland and Wetlands used for peat extraction) in boreal and temperate regions (Table 2.4). In the case of Cropland, because no data are currently available, Tier 1 default values for deep-drained Grassland may be applied. Limited data on ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are currently available for tropical organic soils, and a single Tier 1 emission factor is therefore provided for all drained land-use classes. Scientific background for EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_ditch</sub> and Frac<sub>ditch</sub> is given in Annex 2A.2.

### Tier 2

Tier 2 emission factors EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_land</sub> may be based on country- or region-specific emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from the surface of drained organic soils. These allow further stratification of land-use categories by drainage class, nutrient status or vegetation characteristics.

Methane emissions from drainage ditches will vary according to peat/soil type, land-use type, drainage intensity and (for agriculturally managed areas) land-use intensity. For example, labile organic matter and nutrient inputs from terrestrial areas are likely to increase CH<sub>4</sub> production in ditches (Schrier-Uijl *et al.*, 2011). The Tier 1 emission factors EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_ditch</sub> provided are based on measurements from ditches located within the organic layer. Subsurface drainage systems may represent additional sources of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in Cropland and Grassland, and could be incorporated into the approach provided that appropriate measurement data are available. Countries are encouraged to obtain new measurement data for significant land-use classes to enhance the current dataset, and to develop country-specific Tier 2 emission factors. Sharing of data between countries may be appropriate where environmental conditions and practices are similar.

### Tier 3

A Tier 3 approach for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils might include further details and processes or capture seasonal dynamics of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions as additional elements of stratification or by dynamic modelling.

A Tier 3 approach for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches might include the use of more detailed data to develop and apply process models that describe CH<sub>4</sub> emissions as a function of drainage ditch characteristics and maintenance, for example taking account of: 1) the potential effects of plant or algal growth within ditches; 2) water flow rates, transport length of water and oxygen status; 3) ditch maintenance activities; and 4) the deposition of organic material removed from ditches onto adjacent land areas.

A Tier 3 approach to estimating ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions could take account of the temporal variability of hydrological conditions, labile substrate and nutrient supply, and controls on the composition of in-ditch-vegetation that might enhance or reduce emission rates.

Emissions from stockpiles of drying peat are uncertain and stockpiles may release or consume CH<sub>4</sub> at different rates than the excavation field, but data are not at present sufficient to provide guidance. Methods for estimating this flux may be developed for Tier 3 approaches.



**TABLE 2.3**  
**TIER 1 CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS (EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>-LAND</sub>) IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES <sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category		Climate / vegetation zones	Emission factor <sup>a</sup> (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% confidence interval <sup>b</sup> (centred on mean)		No. of sites	Citations/comments
Forest Land, drained	Nutrient- poor	Boreal	7.0	2.9	11	47	Komulainen <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Lohila <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Martikainen <i>et al.</i> , 1992, 1993, 1995b; Minkinen & Laine, 2006; Minkinen <i>et al.</i> , 2007a; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Ojanen <i>et al.</i> , 2010, 2013
	Nutrient- rich	Boreal	2.0	-1.6	5.5	83	Komulainen <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Laine <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2001b, 2003b, 2006; Mäkiranta <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Martikainen <i>et al.</i> , 1992, 1995b; Minkinen & Laine, 2006; Minkinen <i>et al.</i> , 2007a; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Ojanen <i>et al.</i> , 2010, 2013
Forest Land, drained		Temperate	2.5	-0.60	5.7	13	Glenn <i>et al.</i> , 1993; Moore & Knowles, 1990; Sikström <i>et al.</i> , 2009; von Arnold <i>et al.</i> , 2005a, b; Weslien <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Yamulki <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Forest Land and cleared Forest Land (shrubland <sup>c</sup> ), drained		Tropical/ Subtropical	4.9	2.3	7.5	7	Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Hirano <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2008
Forest plantations, drained <sup>d</sup>		Tropical/ Subtropical	2.7	-0.9	6.3	5	Basuki <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2012c
Plantation: oil palm		Tropical/ Subtropical	0	0	0	1	Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2005b
Plantation: sago palm		Tropical/ Subtropical	26.2	7.2	45.3	6	Inubushi <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2005b; Watanabe <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Cropland, drained		Boreal and Temperate	0	-2.8	2.8	38	Augustin, 2003; Augustin <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Elsgaard <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Flessa <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Kasimir-Klemetsson <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2003a, b, 2004, 2007; Petersen <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Regina <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Taft <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Cropland		Tropical/ Subtropical	7.0	0.3	13.7	5	Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Hirano <i>et al.</i> , 2009

**TABLE 2.3 (CONTINUED)**  
**TIER 1 CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS (EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>-LAND</sub>) IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES <sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category	Climate / vegetation zones	Emission factor <sup>a</sup> (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% confidence interval <sup>b</sup> (centred on mean)		No. of sites	Citations/comments
Rice <sup>c</sup>	Tropical/ Subtropical	143.5	63.2	223.7	6	Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Hadi <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Inubushi <i>et al.</i> , 2003
Grassland, drained	Boreal	1.4	-1.6	4.5	12	Grönlund <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Guðmundsson & Óskarsson, 2008; Hyvönen <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2001 <i>b</i> , 2003 <i>b</i> , 2004, 2010 <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> ; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Regina <i>et al.</i> , 2007
Grassland, drained, nutrient-poor	Temperate	1.8	0.72	2.9	9	Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Kasimir-Klemedtsson <i>et al.</i> , 2009; van den Bos, 2003
Grassland, deep-drained, nutrient-rich	Temperate	16	2.4	29	44	Augustin <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Best & Jacobs, 1997; Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Flessa & Beese, 1997; Flessa <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Jacobs <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Kroon <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Langeveld <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Meyer <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Petersen <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Schrier-Uijl <i>et al.</i> , 2010 <i>a</i> , <i>b</i> ; Teh <i>et al.</i> , 2011; van den Bos, 2003; van den Pol-van Dasselaar <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Wild <i>et al.</i> , 2001
Grassland, shallow-drained, nutrient-rich	Temperate	39	-2.9	81	16	Augustin, 2003; Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Jacobs <i>et al.</i> , 2003; van den Pol-van Dasselaar <i>et al.</i> , 1997
Grassland	Tropical/ Subtropical	7.0	0.3	13.7	5	Same emission factor as tropical Cropland
Peat Extraction	Boreal and Temperate	6.1	1.6	11	15	Hyvönen <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Strack & Zuback, 2013; Sundh <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Tuittila <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Waddington & Day, 2007
Settlements	All climate zones	There is no fixed default emission/removal factor for Settlements. For this category, it is <i>good practice</i> to take the default emission/removal factor from Table 2.3 of the land-use category that is closest to national conditions of drained organic soils under Settlements. Information about national conditions could include drainage level, vegetation cover or other management activities. For example, drained organic soils in urban green areas, parks or gardens could use the default Tier 1 emission/removal factor for Grassland, deep-drained given in Table 2.3.				
Other Land	All climate zones	<i>Other Land Remaining Other Land: 0</i> <i>Land Converted to Other Land: maintain emission factor for previous land-use category</i>				

<sup>a</sup> Mean

<sup>b</sup> Some confidence intervals contain negative values. This indicates that, while the mean emission factor is zero or a net CH<sub>4</sub> emission, a net CH<sub>4</sub> uptake has been observed in some studies.

<sup>c</sup> Shrubland refers to any type of land sparsely or fully covered with shrubs or trees that may fulfil the national forest definition. It extends to degraded lands that cannot be clearly classified as forest or non-forest.

<sup>d</sup> Number derived solely from acacia plantation data.

<sup>e</sup> The default value applies to countries without data on the flooding regime for rice on organic soils. Countries with data on the flooding regime for rice on organic soils may continue to use the methodologies and emission factors provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Plantations can be defined as Forest Land or Cropland or any other land-use category, according to national definitions. It is *good practice* to report plantations in the appropriate national land-use category according to national land-use definitions.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

### Tier 1

It is *good practice* to use the same activity data for estimating CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils. Information on obtaining these data is provided in Section 2.2.1 above. For countries in boreal and temperate regions using the Tier 1 method, if available information does not allow stratification by nutrient status of organic soils, countries may rely on guidance given in Section 2.2.1.1.

Activity data required to estimate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches at Tier 1 consist of areas of drained organic soils disaggregated by land-use category (Forest Land, Grassland, Cropland and Wetlands used for peat extraction) as shown in Table 2.4. Fractional ditch areas recorded in published studies are given for individual sites in Table 2A.1 and these data have been used to provide indicative  $Frac_{ditch}$  values by land-use class in Table 2.4. However, it should be noted that these proportions are likely to vary between countries and it is therefore *good practice* to derive country-specific activity data on fractional ditch areas wherever possible, to reflect local land-use practices. This fractional ditch area may depend on the topographic situation and on organic soil properties rather than on land use alone. Fractional ditch area can be calculated from spatially explicit information about ditch and canal networks. From these the length and width of ditches can be derived, or alternatively ditch spacing and ditch width on organic soils, giving the ditch area on organic soils. This geometrical information is converted to fractional ditch area by dividing the ditch area on organic soils by the area of drained organic soils.

### Tiers 2 and 3

Activity data required for higher tier methods are likely to include more detailed information on land use, in particular land-use intensity within Grassland and Cropland classes. Further stratification may be necessary for other classes if sufficient data become available to estimate emission factors, e.g. for cleared peat swamp forest, oil palm, or pulpwood plantation in tropical peat areas.

Activity data for higher tier methods may be spatially explicit and consist of areas of drained organic soils managed for different forest types, peat extraction, production systems, horticulture and plantations, disaggregated according to the nutrient status of the organic soil if relevant. More sophisticated estimation methodologies will require the determination of areas in different phases of land uses with longer-term rhythms such as age-classes in Forest Land or in a peat extraction operation, where on abandoned areas drainage or the effects of former peat extraction are still present. Land-use intensity, particularly fertiliser and organic matter addition, may be used to refine CH<sub>4</sub> emission estimates for Grassland and Cropland, as emissions are likely to change under more intensive management systems.

To estimate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches, additional activity data are required on fractional ditch area within each land-use category. Country-specific values of fractional ditch areas are used to reflect drainage methodologies such as typical ditch spacing, depth, width and length, maintenance (such as vegetation clearance) and land-use practices. Fractional ditch area can be stratified by type of organic soil or topographic situation, peat/soil properties, and land use.

Activity data for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches could incorporate additional information on water table level and variability (such as seasonal water management regime), flow rates, in-ditch vegetation and land-use factors affecting substrate supply for methanogenesis, such as livestock density and fertiliser application in intensive Grassland and Cropland. Incorporating seasonal and short-term controls on emissions would require additional activity data on the nature and timing of agricultural activities (such as organic matter additions) and on hydrological parameters.

## CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

The steps for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils are as follows:

**Step 1:** Determine areas with drained organic soils under each land-use category for lands remaining in a land-use category, disaggregated by climate domain and other appropriate factors as outlined above and consistent with estimates of on-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils. Where needed for Tier 1 emission factors, land areas are further stratified into nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor organic soils. Temperate nutrient-rich Grassland is further stratified into shallow-drained and deep-drained classes.

**Step 2:** Assign the appropriate value for the fraction of areas covered by ditches using national statistics. If statistics are not available, values given in Table 2.4 provide appropriate defaults.

**Step 3:** Assign the appropriate emission factor values ( $EF_{CH_4\_land}$  and  $EF_{CH_4\_ditch}$ ) from Tables 2.3 and 2.4, respectively.

**Step 4:** Multiply each area by the appropriate emission factor using Equation 2.6 and sum across land-use categories.

**TABLE 2.4**  
**DEFAULT CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSION FACTORS FOR DRAINAGE DITCHES**

Climate zone	Land use	EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub> ditch</sub> (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	Uncertainty range <sup>a</sup> (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	No. of sites	Frac <sub>ditch</sub> (indicative values <sup>e</sup> )	Citations
Boreal / Temperate	Drained Forest Land Drained Wetlands <sup>b</sup>	217	41–393	11	0.025	Cooper & Evans, 2013; Glagolev <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Minkinen & Laine, 2006 (two study areas); Roulet & Moore, 1995 (three study areas); Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012 (three study areas); von Arnold <i>et al.</i> , 2005b
	Shallow-drained Grassland	527	285–769	5	0.05	Best & Jacobs, 1997; Hendriks <i>et al.</i> , 2007, 2010; McNamara, 2013; van den Pol-van Dasselaar <i>et al.</i> , 1999a; Vermaat <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Deep-drained Grassland Cropland <sup>c</sup>	1165	335–1995	6	0.05	Best & Jacobs, 1997; Chistotin <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Schrier-Uijl <i>et al.</i> , 2010b, 2011; Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Teh <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Vermaat <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Peat Extraction	542	102–981	6	0.05	Chistotin <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Hyvönen <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Sundh <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Waddington & Day, 2007
Tropical	All land uses involving drainage	2259	599–3919 <sup>d</sup>	2	0.02	Jauhiainen & Silvennoinen, 2012 (drained and abandoned, and pulpwood plantations)

<sup>a</sup> Values represent 95% confidence intervals unless otherwise stated

<sup>b</sup> Ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Wetlands subject to drainage but no other land-use modifications are assumed to be equivalent to those from organic soils drained for forestry.

<sup>c</sup> Ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Cropland are assumed to be the same as those from high-intensity Grassland, for which more data exist.

<sup>d</sup> Due to limited data for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from tropical drainage channels, the range of measurements is shown, rather than the 95% confidence intervals.

<sup>e</sup> Indicative values for Frac<sub>ditch</sub> within each class are derived from the mean of studies reporting CH<sub>4</sub> emission values for this class. Note that studies from The Netherlands were not included in this calculation, because they are characterised by much higher fractional ditch areas (0.1–0.25) that are not typical of drained organic soils in other countries.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

The principal sources of uncertainty for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils are activity data, including associated information on the fraction of drained areas covered by ditches, and emission factors. Uncertainty ranges are provided in Table 2.3 for values of EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub> land</sub> and Table 2.4 for values of EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub> ditch</sub> for each organic soil/land-use category. Uncertainty ranges in Table 2.3 are expressed as 95% confidence intervals or as standard errors, depending on the number of studies available. The major source of uncertainty in these values is simply the small number of studies on which many Tier 1 estimates are based, and the high degree of heterogeneity in measured fluxes between different studies undertaken within some classes. Confidence intervals (95%) have been calculated for all classes other than the drained tropical organic soil class, for which only one study (Jauhiainen & Silvennoinen, 2012) is available, which provides estimates of ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from areas of drained, deforested and abandoned organic soils, and pulpwood plantations. For the drained tropical organic soils

category, the uncertainty range is provided by the lower (abandoned) and higher (pulpwood plantations) emission values recorded.

The final calculation of  $\text{CH}_4_{\text{organic}}$  is also sensitive to uncertainties in activity data, and in particular to data used to estimate the proportion of the land area that is occupied by drainage ditches,  $\text{Frac}_{\text{ditch}}$ . Many countries lack such data and although activity data should be country-specific, even for Tier 1, indicative values from Table 2A.1 can be used at the discretion of the inventory compiler. Uncertainty assessments should therefore also take account of this source of uncertainty in calculating total  $\text{CH}_4$  emissions from drained organic soils.

## 2.2.2.2 $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ EMISSIONS FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

$\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions from soils are produced by the microbiological processes of nitrification and denitrification (to  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  or  $\text{N}_2$ ) (Firestone & Davidson, 1989; Davidson, 1991). These processes are controlled by several factors, including water-filled pore space (Davidson, 1991; Aulakh & Bijay-Singh, 1997; Dobbie *et al.*, 1999; Ruser *et al.*, 2001), temperature (Keeney *et al.*, 1979; Kroon *et al.*, 2010), and concentration of mineral nitrogen (Ryden & Lund, 1980; Firestone & Davidson, 1989; Bremner, 1997).

Drained organic soils emit significant amounts of  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ , whereas emissions from wet organic soils are close to zero (Kasimir-Klemedtsson *et al.*, 1997; Flessa *et al.*, 1998; Couwenberg *et al.*, 2011). A main reason for increased  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions is nitrogen mineralisation associated with organic matter decomposition in drained organic soils (Höper, 2002). Emissions from this N mineralisation will be dealt with here. Other sources of anthropogenic N in organic soils include nitrogen fertiliser, application of crop residues and organic amendments. These emissions from other N sources are dealt with in Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and in all earlier guidance.

Most of the published data on  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  fluxes from drained organic soils refer to boreal and temperate ecosystems and these data served as the basis for the emission factors given in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. With new studies published since 2005, there are enough data to derive separate  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emission factors for Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland and Peatlands under Peat Extraction in boreal and temperate zones. These new values replace the values given in Table 7.6, Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

There are still only limited data available for drained tropical organic soils. However, the studies that have been published over the past decade provide enough data to develop Tier 1 emission factors for the first time.

## CHOICE OF METHOD

### Tier 1

This section presents the equation for estimating direct emissions of  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  due to drainage of organic soils. The revisions presented here, as shown in Equation 2.7, are applicable to Equation 11.1 presented in Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. This Equation is used to estimate  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  for specific land-use categories, but there are not enough data available to develop coefficients to modify emission factors by condition-specific variables (e.g. variations in drainage depths). Equations 11.1 and 11.2 have been modified to include variables for the boreal climate zone as well by adding terms  $F_{\text{OS, CG Bor NR}}$ ,  $F_{\text{OS, CG, Bor NP}}$ ,  $F_{\text{OS, F, Bor, NR}}$  and  $F_{\text{OS, F Bor NP}}$  (the subscripts CG, F, Bor, NR and NP refer to Cropland and Grassland, Forest Land, Boreal, Nutrient-Rich and Nutrient-Poor, respectively) and their respective emission factors.

Direct  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions from managed soils are estimated using Equation 11.1 in Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. This Equation has three segments: one for emissions associated with N inputs, one for organic soils and one for urine and dung inputs during grazing. In this section, updates are provided for the second segment focusing on organic soils as follows:

**EQUATION 2.7**

**DIRECT  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  EMISSIONS FROM MANAGED/DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$N_2O - N_{OS} = \left[ \begin{aligned} &(F_{\text{OS, CG, Bor}} \cdot EF_{2\text{CG, Bor}}) + (F_{\text{OS, CG, Temp}} \cdot EF_{2\text{CG, Temp}}) + (F_{\text{OS, CG, Trop}} \cdot EF_{2\text{CG, Trop}}) + \\ &(F_{\text{OS, F, Bor, NR}} \cdot EF_{2\text{F, Bor, NR}}) + (F_{\text{OS, F, Temp, NR}} \cdot EF_{2\text{F, Temp, NR}}) + \\ &(F_{\text{OS, F, Bor, NP}} \cdot EF_{2\text{F, Bor, NP}}) + (F_{\text{OS, F, Temp, NP}} \cdot EF_{2\text{F, Temp, NP}}) + (F_{\text{OS, F, Trop}} \cdot EF_{2\text{F, Trop}}) \end{aligned} \right]$$

Where:

$$N_2O - N_{OS} = \text{Annual direct } N_2O\text{--N emissions from managed/draind organic soils, kg } N_2O\text{--N yr}^{-1}$$

- $F_{OS}$  = Annual area of managed/drained organic soils, ha (note: the subscripts CG, F, Temp, Trop, NR and NP refer to Cropland and Grassland, Forest Land, Temperate, Tropical, Nutrient-Rich and Nutrient-Poor, respectively)
- $EF_2$  = Emission factor for  $N_2O$  emissions from drained/managed organic soils,  $kg\ N_2O-N\ ha^{-1}yr^{-1}$ ; (equivalent to Table 11.1, Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* but using updated emission factor values provided in Table 2.5 below; note: the subscripts CG, F, Temp, Trop, NR and NP refer to Cropland and Grassland, Forest Land, Temperate, Tropical, Nutrient-Rich and Nutrient-Poor, respectively.).

## Tier 2

Tier 2 estimates are to be based on the Tier 1 Equation 2.7, but use country- or region-specific emission factors. These can be further stratified by drainage class, nutrient status of organic soils or other criteria used for stratifying organic soils for direct  $N_2O$  emissions. The corresponding emission factors are country- or region-specific and take into account the land-management systems. Tier 2 emission factors can follow the Tier 1 assumption that N mineralisation from degrading organic matter exceeds the amount of N input so that measured  $N_2O$  emissions are attributed in their entirety to the drained organic soil.

## Tier 3

Tier 3 approaches can attribute  $N_2O$  emissions from drained organic soils separately to the mineralisation of peat or organic matter versus N input by fertiliser, crop residues and organic amendments. Attribution could rely on the fraction of  $N_2O$  released by  $N_2O$  emissions peaks after N fertilisation, or by subtracting a fertiliser emission factor from total  $N_2O$  emissions. Nitrogen mineralisation from the drained organic soil can be estimated by  $CO_2-C$  emissions from the drained organic soil and the C/N ratio of the topsoil; this value could be used to predict  $N_2O$  emissions.

Tier 3 methods are based on modelling or measurement approaches. Models can simulate the relationship between the soil and environmental variables that control the variation in  $N_2O$  emissions and the size of those emissions (Stehfest & Bouwman, 2006; Kroon *et al.*, 2010; Dechow & Freibauer, 2011). These models can be used at larger scales where measurements are impractical. Models should only be used after validation against representative measurements that capture the variability of land use, management practices and climate present in the inventory (IPCC, 2010).

## CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

### Tier 1

#### *Emission factors for drained organic soils*

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provide emission factors that were partly disaggregated for land-use types or climatic zones (Table 11.1, Chapter 11, Volume 4). The increased availability of scientific data allows for an improved choice of default emission factors (Table 2.5). Nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich organic soils drained for forestry have different  $N_2O$  emissions. Cropland and Grassland are established on nutrient-rich organic soil or are amended for better nutrient availability and are here considered to be nutrient-rich. Peat extraction occurs both on nutrient-poor (bogs) and on nutrient-rich (fens) peatlands. It is common for the residual bottom peat layers of peat extraction sites to consist of minerogenous but recalcitrant nutrient-rich peat. There are not enough data available to disaggregate peat extraction areas by peat types.

Default emission factors were derived from the mean of all data within each land-use class, typically from chamber measurements. Uncertainty ranges were calculated as 95% confidence intervals. References are given in Table 2.5.



**TABLE 2.5**  
**TIER 1 DIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES<sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category		Climate / vegetation zone	Emission factor (kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% confidence interval		No. of sites	Citations/comments
Forest Land, drained	Nutrient- poor	Boreal	0.22	0.15	0.28	43	Lohila <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Martikainen <i>et al.</i> , 1993, 1995a; Ojanen <i>et al.</i> , 2010, 2013; Regina <i>et al.</i> , 1996
	Nutrient- rich	Boreal	3.2	1.9	4.5	75	Ernfors <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Mäkiranta <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2001b, 2003a, 2006, 2010a; Martikainen <i>et al.</i> , 1993, 1995a; Ojanen <i>et al.</i> , 2010, 2013; Pihlatie <i>et al.</i> , 2004; Regina <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Saari <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Forest Land, drained		Temperate	2.8	-0.57	6.1	13	Sikström <i>et al.</i> , 2009; von Arnold <i>et al.</i> , 2005a, b; Weslien <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Yamulki <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Forest Land and cleared Forest Land (shrubland <sup>b</sup> ), drained		Tropical/ Subtropical	2.4	1.3	3.5	10	Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2012b; Takakai <i>et al.</i> , 2006
Plantation: oil palm		Tropical/ Subtropical	1.2	n.a.	n.a.	1	Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2007b
Plantation: sago palm		Tropical/ Subtropical	3.3	n.a.	n.a.	1	Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2007b
Cropland, drained		Boreal and Temperate	13	8.2	18	36	Augustin <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Elsgaard <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Flessa <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Kasimir-Klemedtsson <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2003a, b, 2004, 2007; Petersen <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Regina <i>et al.</i> , 2004; Taft <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Cropland except rice		Tropical/ Subtropical	5.0	2.3	7.7	8	Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2012b; Takakai <i>et al.</i> , 2006
Rice		Tropical/ Subtropical	0.4	-0.1	0.8	6	Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Hadi <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Inubushi <i>et al.</i> , 2003
Grassland, drained		Boreal	9.5	4.6	14	16	Grønlund <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Hyvönen <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Jaakkola, 1985; Maljanen <i>et al.</i> , 2001b, 2003a, 2004, 2009, 2010b; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Regina <i>et al.</i> , 1996, 2004
Grassland, drained, nutrient-poor		Temperate	4.3	1.9	6.8	7	Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Kasimir-Klemedtsson <i>et al.</i> , 2009

**TABLE 2.5 (CONTINUED)**  
**TIER 1 DIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS FOR DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS IN ALL LAND-USE CATEGORIES<sup>a</sup>**

Land-use category	Climate / vegetation zone	Emission factor (kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% confidence interval		No. of Sites	Citations/comments
Grassland, deep- drained, nutrient-rich	Temperate	8.2	4.9	11	47	Augustin & Merbach, 1998; Augustin <i>et al.</i> , 1996, 1998; Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Flessa & Beese, 1997; Flessa <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Jacobs <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Kroon <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Langeveld <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Meyer <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Petersen <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Teh <i>et al.</i> , 2011; van Beek <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Velthof <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Wild <i>et al.</i> , 2001
Grassland, shallow- drained, nutrient-rich	Temperate	1.6	0.56	2.7	13	Drösler <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Jacobs <i>et al.</i> , 2003
Grassland	Tropical/ Subtropical	5.0	2.3	7.7	8	The emission factor for tropical Cropland can be used
Peatland Managed for Extraction	Boreal and Temperate	0.30	-0.03	0.64	4	Hyvönen <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Regina <i>et al.</i> , 1996
Peatlands Managed for Extraction	Tropical/ Subtropical	3.6	0.2–5.0			Emission factors from Table 7.6 of Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines can be used.
Settlements	All climate zones	There is no fixed default emission/removal factor for Settlements. For this category, it is <i>good practice</i> to take the default emission/removal factor from Table 2.5 of the land-use category that is closest to national conditions of drained organic soils under Settlements. Information about national conditions could include drainage level, vegetation cover or other management activities. For example, drained organic soils in urban green areas, parks or gardens could use the default Tier 1 emission/removal factor for Grassland, deep-drained given in Table 2.5.				
Other Lands	All climate zones	<i>Other Land Remaining Other Land: 0</i> <i>Land Converted to Other Land: maintain emission factor of previous land-use category</i>				

<sup>a</sup> Mean<sup>b</sup> Shrubland refers to any type of land sparsely or fully covered with shrubs or trees that may fulfil the national forest definition. It extends to degraded lands that cannot be clearly classified as forest or non-forest.

Plantations can be defined as Forest Land or Cropland. The attribution to Cropland made in this table is not binding. It is *good practice* to report plantations in the appropriate national land-use category according to national land-use definitions.

In the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, emission factors were provided for  $EF_{2CG, Trop}$  and  $EF_{2F, Trop}$ , based on the expectation that net mineralisation was twice as high in tropical soils as in temperate soils. Research in tropical soils suggests that net mineralisation is not a useful predictor of  $N_2O$  flux and that net nitrification or the nitrate portion of the inorganic-N pool are better predictors (Verchot *et al.*, 1999, 2006; Ishizuka *et al.*, 2005). It also needs to be highlighted that all measurements of  $N_2O$  emissions on tropical organic soils to date are from Southeast Asia and from a very limited number of studies. Nonetheless these emission factors are to be used for all tropical ecosystems until better data become available.

## Tier 2

Tier 2 emission factors may be based on country- or region-specific emission factors for  $N_2O$  emissions from the surface of drained organic soils. These allow further stratification of land-use categories by drainage class, nutrient status or vegetation characteristics. Countries are encouraged to obtain new measurement data for significant land-use classes to enhance the current dataset, and to develop country-specific Tier 2 emission factors. Sharing of data between countries may be appropriate where environmental conditions and practices are similar.

## Tier 3

Tier 3 emission factors or relations are based on country-specific emission data and models calibrated for management practices such as: 1) drainage intensity; 2) crop, livestock or forest type; 3) fertiliser or organic matter additions; 4) peat extraction technology; and 5) the phases of peat extraction or other relevant factors for  $N_2O$  emissions.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Activity data consist of areas of land remaining in a land-use category on drained organic soils stratified by major land-use types, management practices and disturbance regimes. Total areas should be determined according to the Approaches laid out in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and should be consistent with those reported under other sections of the inventory. Stratification of land-use categories according to climate regions, based on default or country-specific classifications, can be accomplished with overlays of land use on suitable climate and soil maps.

## Tier 1

It is *good practice* to use activity data for  $N_2O$  emissions consistent with activity data for  $CO_2$  and  $CH_4$  emissions from soils. Guidance for activity data is given in the respective sections in this Chapter.

## Tiers 2 and 3

Activity data required for higher tier methods are likely to include more detailed information on land use, in particular land-use intensity within Grassland and Cropland classes. Further stratification may be necessary for other classes if sufficient data become available to estimate emission factors, e.g. for cleared peat swamp forest, oil palm or pulpwood plantations in tropical peat areas.

Activity data for higher tier methods may be spatially explicit and consist of areas of drained organic soils under different forest types, peat extraction, cultivation systems, horticulture and plantations, disaggregated according to nutrient status of the organic soil if relevant, and annual peat production data. More sophisticated estimation methodologies will require the determination of areas in different phases of land uses with longer-term rhythms such as age-classes in Forest Land or in a peat extraction cycle, where on abandoned areas drainage or the effects of former peat extraction are still present.

## CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

The steps for estimating  $N_2O$  emissions on drained organic soils are as follows:

**Step 1:** Determine areas with drained organic soils under each land-use category for lands remaining in a land-use category, disaggregated by climate domain and other appropriate factors as outlined above. Where needed for Tier 1 emission factors, land areas are further stratified into nutrient-rich and nutrient-poor organic soils. Temperate nutrient-rich Grassland is further stratified into shallow-drained and deep-drained classes.

**Step 2:** Assign the appropriate values for  $EF_2$  from Table 2.5 for each land-use category, climate domain, nutrient status, and drainage class stratum.

**Step 3:** Multiply activity data by the emission factor for each land-use category according to Equation 2.7.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Uncertainties in estimates of direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drained organic soils are caused by uncertainties related to emission factors (see Table 2.5 for uncertainty ranges), inter-annual variability associated with temperature and precipitation, activity data, lack of coverage of measurements, spatial aggregation and lack of information on specific on-farm practices.

Additional uncertainty will be introduced in an inventory when emission factors are derived from measurements that are not representative of the variation of conditions in a country. Because of very high spatial variability of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soils, most estimates have large standard errors relative to the mean flux. In general, the uncertainty of activity data will be lower than that of the emission factors. Additionally, uncertainties may be caused by missing information on variation in drainage levels, and changing management practices in farming. It is generally difficult to obtain information on the actual drainage levels and possible emission reductions achieved, as well as on farming practices. For more detailed guidance on uncertainty assessment, refer to Chapter 3, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

### 2.2.2.3 CO<sub>2</sub> AND NON-CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS FROM FIRES ON DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

Fires can be a large and variable source of greenhouse gases and significantly affect other feedbacks within the climate system. When compared to combustion of above-ground vegetation, emissions from both uncontrolled wildfires and managed (prescribed) fires in organic (peat) soils are high. On organic soils, fires comprise both surface fires that consume vegetation, litter and duff, and ground fires that burn into and below the surface. Ground fires consume soil organic matter and dead-wood mass as a fuel source. These are smouldering fires that may persist for long periods of time, burn repeatedly in response to changing soil moisture and surface hydrology, and penetrate to different depths. This section addresses emissions arising from combustion of soil organic material. Although the focus of guidance in this Chapter is on drained organic soils, the guidance in Section 2.2.2.3 could also be used to calculate emissions from fires on managed land with undrained and rewetted organic soils (Chapter 3 of this *Wetlands Supplement*).

In any ecosystem, fire activity is strongly influenced by several factors, namely weather/climate, fuel availability, drainage and ignition agents, including human activities (Johnson, 1992; Swetnam, 1993). In ecosystems with organic soils, conditions such as organic soil depth and density, soil moisture, vegetation composition and soil surface micro-topography (e.g. Benscoter & Wieder, 2003) along with fire characteristics, such as intensity, frequency and duration (Kasischke *et al.*, 1995), which are affected by fire management practices, influence the quantity of organic matter consumed and hence emissions of greenhouse gases (Kuhry, 1994; Kasischke *et al.*, 1995; Kasischke & Bruhwiler, 2003).

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* cover emissions from burning of above-ground carbon stocks (biomass and dead organic matter) but do not cover the often substantial release of emissions from combustion of organic soils. It is *good practice* to report greenhouse gas emissions from fires on all managed lands with organic soils, including all fire-related emissions both from natural fires and from those that have a human-induced cause (e.g. soil drainage) even if the initiation of the fire is non-anthropogenic in nature (e.g. lightning strike).

This Chapter updates the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* by:

- providing default methodologies and emission factors for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO emissions from fires on organic soils; and
- providing generic guidance for higher tier methods to estimate these fluxes.

Change in SOC following fire is the result of both CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (principally of CH<sub>4</sub> and CO). Emissions of both CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gases are addressed in the following sections. These deal specifically with below-ground biomass as opposed to vegetation and litter losses (the latter are included in the estimation of carbon stock changes in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*).

## CHOICE OF METHOD

CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from burning of drained organic soils can either be directly measured or estimated using data on the area burnt along with default values for mass of fuel consumed and emission factors provided in this Chapter. Previous *IPCC Guidelines* noted that emissions from wildfires on managed (and unmanaged) land can exhibit large inter-annual variations that may be driven either by natural causes (e.g. climate cycles, random variation in lightning ignitions), or by indirect and direct human causes (e.g. prescribed burning, historical fire suppression and past forest harvest activities) or by a combination of all three causes, the effects of which cannot be readily separated. This variability is also true for emissions from fires on organic soils that critically depend on extent and depth of organic soil, fuel moisture, water table depth and hence thickness of the

drained layer, and resulting depth of consumed organics, all of which are affected by site characteristics, weather, land management, fire type and climate. At Tier 1, differentiation by land-management category and fire type is possible, but reporting at higher tiers will enable a greater level of differentiation between land use, site characteristics and fire types.

The parameters required to calculate the CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from burning organic soils are area burnt, mass of fuel available for consumption, combustion factor (also known as burning efficiency and can be used to characterise smouldering vs. flaming fires), and emission factor. Compared with vegetation fires, the uncertainties involved in estimating emissions from fires on organic soils are much higher because organic soils can burn repeatedly and to different depths. Furthermore, the type and density of the soil organic material combined with the combustion efficiency will determine the nature of gases and other compounds emitted.

The mass of fuel that can potentially burn in a fire event on organic soils will be determined by measuring the depth of burn, along with soil bulk density and carbon content; the former is strongly controlled by soil water content (influenced by position of the water table or permafrost depth) while the latter variables are ideally measured in the field. While default values can be used for Tier 1 reporting, data on the depth of burn and soil carbon density need to be determined in the case of higher tiers. The combustion factor describes how much of the fuel mass available is actually consumed during a fire event, i.e. converted into CO<sub>2</sub> or non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases. The emission factor ( $G_{ef}$ ) determines the mass of CO<sub>2</sub> or non-CO<sub>2</sub> gas emitted per unit mass of fuel consumed by the fire (e.g. g CO<sub>2</sub>/kg dry fuel). Total emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> or non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases are calculated from the product of area burnt and the corresponding biomass loading, combustion factor and emission factor.

**EQUATION 2.8**  
**ANNUAL CO<sub>2</sub>-C AND NON-CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS FROM ORGANIC SOIL FIRE**

$$L_{fire} = A \cdot M_B \cdot C_f \cdot G_{ef} \cdot 10^{-3}$$

Where:

$L_{fire}$  = amount of CO<sub>2</sub> or non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, e.g. CH<sub>4</sub> from fire, tonnes

$A$  = total area burnt annually, ha

$M_B$  = mass of fuel available for combustion, tonnes ha<sup>-1</sup> (i.e. mass of dry organic soil fuel) (default values in Table 2.6; units differ by gas species)

$C_f$  = combustion factor, dimensionless

$G_{ef}$  = emission factor for each gas, g kg<sup>-1</sup> dry matter burnt (default values in Table 2.7)


Where data for  $M_B$  and  $C_f$  are not available, a default value for the amount of fuel actually burnt (the product of  $M_B$  and  $C_f$ ) can be used under Tier 1 methodology (Table 2.6). The value 10<sup>-3</sup> converts  $L_{fire}$  to tonnes.

The amount of fuel that can be burnt is given by the area burnt annually and the mass of fuel available in that area.

Default values for the Tier 1 method or components of a Tier 2 method are provided in Tables 2.6 and 2.7. For higher tiers, data on the variation in the mass of fuel available (based on site- or region-specific data, including area of organic soil burnt, depth of organic soil, depth of burn and/or depth of water table/soil moisture content values and soil bulk density) are incorporated.

Figure 2.2 presents a decision tree that guides the selection of the appropriate tier level to report CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the burning of organic soils.

**Figure 2.2**      **Generic decision tree for identification of the appropriate tier to estimate greenhouse gas emissions from fires on organic soils**



Note:

1: See Chapter 4, “Methodological Choice and Identification of Key Categories” (noting Section 4.1.2 on limited resources), Volume 1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for discussion of *key categories* and use of decision trees.

## Tier 1

Countries may choose to report CO<sub>2</sub> emissions using the Tier 1 method if fires on organic soils are not a *key category*. This approach is based on highly aggregated data and default factors. It does, however, require primary data on the area burnt.

If burning in ecosystems with organic soils is a *key category*, countries are encouraged to report emissions by applying the highest tier possible, given national circumstances. For prescribed fires, country-specific data will be required to generate reliable estimates of emissions.

At Tier 1, it is assumed that there is either no or very little combustive loss of soil organic matter during prescribed fires on organic soils.

## Tiers 2 and 3

The Tier 1 method is refined by incorporating more disaggregated area estimates (per organic soil and fire type sub-categories) and country-specific estimates of combustion and emission factors into Equation 2.8. Tier 2 uses the same procedural steps for calculations as provided for Tier 1. Potential improvements to the Tier 1 approach may include:

- knowledge of the amount of soil organic matter consumed;
- the position of the soil water table relative to the surface;
- improved information on land use/management and their effects on organic soil condition, in particular hydrological status;
- improved data on area burnt, estimated using remotely sensed data of adequate spatial and temporal resolutions and verified according to a robust sampling design at suitable periodicity to take account of the monthly variations in area burnt; and
- estimates of the depth of burn in a representative number of locations.

Countries may further stratify the data on area burnt by depth of burn, organic soil condition (e.g. drained vs. undrained, with further detail possible through characterisation of the intensity of drainage), and fire type (wildfire vs. prescribed).

It may also be possible to develop models with algorithms to generate regional-scale maps of area burnt using satellite data from multiple sources and of moderate spatial resolution. Model results should be validated, for example, by using high spatial resolution data augmented by field observations, and refined based on validation results whenever possible. A sampling approach can be designed to generate estimates of area burnt. This reporting method should provide estimates (fluxes) of the impact of burning on below-ground biomass, particularly including the depth of burn and, if feasible, the variation of depth within the area burnt. Reporting at higher tiers should differentiate fires burning at different intensities (critical for Tier 3) and with different proportions of smouldering vs. flaming combustion (i.e. different Modified Combustion Efficiency (MCE) defined as  $\Delta\text{CO}_2/(\Delta\text{CO}_2 + \Delta\text{CO})$ , which is an index of the relative proportion of smouldering vs. flaming combustion). The development of robust methodologies to assess burn severity in organic soils would enable more accurate quantification of greenhouse gas emissions from below-ground fires.

## CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

### Tier 1

The Tier 1 method uses default values for  $M_B$ ,  $C_f$  and  $G_{ef}$  along with default emission factors provided in Tables 2.6 and 2.7. Gas species in Table 2.7 are given as CO<sub>2</sub>-C, CO and CH<sub>4</sub>.

Due to limited data available in the scientific literature, organic soils have been very broadly stratified according to climate domain (boreal/temperate and tropical) and fire type (wild vs. prescribed). Values are derived from the literature for all categories with the exception of prescribed fires.

For all organic soil fires, the default combustion factor is 1.0, since the assumption is that all fuel is combusted (Yokelson *et al.*, 1997).

<b>TABLE 2.6</b> <b>ORGANIC SOIL FUEL CONSUMPTION VALUES</b> <b>(MASS OF DRY MATTER FOR A RANGE OF ORGANIC SOIL AND FIRE TYPES, TO BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH EQUATION 2.8,</b> <b>TO ESTIMATE THE PRODUCT OF QUANTITIES <math>M_B</math> AND <math>C_F</math>)</b>					
Climate/vegetation zone	Sub-category	Mean (t d.m. ha <sup>-1</sup> )	95% confidence interval (t d.m. ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Citations
Boreal/temperate	Wildfire (undrained peat)	66	46	86	Amiro <i>et al.</i> , 2001; Benscoter & Wieder, 2003; Cahoon <i>et al.</i> , 1994; de Groot & Alexander, 1986; Kajii <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Kasischke & Bruhwiler, 2003; Kasischke <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Kuhry, 1994; Pitkänen <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Poulter <i>et al.</i> , 2006; Turetsky & Wieder, 2001; Turetsky <i>et al.</i> , 2011a, b; Zoltai <i>et al.</i> , 1998
	Wildfire (drained peat)	336	4 <sup>a</sup>		Turetsky <i>et al.</i> , 2011b
	Prescribed fire (land management)	-	-		No literature found
Tropical	Wildfire (undrained peat)	-	-		No literature found
	Wildfire (drained peat)	353	170	536	Ballhorn <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Page <i>et al.</i> , 2002; Usup <i>et al.</i> , 2004
	Prescribed fire (agricultural land management) <sup>b</sup>	155	82	228	Saharjo & Munoz, 2005; Saharjo & Nurhayati, 2005
<sup>a</sup> Standard error <sup>b</sup> The consumption value excludes crop residues. Note: Where fuel consumption values have been reported as t C ha <sup>-1</sup> , default values for organic soil bulk density (0.1 g cm <sup>-3</sup> ) <sup>c</sup> and carbon density (50% mass dry weight) <sup>d</sup> have been applied to derive a value for mass of fuel (t ha <sup>-1</sup> ) (following Akagi <i>et al.</i> , 2011). At higher tier levels, country- or ecosystem-specific values for both these variables are used. <sup>c</sup> The value for surface organic soil bulk density is an average derived from Gorham (1991), who provides a default value of 0.112 g cm <sup>-3</sup> for all northern peatlands and Page <i>et al.</i> (2011), who provide a default value of 0.09 g cm <sup>-3</sup> for all tropical peats. <sup>d</sup> The value for surface organic soil carbon content is an average derived from the typical average for eutrophic peat of 48% and the typical average for oligotrophic peat of 52% (after Lucas (1982), Immirzi <i>et al.</i> (1992) as reported in Charman (2002)).					



**TABLE 2.7**  
**EMISSION FACTORS (G KG<sup>-1</sup> DRY MATTER BURNT) FOR ORGANIC SOIL FIRES. VALUES ARE MEANS  $\pm$  95% CI (TO BE USED AS QUANTITY G<sub>EF</sub> IN EQUATION 2.8)**

Climate/vegetation zone	CO <sub>2</sub> -C	CO	CH <sub>4</sub>	Citations
Boreal/temperate	362 $\pm$ 41	207 $\pm$ 70	9 $\pm$ 4	Ward & Hardy, 1984; Yokelson <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Yokelson <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Tropical	464	210	21	Christian <i>et al.</i> , 2003

1. These values have been derived from a very limited number of studies. The EF values for boreal/temperate fires are arithmetic means of the two values reported by Yokelson *et al.* (1997) for Alaska and Minnesota organic soils (carbon content 49% for Minnesota; n.d. for Alaska), of the minimum and maximum values reported by Ward and Hardy (1984) (no carbon contents reported) and of the single value reported by Yokelson *et al.* (2013) for Alaskan organic soil (carbon content 42%). Surface (flaming) and deep (smouldering) organic soil fires produce a complex mixture of gases and fine particles, the nature of which will reflect vegetation type, fire behaviour, soil physical and chemical characteristics as well as combustion conditions (in particular combustion efficiency) (Itkonen & Jantunen, 1986; NCDENR, 1998). The combustion of organic material leads to a loss of carbon; most of this is in the form of CO<sub>2</sub>, but quantities of CO, CH<sub>4</sub>, long-chain hydrocarbons and carbon particulate matter are also emitted. Other greenhouse gases along with ozone precursors (NO<sub>x</sub>), volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons are also released (Ramadan *et al.*, 2000; Gebhart *et al.*, 2001; Honrath *et al.*, 2004; Val Martin *et al.*, 2006; Lapina *et al.*, 2008; Akagi *et al.*, 2011). Emission factors for N<sub>2</sub>O and NO<sub>x</sub> are not provided at Tier 1. There are very limited data for N<sub>2</sub>O and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from organic soil fires and it should be noted that N<sub>2</sub>O can be produced in canisters during sample storage (e.g. Cofer *et al.*, 1990). At higher tiers, N<sub>2</sub>O and NO<sub>x</sub> can either be measured directly or can be calculated using published emission ratios for organic soil fires (e.g. Christian *et al.*, 2003; Hamada *et al.*, 2013).

2. The composition of organic soil fire emissions differs substantially from forest fires on mineral soils; in part, this is a function of the fact that organic soil fires are dominated by smouldering rather than flaming combustion owing to the moist and often oxygen-limiting substrate conditions. Fire temperatures also differ: the typical peak temperature of smouldering organic soil fires is in the range 500–700°C, while for flaming fires it can be 1000–1500°C (Usup *et al.*, 2004; Rein *et al.*, 2008). The lower temperatures and smouldering combustion associated with organic soil fires make them harder to detect by satellites and lead to the emission of high amounts of CO relative to CO<sub>2</sub> as well as large amounts of fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>); fires on tropical organic soils, for example, emit as much as three to six times more particulate matter per amount of biomass consumed than other types of biomass fires (grassland, forest, plantation fires) (Heil *et al.*, 2006). The emission ratio of CO to CO<sub>2</sub> (ER<sub>CO/CO2</sub>) can be used as an indicator of the relative amount of flaming versus smouldering combustion during biomass burning with higher ER<sub>CO/CO2</sub> observed in smouldering fires (Cofer *et al.*, 1989, 1990; Christian *et al.*, 2007; Yokelson *et al.*, 2007).

## Tiers 2 and 3

At higher tiers, the approach for estimating greenhouse gas emissions from fires on organic soils incorporates country-specific information into Equation 2.8. When deriving higher tier emission factors, country-specific combustion factors need to be developed. Regional factors for stratification could include:

- stratification by drainage class - position of the soil water table is a proxy for soil moisture, which determines depth of burn;
- stratification by depth of burn - this can be measured in the field post-fire (e.g. Turetsky & Wieder, 2001; Page *et al.*, 2002; Turetsky *et al.*, 2011a) or using remote sensing approaches (e.g. LiDAR) (Ballhorn *et al.*, 2009);
- stratification by fire type (wild vs. prescribed fires) - GIS techniques of interpolation may be helpful in this analysis; under Tier 3, one might consider annual sampling of a number of control sites;
- stratification by organic soil type taking into account general hydrology (e.g. bog vs. fen) and vegetation structure (open, shrubby, forested) whenever possible;
- use of regionally specific values for organic soil bulk density and carbon concentration; and
- stratification by land-use and management types, including differences in drainage layout and intensity, land-use intensity and practices, all of which will influence the mass of fuel available for combustion.

Emission factors can be derived from measurements (field or laboratory-based) or calculations validated against country-specific measurements. The literature on emissions from fires on organic soils is very sparse and countries are encouraged to share data when organic soil quality, environmental conditions, and land-use practices are similar.

A higher tier approach might also use process-based models, adequately validated using observation data that take into account temporal and spatial variations in the differences between fires on different types of organic soils and conditions and fuel combustion efficiencies. This approach will involve a comprehensive mechanistic understanding of combustion of organic soils, including the effects of site characteristics, drainage intensity, vegetation cover, soil type and depth, management practices, depth of water table and soil moisture, among others. Higher tier approaches could start by developing robust relationships between drainage and depth of burn,

which could then be further refined by land-management category. Models ideally also take into account the fire return interval. Fire changes organic soil chemical and physical characteristics (Yefremova & Yefremov, 1996; Zoltai *et al.*, 1998; Milner *et al.*, forthcoming) as well as the rate and nature of post-fire vegetation recovery, and thus can alter total net ecosystem productivity.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Activity data consist of areas of land remaining in a land-use category with organic soils stratified by climate zone and fire type. Total areas should be determined according to the Approaches laid out in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and should be consistent with those reported under other sections of the inventory. The assessment of fire-driven changes in soil carbon will be greatly facilitated if this information can be used in conjunction with national soils and climate data, vegetation inventories, maps of burnt area, and other biophysical data. Stratification of land-use categories according to climate zones, based on default or country-specific classifications, can be accomplished with overlays of land use on suitable climate and soil maps.

### Tier 1

The Tier 1 method requires data on burnt area of organic soils stratified by climate domain and fire type (wild vs. prescribed). Data on burnt area can be obtained from ground-based inventories, which can be very valuable in areas of small fire. Some countries/regions may have an established fire inventory method in place, which they are encouraged to maintain rather than go with less comprehensive satellite methods. For larger and/or less accessible locations, burnt area data are often obtained from a time series of images from remote sensors. In-country burnt area maps should ideally be mapped at Landsat TM scale (30–50 m resolution). If data not available at this resolution, 250 m and even 1 km data can be used. Box 2.1 provides more details on the remote sensing platforms currently used for obtaining burnt area data. Other methods, such as national statistics and forest inventory fire data, can also produce suitable information in some cases, but may not be as reliable or as comprehensive as remotely sensed data. Caution is advised regarding the detection of thermal anomalies using datasets derived from satellite data. Although this provides a reasonable indicator of the presence of a fire, burnt area parameters required in the emission estimate equations cannot reliably be derived.

#### Box 2.1

##### RECENT ADVANCES IN SATELLITE-DERIVED FIRE PRODUCTS

Recent advances in satellite-derived fire products using MODerate resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) data from the Terra and Aqua satellites (Roy *et al.*, 2008; Giglio *et al.*, 2009), the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) sensor of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Polar Operation Environmental Satellite (POES), the European AATSR and VEGETATION/PROBA satellites, and the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES) have all enabled the derivation of burnt area data in near real-time and thereby enhanced the ability to estimate the areal extent of regional and global wildfires and hence the scale of emissions (e.g. Gregoire *et al.*, 2003; Simon *et al.*, 2004; Tansey *et al.*, 2008; Giglio *et al.*, 2009; Kasischke *et al.*, 2011). Products derived from the satellite datasets provide either an indication of the area burnt or an indication that a possible active fire is burning within the grid cell, based on a high surface temperature signal at thermal wavelengths. At the global scale, these datasets are coarse resolution (a pixel size larger than 500 m). The resulting uncertainties and particular challenges associated with commission and omission errors in remote sensing approaches to peat fire detection and characterisation, however, need to be recognised and acknowledged. In normal years, for example, fires on tropical organic soils are relatively small (several hectares would be towards the upper end), and it is therefore necessary to consider using satellite datasets acquiring imagery at an appropriate resolution. During extended smouldering, fires in organic soils may be particularly difficult to pick up by sensors sensitive to thermal wavelengths. There are ongoing issues with cloud cover, which are being addressed with increasing use of radar imagery. Furthermore, there are very few operational systems that can be used to develop robust and temporally stable products. The Landsat-8 mission and the forthcoming European Space Agency/European Commission Sentinel programme will help address this issue. The size of the study area is also very important as there may be existing datasets available from which a long-term time series of fire disturbance can be reconstructed (e.g. 40 years of Landsat data with gap filling with radar imagery). The UN World Meteorological Organization has produced useful materials on fire assessment and standards (e.g. GTOS-68, 2009).

Data on the location of organic soils can be obtained from several institutions, including ISRIC and FAO, which have country-specific and global maps that include organic soils (<http://webarchive.iiasa.ac.at/Research/LUC/External-World-soil-database/HTML/>);

<http://www.fao.org/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home>; <http://www.isric.org/>). A global consortium has been formed to make a new fine resolution digital soil map of the world (<http://www.globalsoilmap.net/>).

### Tiers 2 and 3

Higher tier methods require more disaggregated and spatially explicit activity data than lower tiers. This includes disaggregation according to drainage class, vegetation type and condition (the latter refers to moisture, leaf on/off, and other factors), drainage depth, and land-management status to improve Tier 1 estimates. It may also take into account such variables as seasonal norms and modifications in water table level due to seasonal weather patterns, etc. Data on depth of burn (obtained from *in situ* field measurements), along with country-specific data on organic soil bulk density and carbon content, will also greatly improve knowledge of the mass of fuel consumed and the scale of carbon emissions. Seasonal variations in fire-driven emissions are then aggregated to annual emissions.

The accuracy of emission estimates will be further improved if information is available on land use and its effect on organic soil condition, since fire extent and severity and hence quantity of emissions increase according to the scale of disturbance (e.g. disturbance of vegetation cover and the presence of drainage structures associated with agriculture, forestry, peat extraction, oil and gas extraction, roads etc. (e.g. Turetsky *et al.*, 2011a, b)). Remote sensing techniques (e.g. Kasischke *et al.*, 2009) can also be used to provide an indication of likely fire risk by estimating soil water conditions and providing an accurate proxy measure of organic soil surface water content levels and hence likely depth of burn at a landscape scale.

### CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

The steps for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fires on drained organic soils for land remaining in a land-use category are as follows:

**Step 1:** Using guidance in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, stratify areas with drained organic soils of land remaining in a land-use category for each land-use category according to climate domain and fire type. Obtain estimates of A (area burnt) from national sources or, if not available, from global databases.

**Step 2:** Assign the appropriate fuel consumption value from Table 2.6 ( $M_b \cdot C_f$  with  $C_f=1$ ) and emission factor ( $G_{ef}$ ) from Tables 2.6 and 2.7 for the gas.

**Step 3:** Estimate CO<sub>2</sub> or non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by multiplying the burnt area by the appropriate fuel load ( $M_B$ ) and emission factor ( $G_{ef}$ ) from Tables 2.6 and 2.7 using Equation 2.8.

**Step 4:** Repeat step 3 for each greenhouse gas using emission factors ( $G_{ef}$ ) in Table 2.7.

### UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

There are several sources of uncertainty related to estimates of CO<sub>2</sub> and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fires on organic soils. Fire behaviour varies greatly among wetland types and hence, disaggregation of vegetative formations will lead to greater precision. The fraction of fuel that is actually combusted during burning (the combustion factor) varies, not only between ecosystems, but also between fires, between years, and as a function of land-management practices. Measurements from a given fire, year and/or region cannot be extrapolated with confidence to other locations or years, or to the biome scale. An important cause of uncertainty is the choice of emission factor that partitions the smoke into CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and other trace gases, since this is strongly driven by the amount of flaming versus smouldering combustion that occurs; this can vary widely in organic soils, and is not well characterised from field data. In addition, the accuracy of estimates of area burnt, proportion of the available fuel oxidised and the biomass fuel available also contribute to emission uncertainty. Uncertainties of estimates of areas burnt can vary markedly depending on the methodology employed; for example, where very high resolution remote sensing is used, it may be of the order of  $\pm 20\%$ , whereas the use of global fire maps may result in uncertainties of up to two-fold. Uncertainties in estimates of greenhouse gas emissions from fire over large regions are likely to be at least  $\pm 50\%$ , even with good country-specific data, and at least two-fold where only default data are used. The calculation of emission errors is addressed by French *et al.* (2004). The study looked at possible ranges of error in input variables, since robust data are not available for the range of fire conditions and vegetation types that can burn. The sensitivity analysis revealed that the ground-layer fraction consumed is the most important parameter in terms of output uncertainty, indicating that burning in sites with deep organic soils can be the most problematic in terms of uncertainty. The results of that work showed that input datasets are incomplete in describing the possible variability in conditions for both pre-burn and during the fire, and attention to improving measurements and obtaining a range of measurements is a priority for modelling emissions from fire in organic soils.

## 2.3 LAND CONVERTED TO A NEW LAND-USE CATEGORY

### 2.3.1 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land converted to another land-use category on drained organic soils are calculated in the same way as CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land remaining in a land-use category.<sup>1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals for the lands in the conversion category are calculated using Equations 2.1 and 2.2.

On-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions after land-use change on drained organic soils can occur from all five carbon pools. Land-use change can result in direct losses/gains because of biomass clearance/(re)planting. This is addressed by guidance for changes in the carbon pools in above-ground and below-ground biomass and dead organic matter on lands converted to another land-use category provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Land-use change can indirectly affect carbon gains and losses because of altered growth of woody biomass and altered respiration and organic matter oxidation through altered soil temperature. These effects are included in the guidance for lands remaining in a land-use category provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for above-ground and below-ground biomass and dead organic matter and updated emission factors in Table 2.1 in Section 2.2.1.1.

Additional carbon losses from biomass and soil can occur through altered fire frequency after drainage and land-use change. These CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fire are addressed in Section 2.3.2.3.

#### 2.3.1.1 ON-SITE CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS/REMOVALS FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS (CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>ON-SITE</sub>)

##### CHOICE OF METHOD

###### Tier 1

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land converted to another land-use category on drained organic soils within the inventory time period are calculated in the same way as CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land remaining in a land-use category. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals for lands in the conversion category are calculated using Equation 2.3 if soils are drained. Specific guidance for other land-use categories is given in Chapters 5, 6, 8 and 9 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

At Tier 1, there is no transition period for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained organic soils because the land immediately switches to the methods for the new land-use category. High carbon loss from drained organic soils can occur after natural vegetation is converted to another land use, e.g. after converting tropical Forest Land to palm plantations, or converting Grassland to Cropland, and in particular, immediately after initial drainage of organic soils (Stephens *et al.*, 1984; Wösten *et al.*, 1997; Hooijer *et al.*, 2012). These CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>on-site</sub> emissions in the transition phase are not captured by the Tier 1 default emission factors shown in Table 2.1, which were derived from data representing long-term land uses present for decades in the boreal and temperate climate zones, and land uses drained for more than six years in the tropical climate zone. A transitional phase is not captured by Tier 1 methodology due to lack of scientific data for deriving default emission factors. After initial drainage of organic soils and if a transitional phase occurs, this should be addressed using higher tier methods.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, if Forest Land is converted to Cropland, methodology and emission factors for Cropland are to be used.

**Tier 2**

Country-specific Tier 2 emission factors may include CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the transition phase after land conversion, in particular after initial drainage of organic soils and when land conversion is associated with deeper drainage.

**Tier 3**

Tier 3 methodologies could further consider the dynamic nature of the additional CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>on-site</sub> emissions in the transition phase, which may be highest in the first years after the transition.

Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 approaches is given in Section 2.2.1.1.

**CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS****Tier 1**

At Tier 1, CO<sub>2</sub> emission/removal factors for lands in the conversion category are the same as for land remaining in a land-use category. For Tier 1, these are given in Table 2.1. Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 emission/removal factors is given in Section 2.2.1.1.

**Tier 2**

If land conversions on drained organic soils contribute significantly to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from soils and if CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from soils are a *key category*, it is *good practice* to develop country-specific Tier 2 emission factors that include additional CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>on-site</sub> emissions in the transition phase. Tier 2 emission factors could be stratified by type of land conversion and by the magnitude of change in water table through drainage. Unless other country-specific evidence is available, the default length of 20 years can be used for the transition phase.

**Tier 3**

Tier 3 methodologies could develop response functions or models that capture the dynamic nature of additional CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>soil-on-site</sub> emissions in the transition phase.

**CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA**

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.1.1.

**UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT**

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.1.1.

### **2.3.1.2 OFF-SITE CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS VIA WATERBORNE CARBON LOSSES FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS (CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>SOIL-ONSITE</sub>)**

**CHOICE OF METHOD****Tier 1**

At Tier 1, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land converted to another land-use category on drained organic soils within the inventory time period are calculated in the same way as CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land remaining in a land-use category. Guidance for DOC is given in Section 2.2.1.2. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals for lands in the conversion category are calculated using Equations 2.4 and 2.5.

**Tier 2**

The Tier 2 approach for waterborne carbon losses from drained organic soils incorporates country-specific information to estimate emissions. Tier 2 uses the same procedural steps for calculations as provided for Tier 1. Tier 2 emission factors can be developed following the same principles as for land remaining in a land-use category. Guidance is given in Section 2.2.1.2. Generally, the same stratification should be used for land converted to another land-use category as is used for land remaining in a land-use category. Tier 2 approaches for land-use changes can be further stratified according to the time since land-use change. Specific transition periods can be considered depending on the type of land-use change and the persistence of emissions or removals, which differ from those on lands that have been in the new land-use category for a long time. Alternatively, the default transition period applicable to the new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* can be applied.

**Tier 3**

The development of Tier 3 approaches follows the guidance given in Section 2.2.1.2, including the guidance for transparent documentation of Tier 3 approaches given in Section 2.2.1.1. Generally, the same approach should be used for land converted to another land-use category as is used for land remaining in a land-use category. Tier 3 methods should further differentiate transition effects of increased or reduced waterborne carbon losses after land-use change and time since land-use change.

Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 approaches is given in Section 2.2.1.2.

**CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS**

CO<sub>2</sub> emission/removal factors for lands in the conversion category are the same as for land remaining in a land-use category. For Tier 1, these are given in Table 2.2. Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 emission/removal factors is given in Section 2.2.1.2.

**CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA**

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.1.2.

**UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT**

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.1.2.

## **2.3.2 Non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from drained inland organic soils**

### **2.3.2.1 CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS/REMOVALS FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS**

**CHOICE OF METHOD**

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions/removals from land converted to another land-use category on drained organic soils within the inventory time period are calculated in the same way as CH<sub>4</sub> emissions/removals from land remaining in a land-use category.<sup>2</sup> CH<sub>4</sub> emissions/removals for lands in the conversion category are calculated using Equation 2.5. Additional guidance on the Tier 1, 2, and 3 approaches is given in Section 2.2.2.1.

**CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS**

CH<sub>4</sub> emission/removal factors for land in the conversion category are the same as for land remaining in a land-use category. For Tier 1, these are given in Tables 2.3 and 2.4. Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 emission/removal factors is given in Section 2.2.2.1.

**CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA**

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.2.1.

**UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT**

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.2.1.

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, if Forest Land is converted to Cropland, methodology and emission factors for Cropland are to be used.

### 2.3.2.2 N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

#### CHOICE OF METHOD

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from land converted to another land-use category on drained organic soils within the inventory time period are calculated in the same way as N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from land remaining in a land-use category. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions for lands in the conversion category are calculated using Equation 2.7. Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 approaches is given in Section 2.2.2.2.

#### CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors for land in the conversion category are the same as for land remaining in a land-use category. For Tier 1, these are given in Table 2.5. Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 emission/removal factors is given in Section 2.2.2.2.

#### CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.2.2.

#### UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.2.2.

### 2.3.2.3 NON-CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS FROM BURNING ON DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS

#### CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

Non-CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors for land in the conversion category are the same as for land remaining in a land-use category. For Tier 1, these are given in Tables 2.6 and 2.7. Additional guidance on Tier 1, 2, and 3 emission/removal factors is given in Section 2.2.2.3.

#### CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.2.3.

#### UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Guidance is the same as for land remaining in a land-use category, as given in Section 2.2.2.3.

## 2.4 COMPLETENESS, TIME SERIES CONSISTENCY, QA/QC AND REPORTING AND DOCUMENTATION

### 2.4.1 Completeness

Complete greenhouse gas inventories will include estimates of all greenhouse gas emissions and removals on drained inland organic soils for which Tier 1 guidance is provided in this Chapter, for all types of organic soils and land-use categories that occur on the national territory. Further guidance on completeness is provided in Chapter 7.5 of the *Wetlands Supplement*.

### 2.4.2 Time series consistency

It is *good practice* for countries to clearly define organic soils and use this definition consistently over time.

Consistent time series require that the same methodology be used for the entire time series. Whenever new methodologies are used, previous estimates should be recalculated using the new methods for all years in the time series. It is also *good practice* to report why new estimates are regarded as more accurate or less uncertain.

One potential problem in recalculating previous estimates is that certain datasets may not be available for the earlier years. There are several ways of overcoming this limitation and they are explained in detail in Chapter 5, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Time series consistency is discussed further in Chapter 7.6 of the

*Wetlands Supplement* and Chapter 5, Volume 1 (Time series consistency and recalculations) of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

### 2.4.3 Quality Assurance and Quality Control

It is *good practice* to develop and implement quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures as outlined in Chapter 7.7 of the *Wetlands Supplement*. Countries using Tier 1 methods are encouraged to critically assess the applicability of default assumptions to their national circumstances. These default assumptions are presented in the main text and Annexes to this Chapter. Water table or drainage classes and time after water table drawdown are likely to have the strongest impact on greenhouse gas emissions and removals. Water table information should be factored in to the assessment of the applicability of or development of emission factors. Countries are encouraged to focus the efforts of QA/QC procedures on the accuracy of water table information.

Higher tier methods should be carefully designed to ensure that resulting estimates are compatible across different pools. In particular, potential double-counting or omission of emissions or removals could occur if measurements underlying national emission factors comprise several carbon pools, e.g. organic soil pool and dead organic matter, soil respiration with components of autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration that are not attributable to the organic soil, or combined on-site and off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Annex 2A.1 of this Chapter describes the underlying assumptions and methodologies used in deriving Tier 1 emission factors that avoid double-counting or omission of carbon pools.

Where country-specific emission factors are used, they should be based on high-quality field data, developed using a rigorous measurement programme and adequately documented, preferably in peer-reviewed, scientific literature.

It is *good practice* to develop additional, category-specific QA/QC procedures for greenhouse gas emissions and removals from drained organic soils. Examples of such procedures include, but are not limited to, examining the time series of the total area of managed land on organic soils and the fraction of these soils that is drained across all land-use categories (to ensure there are no unexplained gains or losses of land) and conducting a comparative analysis of emission factors in the scientific literature or in neighbouring countries with similar environmental and management conditions.

### 2.4.4 Reporting and documentation

Chapter 7.2.1.1 of the *Wetlands Supplement* provides specific guidance on where to report greenhouse gas emissions and removals from drained organic soils.

It is *good practice* for countries to report and document how they define organic soils, how they ensure consistency with the IPCC definition and how drained organic soils are identified.

Countries using Tier 1 methods are encouraged to document their assessment of whether the default assumptions are applicable to their national circumstances and of actions taken in case default assumptions are considered not or only partially applicable. It is *good practice* to document how national data compare to default assumptions and why they may differ. Whenever national methodologies are used it is *good practice* to document transparently and completely data sources, underlying assumptions, compatibility with the assumptions in the Tier 1 methodology or reasons for deviations, data used, and models or calculation algorithms used in the national methodology. It is *good practice* to document, and countries are encouraged to publish, the data, methodology and results of their assessment of how and why they represented the national circumstances and to document the QA/QC procedures, e.g. peer-review of methodologies before application in the inventory.



## Annex 2A.1 Scientific background for developing CO<sub>2</sub>-C emission/removal factors for drained inland organic soil from the scientific literature in Table 2.1

The Tier 1 CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors presented in Table 2.1 were calculated as annual net change of soil organic carbon (SOC) plus below-ground portion of litter carbon in different land uses. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were obtained using two well-established methodologies:

1. **Flux method:** Flux measurements are commonly used on all types of organic soils to determine gas exchange at frequencies from minutes to weeks over monitoring periods of up to a few years.
2. **Subsidence method:** Determining subsidence rates of drained organic soils at frequencies of months to years, over periods representing one to many years of subsidence.

### Flux method

The flux method uses chamber-based techniques or eddy covariance in combination with auxiliary carbon pool data from the study sites.

#### *Dark chamber measurements*

Chamber flux measurements are made with varying frequency over short periods with dark chambers to determine total respiration (R<sub>t</sub>), which includes autotrophic (R<sub>a</sub>) plus heterotrophic (R<sub>h</sub>) respiration from the soil and heterotrophic respiration from litter. To obtain organic soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the observed flux (R<sub>t</sub>) must be adjusted for contributions from other carbon pools (e.g. litter) and autotrophic (plant root) respiration needs to be subtracted (Ojanen *et al.*, 2012). For these calculations, the proportion of R<sub>h</sub> to R<sub>t</sub> was estimated from a limited number of studies.

As with any mass balance approach, outputs must be balanced against inputs to calculate a net flux to the atmosphere. Thus, inputs in the form of root mortality and above-ground litterfall are important in calculating net carbon loss or gain. Tier 1 assumes that the litter pool remains constant in land remaining in a land-use category, so litter inputs to SOC are equal to litterfall plus root mortality. While litterfall is relatively easy to measure, below-ground litter inputs are hard to measure directly (Gaudinski *et al.*, 2010; Finér *et al.*, 2011; Sah *et al.*, 2011). Estimates of litter inputs were made from a limited number of studies and were subtracted from R<sub>h</sub> to estimate the net flux of carbon to the atmosphere. On Peatlands Managed for Extraction, no vegetation is present and so the net change in soil carbon was assumed to be R<sub>h</sub>.

#### *Transparent chamber measurements*

CO<sub>2</sub> emission measurements using transparent chambers determine net ecosystem exchange (NEE), i.e. the balance between R<sub>t</sub> and gross primary productivity (GPP). To obtain SOC emissions, NEE must be corrected for the contributions from other carbon pools (e.g. litter, above-ground biomass, etc.). Design and use of transparent chambers are described in detail by Drösler (2005).

#### *Eddy covariance flux measurements*

The eddy covariance (EC) method is the most useful for larger sites or at landscape scales. Sophisticated instrumentation and data-processing software calculate fluxes of gases by the covariance of gas concentrations with upward and downward movements of air parcels. In its simplest interpretation for CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes, the EC method measures NEE (the balance of ecosystem respiration and GPP). Whenever photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) is zero (such as at night), GPP is zero and NEE is equivalent to ecosystem respiration or R<sub>t</sub>. In essence, the strategy for obtaining R<sub>h</sub> from EC results is the same as for transparent chambers; correction is required for R<sub>a</sub> (above-ground and below-ground), removals of biomass carbon, inputs of carbon from fertilisers, etc.

### Subsidence method

Drainage of an organic soil leads to subsidence or loss of elevation (Armentano & Menges, 1986; Grønlund *et al.*, 2008; Leifeld *et al.*, 2011). Oxidative loss of carbon can be related to volume loss of the organic soil using bulk density and soil carbon content obtained from soil cores or pits. Total subsidence of the drained organic soil surface is tracked over time using elevation markers. Other markers, such as pollen, have been used to correlate horizons among cores (Minkinen *et al.*, 1999) as an aid to determining subsidence rates.

The parameters used for calculating emissions in each study varied slightly. We applied a standardised approach to calculating emissions from each study so that assumptions across sites would be consistent. CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimates are obtained by converting the volume loss to carbon via bulk density, carbon content and estimates of

the oxidised fraction of the volume lost compared with compaction. Bulk density was considered to remain constant over short periods of time and oxidation fractions were calculated from data in each paper, when available, or data from similar sites were used when data were not available. In all papers in tropical climate, carbon content was measured by loss on ignition, which may lead to an underestimate of the carbon content. For these studies, carbon content was estimated using the relationship of Warren *et al.* (2012). Subsidence emissions were corrected for DOC losses using Tier 1 default factors from Section 2.2.1.2.

#### *Tropical emission/removal factors*

Two types of data were available for the tropical climate zone: flux studies and studies based on subsidence. Integrating the two approaches was problematic because the data for each approach were different and because many studies had not measured all parameters required to fully assess C losses. The approach that was finally adopted was to calculate one estimate using a gain-loss approach based on flux data for each of the gain and loss terms of the mass balance for each land use. A second estimate was calculated using the subsidence approach, aggregated by site. The average of the two approaches was used to determine the emission factor, when there were appropriate data available for a particular land use. This was only the case for acacia and oil palm plantations.

There was divergence of opinion on several points with regard to each of the calculations described above; the general approach adopted was to calculate independent estimates using different best judgements about the application of subsidence and gain-loss calculations to the dataset and to then average the two calculations when they came to different values. One point of divergence was over the importance of consolidation of peat layers below the water table. Another was over the ability of surface flux measurements to adequately capture respiration of below-ground litter. Two calculations were made, one excluding one recently cleared subsidence site and including the below-ground carbon inputs to the measured surface fluxes. A second calculation was made including the site previously excluded and excluding below-ground inputs. The final emission factor was derived from the average of these two calculations.

Errors were propagated using the quadrature of absolute errors method (Malhi *et al.*, 2009) for each calculation. Most estimates converged, but several estimates differed by more than 4 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>. These differences were not statistically significant and means from each approach were within the 95% confidence interval of each other. To resolve the discrepancy between the two approaches, the final emission factor was determined to be the mean of the two approaches. The uncertainty interval was taken from the highest and lowest values of the 95% confidence interval for either approach.

### **Selection of studies**

A dramatic increase in published studies of CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes occurred recently but not all studies reported results that could be used to develop Table 2.1. Studies included in the derivation of emission factors were assessed on the basis of a set of quality criteria.

- Study site characteristics (site location, land use, soil type, peat depth, land-use history prior to current land use described, and water table). Sites on drained organic soils were included. All sites in the boreal and temperate zone had a decadal history of reported land use. Sites in tropical climate had at least six years of drainage and current land use.
- Experimental study design: need for exclusion of unrealistic data, e.g. extreme fertilisation, extreme water table level. Only “control” and common practice sites were included. Many experimental studies involved manipulations other than drainage so often their results could not be used; exceptions are results from a “control” drained site. Survey studies, particularly on Cropland and Grassland, often involved fertilisation or annual cropping where corrections were often possible to determine Rh. Most studies in the boreal climate region and many in the temperate were conducted seasonally, typically from April/May through September/October (in the northern hemisphere). Annualisation of seasonal results was guided by several studies that specifically targeted winter fluxes (e.g. Alm *et al.*, 1999; Heikkinen *et al.*, 2002; Saarnio *et al.*, 2007). Tropical sites were assessed as representative of the annual flux 1) if data adequately covered dry and wet seasons, in practice seven months or more; and 2) if there were at least monthly flux observations (typically more in short studies).
- Monitoring and flux quality (study design and position of chambers and subsidence poles, temporal coverage, spatial coverage, monitoring frequency, total number of samples, number of replicates, measurement methodology, methodology used for annual flux estimates, data quality control, and uncertainty estimate for fluxes provided). Studies were accepted if there were at least three spatial replicates. Studies in tropical climate were additionally ranked from “A” = “very good and robust” to “E” = “highly uncertain, inadequate for deriving annual emission factors”. Studies classified from A to D were included in the derivation of emission factors to use the broadest possible database despite sometimes there being considerable uncertainty.

- Every site was entered as one entry into the emission factor data. Multi-year observations were averaged to a single value to avoid over-representation of sites with a long time series of observations.
- Transparency and traceability of reported values and calculations: in the case of studies with incomplete methodology description or inconsistent reported numbers, the authors of the assessed studies were contacted. This made it possible to reduce uncertainty in a few studies. Unclear studies were excluded.
- No double-counting: some studies were performed close to each other. Authors who knew the exact positions of the observation points were contacted to check whether observations were independent of each other. Sites located within a few metres of each other were treated as one. Some of the subsidence studies had large numbers of replicates, which may be partially independent of each other. There was no agreement among the authors on how to objectively split these studies into sub-sites, so each subsidence study was treated as a single site.
- Criteria for gain and loss terms of mass balance for the flux method: some studies using the flux method, including most studies in tropical climate, have reported total soil respiration only. In these cases, the reported CO<sub>2</sub> flux had to be corrected by gain and loss terms of mass balance to derive the CO<sub>2</sub> flux from the organic soil pool in Table 2.1 and to avoid double-counting with biomass and litter carbon pools. These terms are the ratio of heterotrophic to total respiration, above-ground litter input and fine root mortality (Hergoualc'h & Verchot, 2013). Whenever available, the terms were taken directly from the flux studies. Otherwise, generic land-use-specific values were developed based on studies of these terms that passed the quality criteria of study site characteristics, monitoring quality, transparency, and traceability. The ratio of heterotrophic to total respiration data was derived purely from studies on organic soils. When no data were available, e.g. for sago palm plantations and rice, the ratio was transferred from the most similar land-use type. Above-ground litter and root input were available from studies on organic soils for all land-use types except for plantations and rice. Instead of *Acacia crassicaarpa*, which is grown on organic soils, data from *Acacia mangium* chronosequences on mineral soils (Nouvellon *et al.*, 2012) were used, which best reflected the age-dependent litter production. For oil palm, data from mineral and organic soils were used (Henson & Dolmat, 2003; Lamade & Bouillet, 2005). Due to high root biomass and spatial heterogeneity (Dariah *et al.*, 2013), root input by oil palm is particularly uncertain. For sago palm, the oil palm and rice values were used for above-ground and below-ground inputs, respectively, due to lack of land-use-specific data (Kakuda *et al.*, 2005).

## **Annex 2A.2     Derivation of ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors**

The Tier 1 default emission factors presented in Table 2A.1 were derived from the published studies listed. The number of studies available remains relatively small, although some include a substantial number of individual measurement sites. Measured fluxes are generally quite variable within each soil/land-use type, and are not evenly distributed across different organic soil types (e.g. most of the data for deep-drained and shallow-drained Grassland on organic soils are obtained from studies in the Netherlands). Tier 1 defaults for  $EF_{CH_4-ditch}$  were derived from the mean of all data within each land-use class, and uncertainty ranges were calculated as 95% confidence intervals. Indicative Tier 1 default values for the fractional area of ditches within drained organic soils were calculated in the same way, except that data from the Netherlands were omitted from the Grassland classes, on the basis that fractional ditch areas are considered to be higher in that country than elsewhere, and that their inclusion would therefore lead to atypically high default values. Note that there are currently few data on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from ditches in tropical organic soils or from blanket bogs. Further published data on ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emissions may be used to refine the default values presented in Table 2.4, or to derive country-specific Tier 2 emission factors.

**TABLE 2A.1**  
**COLLATED DATA ON DITCH CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM DRAINED AND REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

<b>Organic soil/land-use type</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>, ditch</sub> (t CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	<b>Frac<sub>ditch</sub></b>
Deep-drained Grassland	The Netherlands	Schrier-Uijl <i>et al.</i> , 2010b, 2011	0.435	0.21
Deep-drained Grassland	The Netherlands	Vermaat <i>et al.</i> , 2011	0.592	0.25
Deep-drained Grassland	The Netherlands	Best & Jacobs, 1997	0.072	0.06
Deep-drained Grassland	UK	McNamara, 2013	0.580	0.04
Dee-drained Grassland	Russia	Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012	0.450	0.04
Deep-drained Grassland	Russia	Chistotin <i>et al.</i> , 2006	1.989	0.04
Deep-drained Grassland	USA	Teh <i>et al.</i> , 2011	1.704	0.05
Shallow-drained Grassland	The Netherlands	Vermaat <i>et al.</i> , 2011	0.592	0.25
Shallow-drained Grassland	The Netherlands	Best & Jacobs, 1997	0.345	0.06
Shallow-drained Grassland	The Netherlands	van den Pol-van Dasselaar <i>et al.</i> , 1999a, b, c	0.085	0.25
Shallow-drained Grassland	The Netherlands	Hendriks <i>et al.</i> , 2007, 2010	0.375	0.10
Drained treed bog	Canada	Roulet & Moore, 1995	0.114	0.03
Drained treed fen	Finland	Minkinen & Laine, 2006	0.783	0.03
Drained afforested fen	Russia	Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012	0.139	0.02
Drained afforested fen	Russia	Glagolev <i>et al.</i> , 2008	0.088	0.04
Drained treed bog	Canada	Roulet & Moore, 1995	0.028	0.03
Drained afforested bog	Russia	Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012	0.301	0.01
Drained afforested bog	Russia	Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012	0.011	0.01
Drained afforested bog	Canada	Roulet & Moore, 1995	0.192	0.03
Drained afforested bog	Sweden	von Arnold <i>et al.</i> , 2005b	0.013	0.02
Drained afforested bog	Finland	Minkinen & Laine, 2006	0.053	0.03
Peat extraction site	Finland	Nykänen <i>et al.</i> , 1995	0.133	0.02
Peat extraction site	Sweden	Sundh <i>et al.</i> , 2000	0.356	0.03
Peat extraction site	Russia	Sirin <i>et al.</i> , 2012	1.022	0.04
Peat extraction site	Russia	Chistotin <i>et al.</i> , 2006	0.797	0.04
Peat extraction site (inactive)	Finland	Hyvönen <i>et al.</i> , 2013	0.011	0.06
Peat extraction (inactive)	Canada	Waddington & Day, 2007	0.110	0.05
Drained blanket bog	UK	Cooper & Evans, 2013	0.070	0.03
Drained tropical peat (abandoned)	Indonesia	Jauhiainen & Silvennoinen, 2012	0.449	0.02
Drained tropical peat (pulpwood plantation)	Indonesia	Jauhiainen & Silvennoinen, 2012	2.939	0.02

## Annex 2A.3 Derivation of DOC emission factors

Dissolved organic carbon (DOC) is commonly the largest component of waterborne carbon loss from peatlands and organic soils, with measured fluxes from natural peatlands ranging from 0.04 to 0.63 t C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>. In many peatlands, this flux is of comparable magnitude to the rate of long-term carbon accumulation (e.g. Gorham, 1991; Turunen *et al.*, 2004), and the size of waterborne carbon flux can therefore determine whether the site is a carbon sink or source (e.g. Billett *et al.*, 2004; Rowson *et al.*, 2010). If this DOC is subsequently converted to CO<sub>2</sub> via photochemical or biological breakdown processes, this flux will also contribute to overall CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the organic soil (as an “off-site” emission). This Annex describes the methodology that was used to derive emission factors for DOC losses from drained peatlands and organic soils. At present, it is not considered possible to set reliable emission factor estimates for other forms of waterborne carbon loss, or for the effects of specific land uses and land-use changes (other than drainage) on DOC loss. Methodological requirements to develop these emission factors in the future are described in Appendix 2a.1. The approach is based on Equation 2.5.

### Estimation of DOC<sub>FLUX-NATURAL</sub>

Most available published studies of drainage impacts on DOC loss report concentration changes relative to undrained comparison sites, rather than direct (robust) flux measurements. On the other hand, a larger number of studies provide reliable DOC flux estimates from natural, or near-natural, peatland systems. These two data sources (DOC fluxes from natural sites, and DOC changes from drained-natural comparisons) were therefore combined to derive best estimates of the DOC flux from drained sites, following Equation 2.5.

Default values for DOC<sub>FLUX-NATURAL</sub> were derived from 23 published studies reporting DOC fluxes for 26 sites in total, including natural boreal and temperate raised bogs and fens, temperate blanket bogs and tropical peat swamp forests (Table 2A.2). Most data were derived from catchment-scale studies with natural drainage channels, for which accurate hydrological data are available, and to avoid double-counting of reactive DOC exports from peatlands that are rapidly converted to CH<sub>4</sub> or CO<sub>2</sub> within the ditch network (i.e. on-site emissions). Clear differences in flux were observed according to climate zone, with the lowest fluxes from boreal sites and the highest fluxes from tropical sites, supporting a simple Tier 1 classification system for natural DOC flux estimates based on this classification.

<b>TABLE 2A.2</b> <b>ANNUAL DOC FLUX ESTIMATES FROM NATURAL OR SEMI-NATURAL PEATLANDS USED TO DERIVE DEFAULT</b> <b>VALUES FOR DOC<sub>FLUX-NATURAL</sub></b>			
<b>Climate zone</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Study</b>	<b>DOC flux (t C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup>)</b>
Boreal	Finland	Juutinen <i>et al.</i> , 2013	0.037
Boreal	Canada	Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2003	0.043
Boreal	Canada	Koprivnjak & Moore, 1992	0.052
Boreal	Canada	Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2003	0.060
Boreal	Finland	Kortelainen <i>et al.</i> , 2006	0.060
Boreal	Finland	Jager <i>et al.</i> , 2009	0.078
Boreal	Sweden	Ågren <i>et al.</i> , 2008	0.099
Boreal	Finland	Rantakari <i>et al.</i> , 2010	0.120
Boreal	Sweden	Nilsson <i>et al.</i> , 2008	0.130
Boreal	Finland	Kortelainen <i>et al.</i> , 2006	0.159
Temperate	Canada	Strack <i>et al.</i> , 2008	0.053
Temperate	Canada	Roulet <i>et al.</i> , 2007	0.164
Temperate	USA	Urban <i>et al.</i> , 1989	0.212
Temperate	USA	Kolka <i>et al.</i> , 1999	0.235
Temperate	Canada	Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2003	0.290
Temperate	Canada	Clair <i>et al.</i> , 2002	0.360
Temperate	UK	Dawson <i>et al.</i> , 2004	0.194
Temperate	UK	Dinsmore <i>et al.</i> , 2010	0.260
Temperate	UK	Billett <i>et al.</i> , 2010	0.234
Temperate	UK	Billett <i>et al.</i> , 2010	0.276
Temperate	Ireland	Koehler <i>et al.</i> , 2009, 2011	0.140
Temperate	Australia	di Folco & Kirkpatrick, 2011	0.134
Tropical	Indonesia	Baum <i>et al.</i> , 2007	0.470
Tropical	Indonesia	Alkhatib <i>et al.</i> , 2007	0.549
Tropical	Malaysia	Yule & Gomez, 2009; Zulkifli, 2002	0.632
Tropical	Indonesia	Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2013	0.625

### Estimation of $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$

A total of 11 published studies were identified that provided sufficient data to calculate ratios of either DOC concentration or DOC flux between comparable drained and undrained peat sites (Table 2A.3). These included data from boreal and temperate raised bogs and fens, blanket bogs and tropical peats, and drainage for both peat extraction and land-use change to agriculture. There is a reasonable degree of consistency among the studies included; all show an increase in DOC following drainage, with an overall range of 15-118%. Most of the published studies suggest a DOC increase close to the mean (across all studies) of 60%, and there was insufficient evidence to support the use of different Tier 1  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  values for different peat types, climate zones, drainage type or drainage intensity. The use of concentration data to estimate  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  does, however, assume no corresponding change in total water flux as a result of drainage, which adds uncertainty to the calculated flux changes. This uncertainty should be relatively small for high-precipitation boreal/temperate bogs, as a large change in water flux could only occur if there is a correspondingly large change in evapotranspiration. For drier bog sites, drainage might be expected to increase water fluxes, therefore amplifying the observed concentration differences between drained and undrained sites (e.g. Strack & Zuback, 2013). However, for fens, which are fed by external groundwater or surface water inputs rather than solely by precipitation, there is greater potential for drainage to lead to fundamental changes in hydrological functioning (e.g. by routing lateral water inputs around the fen rather than through it), thus altering the water flux.

Consequently, although observed DOC concentration changes in drained fens are similar to those from drained bogs (Table 2A.3), the appropriate default value of  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  for fens is more uncertain. At Tier 1, it could therefore be assumed that the DOC flux from a drained fen is unchanged from the natural flux (i.e. that  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  is equal to zero and that the DOC export is thus equal to  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX-NATURAL}}$ ). At Tier 2, it may be possible to develop specific estimates of  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  based on paired comparisons between reliable DOC flux measurements for undrained and drained fens, either on a country-specific basis or by pooling studies in different countries. Alternatively, direct measurements of DOC export flux could be used to derive Tier 2 emission factors for DOC emissions from drained fens.

Overall, the available data support a Tier 1 default  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  value of 0.60 for drained bogs and tropical organic soils. Given difficulties in quantifying the water budget of drained fens, there is greater uncertainty about the applicable value for  $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$  for this organic soil type. Countries may therefore choose to apply the same Tier 1 default value as for other soil types, or to make the assumption that DOC export does not increase with drainage from fens, i.e. to apply the natural DOC flux value to calculate  $\text{EF}_{\text{DOC}}$ . An exception may also be made where drainage channels are cut into underlying mineral soils, as this has been found to reduce DOC loss (e.g. Moore, 2003).



TABLE 2A.3 DOC CONCENTRATION (ABOVE) OR FLUX (BELOW) COMPARISONS BETWEEN DRAINED AND UNDRAINED ORGANIC SOILS, USED TO DERIVE DEFAULT VALUE FOR $\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$						
Organic soil type	Land use	Country	Study	DOC		$\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{DRAINAGE}}$ (%)
				Undrained	Drained	
<i>Concentration-based studies (DOC mg l<sup>-1</sup>)</i>						
Boreal bog	Drainage (peat extraction)	Canada	Glatzel <i>et al.</i> , 2003	60	110	83%
Boreal fen	Drainage	Canada	Strack <i>et al.</i> , 2008	16	24.29	53%
Boreal fen	Drainage	USA	Kane <i>et al.</i> , 2010	56	71.7	29%
Boreal fen	Drainage (peat extraction)	Finland	Heikkinen, 1990	17	20	15%
Temperate bog	Drainage	Poland	Banaś & Gos, 2004	48	71	49%
Temperate bog	Drainage (peat extraction)	New Zealand	Moore & Clarkson, 2007	70	108	54%
Temperate bog	Drainage	Czech Republic	Urbanová <i>et al.</i> , 2011	36	53.9	51%
Temperate fen	Drainage	Czech Republic	Urbanová <i>et al.</i> , 2011	17	37.5	118%
Temperate blanket bog	Drainage	UK	Wallage <i>et al.</i> , 2006	28	42.9	55%
<i>Flux-based studies (DOC g m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)</i>						
Tropical peat	Drainage (sago palm)	Malaysia	Inubushi <i>et al.</i> , 1998	33	63	91%
Tropical peat	Drainage (agriculture)	Indonesia	Moore <i>et al.</i> , 2013	62	97	54%

### Estimation of $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$

The significance of DOC export in terms of greenhouse gas estimation depends on its ultimate fate, i.e. whether it is returned to the atmosphere as CO<sub>2</sub> (or even CH<sub>4</sub>) or deposited in stable forms such as lake or marine sediments. The latter simply represents a translocation of carbon between stable stores, and should therefore not be included in the estimation. The parameter  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$  sets the proportion of DOC exported from organic soils that is ultimately converted to CO<sub>2</sub>. While uncertainty remains in the estimation of this parameter, there is growing evidence that fluvial systems process a high proportion of incoming terrestrial carbon, and that much of this is converted to CO<sub>2</sub> (e.g. Algesten *et al.*, 2003; Cole *et al.*, 2007; Wickland *et al.*, 2007; Battin *et al.*, 2009). Both Algesten *et al.* (2003) and Jonsson *et al.* (2007) estimated that, within large, lake-influenced catchments in Sweden, around 50% of all terrestrially derived organic carbon was mineralised. Wickland *et al.* (2007) measured 6–15% conversion of pore-water DOC to CO<sub>2</sub>, and 10–90% conversion of the vegetation-derived DOC, during one-month dark incubations, while Raymond and Bauer (2001) measured 63% biodegradation of riverine DOC during a one-year dark incubation. Multiple studies showing a strong correlation between lake DOC concentration and dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (e.g. Sobek *et al.*, 2003; Stutter *et al.*, 2011 and references therein) all suggest widespread conversion of DOC to CO<sub>2</sub> in lakes. Dawson *et al.* (2001) estimated that 12–18% of DOC was removed within a 2 km stream reach. Experiments undertaken on light-exposed samples of peat-derived waters (Köhler *et al.*, 2002; Jones *et al.*, 2013; Worrall *et al.*, 2013) consistently show rapid and extensive DOC loss, with averages ranging from 33–75% over periods of up to 10 days. Both Köhler *et al.* (2002) and Jones *et al.* (2013) found that peat-derived DOC was more susceptible to photodegradation than DOC from other water sources, and Köhler *et al.* (2002) found that most of the DOC lost was converted to CO<sub>2</sub> (e.g. Opsahl & Benner, 1998). Jones *et al.* (2013) observed that since much of this degradation occurs within the first 48 hours, this would be sufficient to convert most peat-derived DOC to CO<sub>2</sub> before it enters the sea. Overall, Algesten *et al.* (2003) estimated that 90% of the DOC removal in the large catchments studied was due to mineralisation to CO<sub>2</sub>, with only 10% buried in lake sediments. Terrestrially-derived DOC that does reach the sea largely appears to be photochemically or microbially processed in the marine system, mostly within years to decades (Opsahl & Benner, 1997; Bianchi, 2011).

In summary, there is strong evidence that a high proportion of peat-derived DOC is mineralised rapidly in headwaters, that this processing continues at a relatively high rate through rivers and lakes, and that any peat-derived DOC that does reach the sea will nevertheless largely be mineralised in the marine ecosystem. These observations support the use of a high value for  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC-CO}_2}$ . Taking the ratio of mineralisation to sediment burial obtained by Algesten *et al.* (2003), and assuming that a similar ratio applies to any DOC exported to the ocean, would suggest that around 90% of peat-derived DOC is eventually converted to CO<sub>2</sub>. On this basis, a Tier 1

default value of 0.9 is proposed, with an uncertainty range of 0.8–1.0 to reflect uncertainties in the proportion of DOC returned to burial in lake or marine sediments.

There is some evidence that controlled burning (for moorland management) also increases DOC losses (e.g. Yallop *et al.*, 2010; di Folco & Kirkpatrick, 2011), although other experimental studies have shown no effect (e.g. Ward *et al.*, 2007; Worrall *et al.*, 2007). A precautionary estimate is that managed burning may increase mean DOC loss by 20–50%, but further work is required to resolve uncertainties on this issue (Holden *et al.*, 2012). Grazing levels on semi-natural vegetation have not been shown to affect DOC loss (Ward *et al.*, 2007; Worrall *et al.*, 2007), and data on the effects of more intensive agricultural (Grassland and Cropland) management on DOC loss are currently insufficient to estimate an emission factor. Generic values for the effects of drainage therefore may be used.

## **Annex 2A.4 Derivation of CO<sub>2</sub>-C and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors for emissions from burning of drained inland organic soils from the scientific literature in Tables 2.6 and 2.7**

CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors for fires on drained organic soils were obtained by consideration of the available scientific literature. The data presented in Tables 2.6 and 2.7 provide default values for the mass of available fuel and emission factors.

The data in Table 2.6 were obtained using a variety of approaches to calculate the mass of fuel combusted. It should be noted that there are only a limited number of publications providing ground- or laboratory-based data on the depth (i.e. volume) of soil organic material consumed. Quantitative estimation of depth of burn as well as organic soil characteristics (i.e. bulk density and carbon content) are not easy to determine in the field and so information on these key parameters is often based on theoretical assumptions or on limited ground measurements. This knowledge gap contributes considerably to overall uncertainties related to emissions from fires on organic soils because it is difficult to accurately assess the amount of fuel that is consumed. Field data on depth of burn are available from a number of studies of fires on organic soils in northern forests and peatlands in North America, Europe and Asia (e.g. Zoltai *et al.*, 1998; Turetsky & Wieder, 2001; Page *et al.*, 2002; Benscoter & Wieder, 2003; Ballhorn *et al.*, 2009; de Groot *et al.*, 2009; Turetsky *et al.*, 2011a), while in other cases, data have been extrapolated from previous studies.

Obtaining accurate field data on the depth of combustion on organic soils is problematic since there is usually a lack of reference data. Turetsky and Wieder (2001) developed a method for field assessment that considered the rooting depth of trees, while other studies have used comparison of adjacent unburnt sites to quantify combustion depth (e.g. Kasischke, 2000; Page *et al.*, 2002; de Groot *et al.*, 2009; Turetsky *et al.*, 2011a) or measurement of fuel loads before and after experimental fires (e.g. Usup *et al.*, 2004). The use of LiDAR remote sensing has also been applied in one study (Ballhorn *et al.*, 2009).

Nearly all the data presented in Table 2.6 for boreal and temperate zones are actually from the boreal zone, with only one study in the temperate zone (Poulter *et al.*, 2006) and two studies in the tropical zone (Page *et al.*, 2002; Ballhorn *et al.*, 2009). Most studies are of wildfires (i.e. unwanted and unplanned fires ignited other than by prescription (e.g. by lightning or as a result of human activities, including escaped prescribed fires as well as those started through negligence or by arson) and are for fires on undrained peatland organic soils. Only Turetsky *et al.* (2011b) provide depth-of-burn data for a wildfire on a drained boreal organic soil. In addition, there are no data for organic soil losses associated with prescribed fires in the boreal/temperate zone but some studies suggest that DOC increases following fire (see also Annex 2A.2). Most prescribed (i.e. managed) fires on the vegetation of organic soils probably result in either no or only minimal ignition loss of soil carbon.

Fuel moisture content, depth of water table and burn history will all determine the extent of organic soil combustion during a prescribed fire but the scale of loss will often depend on the skill and experience of the fire manager. In some parts of the temperate zone, prescribed rotational burning of vegetation on organic soils is a long-established land-management practice. In the UK, it is carried out on about 18% of peatlands, predominantly in the uplands (Marsden & Ebmeier, 2012), with the aim of removing older, less productive vegetation and encouraging new growth for livestock grazing and cover for game birds (Worrall *et al.*, 2010). In North America, prescribed burning of vegetation on organic soils is also practised, with a range of benefits including the reduction of wildfire hazards, improvement of wildlife habitats and restoration of ecosystem diversity and health (e.g. Christensen, 1977). Typically, prescribed burning will be carried out when fuel moisture is high enough to prevent combustion of the organic soil but low enough to carry a surface fire, thus reducing the risk of soil ignition. Shifts in climate have narrowed the window of opportunity for prescribed burning and changes in weather patterns have resulted in unexpected drying of peatlands during ongoing prescription burns. Some local fire managers have recognised this shift, but unfortunately this is a minimally studied area and little information exists on the scale of emissions arising from the combustion of organic soils during prescription burns. At Tier 1, it is assumed that there is either no or very little combustive loss of soil organic matter during prescribed fires on organic soils.

The average depth of burn of tropical organic soils has not been explored in a consistent way that representatively covers the different geographical regions, vegetation types, or fire types (i.e. wild vs. prescribed fires). There have been a limited number of field measurements of depth of burn and estimates of organic soil combustion losses. These have used either direct field measurements (e.g. Page *et al.*, 2002; Usup *et al.*, 2004) or a combination of field measurements and LiDAR data (e.g. Ballhorn *et al.*, 2009). There are only three studies of wildfires on drained organic soils and none in undrained organic soils, although other studies have demonstrated that, when in an intact condition, tropical peat swamp forest is at very low risk of fire (e.g. Page *et al.*, 2002).

There have been a limited number of studies investigating depth of burn on drained organic soils under agricultural management (e.g. Saharjo & Munoz, 2005). Prescribed agricultural burning is undertaken on both a small and a large scale to improve soil fertility and/or to remove forest or crop residues during land preparation activities. For example, traditional “*sonor*” rice cultivation on shallow organic soils involves regular burning of crop residues along with the soil surface to enhance soil fertility. In addition to field measurements, there have been limited laboratory-based burn tests aimed at establishing environmental controls on depth of organic soil combustion (e.g. Benscoter *et al.*, 2011). While more field and laboratory experiments to determine fuel consumption during fires on organic soils are needed (French *et al.*, 2004), there is also a need for improved remote sensing methods to aid burn severity mapping in peatlands (defined as the magnitude of ecological changes between pre- and post-fire conditions), which can provide an indication of the likely depth of burn. Burn severity is not easy to either investigate or quantify but there have been a limited number of studies using spectral indices to discriminate different levels of burn severity in boreal and temperate forests (e.g. van Wagendonk *et al.*, 2004; Epting *et al.*, 2005; Hall *et al.*, 2008) but only one study to date of tropical organic soils (Hoscilo *et al.*, 2013). Even regionally developed consumption models can have large uncertainties with respect to organic soil consumption. The development of robust methodologies to assess burn severity and total organic soil consumption in wetlands would enable more accurate quantification of carbon emissions from both above-ground and below-ground fires for reporting at higher tiers.

Accurate assessment of the volume of organic soil combusted during a fire will only be feasible at Tier 2 and Tier 3, while at Tier 1 some simplifying assumptions are required.

## Appendix 2a.1 Estimation of Particulate Organic Carbon (POC) and Dissolved Inorganic Carbon (DIC) loss from peatlands and drained organic soils: Basis for future methodological development

This Appendix provides a basis for future methodological development rather than complete guidance.

### Particulate Organic Carbon

Particulate organic carbon (POC) is generally a negligible component of the carbon balance of natural peatlands and organic soils. However, disturbance of organic soils through land-use change, including drainage (which can include the dredging of peat from drains and canals), burning (managed burning and wildfire), conversion to arable land and peat extraction, can all result in high rates of POC loss via waterborne erosion and also wind erosion. In actively eroding blanket bogs, POC losses in excess of  $100 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  may represent the dominant form of soil carbon loss (e.g. Pawson *et al.*, 2008; Worrall *et al.*, 2011).

Available data suggest that the key determinant of POC loss is the proportion of the total area occupied by exposed (bare) peat, according to Equation 2A.1. The bare peat area,  $PEAT_{BARE}$ , would include unvegetated drainage ditches, erosion gullies, peat extraction surfaces and areas of the soil surface exposed by burning, intensive grazing or the deposition of peat dredged from drainage channels onto the land surface. For Cropland, some estimation of the annual average proportion of the organic soil surface exposed over the full crop rotation would be required. Data from eroding UK blanket bogs suggest that waterborne POC exports can be reasonably well predicted based on a POC flux from bare peat surfaces ( $POC_{FLUX\_BAREPEAT}$ ) of around  $4 \text{ t C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  (Goulsbra *et al.*, 2013). Further work is required to establish whether different values would be applicable to other soil types, land-use types and climate regimes (in particular whether it is dependent on precipitation amount or intensity). At present, there are few data on which to base an estimate of airborne POC loss, and further work is required to quantify this loss term, which may be large in peat extraction and Cropland sites.

Finally, there is limited information currently available from which to derive a value for the proportion of POC ultimately converted to  $\text{CO}_2$  ( $Frac_{POC-CO_2}$ ). Unlike DOC, a substantial proportion of POC is mobilised from organic soils through physical erosion processes, and its reactivity in fluvial systems is uncertain. Some studies have shown fairly high rates of POC turnover in river and estuarine systems (e.g. Sinsabaugh & Findlay, 1995), and POC redeposited on floodplains may be subject to moderate rates of oxidation (Goulsbra *et al.*, 2013). However, it is likely that a significant proportion of waterborne POC loss from organic soils may simply be transferred to lake or coastal sediments, redeposited on floodplains or transported to other land areas via aeolian transport, rather than converted to  $\text{CO}_2$ . Further research is therefore needed to establish realistic ranges for  $Frac_{POC-CO_2}$  in different systems.

**EQUATION 2A.1**

**CALCULATION OF POC EXPORT FROM DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$EF_{POC} = POC_{FLUX\_BAREPEAT} \bullet PEAT_{BARE} \bullet Frac_{POC-CO_2}$$

Where:

$EF_{POC}$  = POC emission factor,  $\text{t C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$

$POC_{FLUX\_BAREPEAT}$  = Flux of POC from a bare peat surface,  $\text{t C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$

$PEAT_{BARE}$  = Proportion of the ground surface occupied by exposed peat

$Frac_{POC-CO_2}$  = Conversion factor for the fraction of POC converted to  $\text{CO}_2$  following export from site

### Dissolved Inorganic Carbon

Waterborne carbon fluxes from organic soils, comprising bicarbonate ion ( $\text{HCO}_3^-$ ), carbonate ions ( $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ ) and free  $\text{CO}_2$ , are collectively termed dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC). These different carbon species exist in equilibrium, depending primarily on the pH of the water. In water-draining low-pH organic soils (i.e. bogs), almost all DIC is present as  $\text{CO}_2$ . Most of this  $\text{CO}_2$  derives from autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration within organic soils, and is transferred laterally from soils into drainage waters, where it is consistently present at concentrations well in excess of atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations. This supersaturated  $\text{CO}_2$  will be emitted ("evaded" or "degassed") to the atmosphere, typically within a few kilometres of its source (e.g. Hope *et al.*, 2001). Limited measurements of  $\text{CO}_2$  evasion from natural peatlands suggest that this emission is a quantitatively significant component of the overall carbon budget. For example, Dinsmore *et al.* (2010) recorded

a DIC flux of 0.12–0.16 t C ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup> at a Scottish peatland catchment, of which over 90% was evaded to the atmosphere within the first 5 km of stream length. Although this may be considered an “on-site” emission, in practice it will not be measured as part of the terrestrial CO<sub>2</sub> emission using chamber-based methods, and is unlikely to be captured by eddy covariance methods. Consequently, direct measurements of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from water bodies draining organic soils (e.g. using floating chambers or gas transfer coefficients linked to measurements of dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> within the water column) are likely to be required in order to obtain reliable estimates of this component of the carbon flux. Currently, only a few such measurements are available for undrained organic soils (e.g. Hope *et al.*, 2001; Billett & Moore, 2008; Dinsmore *et al.*, 2009, 2010; Wallin *et al.*, 2011). For drained organic soils, insufficient data are currently available to permit default emission factors to be developed. Further measurements of CO<sub>2</sub> evasion for a range of climate zones, soil types, land-use classes and drainage systems are therefore required to support future methodological development in this area. Care is required to avoid double-counting of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with mineralisation of DOC within downstream water bodies, as opposed to direct degassing of CO<sub>2</sub> released from the organic soil into the water body.

As noted above, other components of the DIC flux can be considered minor for bogs, due to their low pH. This is not the case for fens, which have a higher pH, so that HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup> may form significant components of total DIC export. However, a high proportion of this flux may derive from weathering processes external to the organic soil (i.e. in groundwater or river water inputs to the fen) and this geogenic flux cannot be considered a part of the internal carbon budget of the organic soil (Fiedler *et al.*, 2008). On the other hand, autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration processes may also generate dissolved CO<sub>2</sub>, which can then dissociate to form HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup> in alkaline waters. This flux *does* form a component of the organic soil carbon balance, but further work is needed in order to: 1) quantify this flux (particularly for drained organic soils); 2) differentiate this biogenic DIC from geogenic DIC (e.g. using isotopic methods); and 3) determine the proportion of DIC exported from organic soils that is ultimately returned to the atmosphere as CO<sub>2</sub>, rather than sequestered into sediments, such as marine carbonate deposits.

Finally, available data consistently suggest that, other than emissions from drainage ditches (see Section 2.2.2.1), on- or off-site emissions of dissolved CH<sub>4</sub> from water bodies represent a negligible component of the total carbon and greenhouse gas budget of organic soils (e.g. Hope *et al.*, 2001; Dinsmore *et al.*, 2010; Billett & Harvey, 2013).

## References

- Ågren, A., Jansson, M., Ivarsson, H., Bishop, K. & Seibert, J. (2008) Seasonal and runoff-related changes in total organic carbon concentrations in the River Öre, Northern Sweden. *Aquatic Science* **70**: 21–29.
- Ahlholm, U. & Silvola, J. (1990) Turvetuotannon ja turpeen käytön osuus maapallon ja Suomen hiilitaseessa. Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ser. D 183, 1–57 (in Finnish).
- Akagi, S.K., Yokelson, R.J., Wiedinmyer, C., Alvarado, M.J., Reid, J.S., Karl, T., Crounse, J.D. & Wennberg, P.O. (2011) Emission factors for open and domestic biomass burning for use in atmospheric models. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **11**: 4039–4072.
- Algesten, G., Sobek, S., Bergström, A.-K., Ågren, A., Tranvik, L. & Jansson, M. (2003) Role of lakes for organic carbon cycling in the boreal zone. *Global Change Biology* **10**: 141–147.
- Ali, M., Taylor, D. & Inubushi, K. (2006) Effects of environmental variations on CO<sub>2</sub> efflux from a tropical peatland in Eastern Sumatra. *Wetlands* **26**: 612–618.
- Alkhatib, M., Jennerjahn, T.C. & Samiaji, J. (2007) Biogeochemistry of the Dumai River estuary, Sumatra, Indonesia, a tropical blackwater river. *Limnology and Oceanography* **52**: 2410–2417.
- Alm, J., Saarnio, S., Nykänen, H., Silvola, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (1999) Winter CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes on some boreal natural and drained peatlands. *Biogeochemistry* **44**: 163–186.
- Amiro, B.D., Todd, J.B., Wotton, B.M., Logan, K.A., Flannigan, M.D., Stocks, B.J., Mason, J.A., Martell, D.J. & Hirsch, K.G. (2001) Direct carbon emissions from Canadian forest fires, 1959–1999. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **31**: 512–525.
- Armentano, T.V. & Menges, E.S. (1986) Patterns of change in the carbon balance of organic soil – wetlands of the temperate zone. *Journal of Ecology* **74**: 755–774.
- Augustin, J. (2003) Gaseous emissions from constructed wetlands and (re)flooded meadows. *Publicationes Instituti Geographici Universitatis Tartuensis* **94**: 3–8.
- Augustin, J. & Merbach, W. (1998) Greenhouse gas emissions from fen mires in Northern Germany: quantification and regulation. In: *Beiträge aus der Hallenser Pflanzenernährungsforschung*, ed. W. Merbach & L. Wittenmayer, pp. 97–110. Beuren, Germany: Grauer.
- Augustin, J., Merbach, W., Käding, H., Schmidt, W. & Schalitz, G. (1996) Lachgas- und Methanemission aus degradierten Niedermoorstandorten Nordostdeutschlands unter dem Einfluß unterschiedlicher Bewirtschaftung. In: *Von den Ressourcen zum Recycling*, ed. Alfred-Wegener-Stiftung, pp. 131–139. Berlin, Germany: Ernst & Sohn.
- Augustin, J., Merbach, W., Steffens, L. & Snelinski, B. (1998) Nitrous oxide fluxes of disturbed minerotrophic peatlands. *Agrobiological Research* **51**: 47–57.
- Aulakh, M.S. & Bijay-Singh (1997) Nitrogen losses and fertilizer N use efficiency in irrigated porous soils. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **47**: 197–212.
- Ballhorn, U., Siegert, F., Mason, M. & Limin, S. (2009) Derivation of burn scar depths and estimation of carbon emissions with LIDAR in Indonesian peatlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **106**: 21213–21218.
- Banaś, K. & Gos, K. (2004) Effect of peat-bog reclamation on the physico-chemical characteristics of ground water in peat. *Polish Journal of Ecology* **52**: 69–74.
- Basuki, S., Suwardi & Munoz, C.P. (2012) Emission of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> from plantation forest of *Acacia crassiparva* on peatlands in Indonesia. In: *Proceedings of the 14th International Peat Congress*. Stockholm, Sweden, 3–8 June.
- Battin, T.J., Luysaert, S., Kaplan, L.A., Aufdenkampe, A.K., Richter, A. & Tranvik, L.J. (2009) The boundless carbon cycle. *Nature Geoscience* **2**: 598–600.
- Baum, A., Rixen, T. & Samiaji, J. (2007) Relevance of peat draining rivers in central Sumatra for the riverine input of dissolved organic carbon into the ocean. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **73**: 563–580.
- Benscoter, B.W. & Wieder, R.K. (2003) Variability in organic matter lost by combustion in a boreal bog during the 2001 Chisholm fire. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **33**: 2509–2513.
- Benscoter, B.W., Thompson, D.K., Waddington, J.M., Flannigan, M.D., Wotton, B.M., de Groot, W.J. & Turetsky, M.R. (2011) Interactive effects of vegetation, soil moisture, and bulk density on depth of burning of thick organic soils. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **20**: 418–429.

- Best, E.P.H. & Jacobs, F.H.H. (1997) The influence of raised water table levels on carbon dioxide and methane production in ditch-dissected peat Grasslands in the Netherlands. *Ecological Engineering* **8**: 129–144.
- Bianchi, T.S. (2011) The role of terrestrially derived organic carbon in the coastal ocean: a changing paradigm and the priming effect. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **108**: 19473–19481.
- Billett, M.F. & Harvey, F.H. (2013) Measurements of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> evasion from UK Peatland headwater streams. *Biogeochemistry* doi: 10.1007/s10533-012-9798-9.
- Billett, M.F. & Moore, T.R. (2008) Supersaturation and evasion of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> in surface waters at Mer Bleue peatland, Canada. *Hydrological Processes* **22**: 2044–2054.
- Billett M.F., Charman, D.J., Clark, J.M., Evans, C.D., Evans, M.G., Ostle, N.J., Worrall, F., Burden, A., Dinsmore, K.J., Jones, T., McNamara, N.P., Parry, L., Rowson, J.G. & Rose, R. (2010) Carbon balance of UK peatlands: current state of knowledge and future research challenges. *Climate Research* **45**: 13–29.
- Billett, M.F., Palmer, S.M., Hope, D., Deacon, C., Storeton-West, R., Hargreaves, K.J., Flechard, C. & Fowler, D. (2004) Linking land-atmosphere-stream carbon fluxes in a lowland peatland system. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **18**: GB1024.
- Blodau, C. (2002) Carbon cycling in peatlands: a review of processes and controls. *Environmental Reviews* **10**: 111–134.
- Brady, M.A. (1997) Organic matter dynamics of coastal peat deposits in Sumatra, Indonesia [PhD thesis]. Department of Forestry, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Bremner, J.M. (1997) Sources of nitrous oxide in soils. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **49**: 7–16.
- Cahoon, D.J., Stocks, B.J., Levine, J., Cofer, W. & Pierson, J. (1994) Satellite analysis of the severe 1987 forest fire in northern China and southeastern Siberia. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **99**: 18627–18638.
- Charman, D. (2002) *Peatlands and Environmental Change*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Chimner, R.A. (2004) Soil respiration rates of tropical peatlands in Micronesia and Hawaii. *Wetlands* **24**: 51–56.
- Chimner, R.A. & Ewel, K.C. (2004) Differences in carbon fluxes between forested and cultivated Micronesian tropical peatlands. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **12**: 419–427.
- Chimner, R.A. & Ewel, K.C. (2005) A tropical freshwater wetland: II. Production, decomposition, and peat formation. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **13**: 671–684.
- Chistotin, M.V., Sirin, A.A. & Dulov, L.E. (2006) Seasonal dynamics of carbon dioxide and methane emission from a peatland in Moscow Region drained for peat extraction and agricultural use. *Agrokhimiya* **6**: 54–62.
- Christensen, N.L. (1977) Fire and soil-plant nutrient relations in a pine-wiregrass savanna on the coastal plain of North Carolina. *Oecologia* **31**: 27–44.
- Christian, T.J., Kleiss, B., Yokelson, R.J., Holzinger, R., Crutzen, P.J., Hao, W.M., Saharjo, B.H. & Ward, D.E. (2003) Comprehensive laboratory measurements of biomass-burning emissions: 1. Emissions from Indonesian, African and other fuels. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **108**: D23. doi: 4710.1029/2003JD003704.
- Christian, T.J., Yokelson, R.J., Carvalho Jr, J.A., Griffith, D.W.T., Alvarado, E.C., Santos, J.C., Neto, T.G.S., Veras, C.A.G. & Hao, W.M. (2007) The tropical forest and fire emissions experiment: trace gases emitted by smoldering logs and dung from deforestation and pasture fires in Brazil. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **112**: D18308. doi: 18310.11029/12006JD008147.
- Clair, T.A., Arp, P., Moore, T.R., Dalvac, M. & Meng, F.-R. (2002) Gaseous carbon dioxide and methane, as well as dissolved organic carbon losses from a small temperate wetland under a changing climate. *Environmental Pollution* **116**: S143–S148.
- Cofer III, W.R., Levine, J.S., Sebacher, D.I., Winstead, E.L., Riggan, P.J., Stocks, B.J., Brass, J.A., Ambrosia, V.G. & Bost, P.J. (1989) Trace gas emissions from chaparral and boreal forest fuels. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **94**: 2255–2259.
- Cofer III, W.R., Levine, J.S., Winstead, E.L. & Stocks, B.J. (1990) Gaseous emissions from Canadian boreal forest fires. *Atmosphere and Environment, Part A* **24**: 1653–1659.
- Cole, J.J., Prairie, Y.T., Caraco, N.F., McDowell, W.H., Tranvik, L.J., Striegl, R.G., Duarte, C.M., Kortelainen, P., Downing, J.A., Middelburg, J.J. & Melack, J. (2007) Plumbing the global carbon cycle: integrating inland waters into the terrestrial carbon budget. *Ecosystems* **10**: 171–184.



- Comeau, L.-P., Hergoualc'h, K., Smith, J.U. & Verchot, L. (2013) *Conversion of intact peat swamp forest to oil palm plantation: effects on soil CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in Jambi, Sumatra*. Working Paper 110. Bogor, Indonesia: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Cooper, M. & Evans, C. (2013) CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from ditches in a drained upland blanket bog, North Wales, UK. In: Emissions of greenhouse gases associated with peatland drainage waters. Report to Defra under project SP1205: Greenhouse gas emissions associated with non-gaseous losses of carbon from peatlands – fate of particulate and dissolved carbon. Report to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
- Couwenberg, J. & Hooijer, A. (2013) Towards robust subsidence-based soil carbon emission factors for peat soils in south-east Asia, with special reference to oil palm plantations. *Mires and Peat* **12**: 1–13.
- Couwenberg, J., Thiele, A., Tanneberger, F., Augustin, J., Bärtsch, S., Dubovik, D., Liashchynskaya, N., Michaelis, D., Minke, M., Skuratovich, A. & Joosten, H. (2011) Assessing greenhouse gas emissions from peatlands using vegetation as a proxy. *Hydrobiologia* **674**: 67–89.
- Czaplak, I. & Dembek, W. (2000) Polish peatlands as a source of emission of greenhouse gases. *Zeszyty Edukacyjne wyd. IMUZ* **6**: 61–71.
- Dariah, A., Marwanto, S. & Agus, F. (2013) Peat CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from oil palm plantations, separating root-related and heterotrophic respirations. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* doi: 10.1007/S11027/013/95915/6.
- Darung, U., Morishita, T., Takakai, F., Dohong, S., Limin, H.S. & Hatano, R. (2005) The effects of forest fire and agriculture on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from tropical peatlands, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. In: *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Human Dimension of Tropical Peatland under Global Environmental Changes*, pp. 112–119. Bogor, Indonesia, 8–9 December 2004.
- Davidson, E.A. (1991) Fluxes of nitrous oxide and nitric oxide from terrestrial ecosystems. In: *Microbial Production and Consumption of Greenhouse Gases: Methane, Nitrogen Oxides and Halomethanes*, ed. J.E. Rogers & W.B. Whitman, pp. 219–235. Washington, DC, USA: American Society for Microbiology.
- Dawson, J.J.C., Bakewell, T. & Billett, M.F. (2001) Is in-stream processing an important control on spatial changes in carbon fluxes in headwater catchments? *Science of the Total Environment* **265**: 153–167.
- Dawson, J.J.C., Billett, M.F., Hope, D., Palmer, S.M. & Deacon, C.M. (2004) Sources and sinks of aquatic carbon in a peatland stream continuum. *Biogeochemistry* **70**: 71–92.
- de Groot, W.J. & Alexander, M.E. (1986) Wildfire behavior on the Canadian Shield: case study of the 1980 Chachukew Fire, east-central Saskatchewan. In: *Proceedings of the Third Central Region Fire Weather Committee Science and Technology Seminar, Winnipeg, Manitoba*. Canadian Forest Service, Western and Northern Regions, Northern Forestry Centre, Edmonton, Canada.
- de Groot, W.J., Pritchard, J. & Lynham, T.J. (2009) Forest floor fuel consumption and carbon emissions in Canadian boreal forest fires. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **39**: 367–382.
- Dechow, R. & Freibauer, A. (2011) Assessment of German nitrous oxide emissions using empirical modelling approaches. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **91**: 235–254.
- Deverel, S.J. & Leighton, D.A. (2010) Historic, recent, and future subsidence, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, USA. *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science* **8**(2).
- di Folco, M.-B. & Kirkpatrick, J.B. (2011) Topographic variation in burning-induced loss of carbon from organic soils in Tasmanian moorlands. *Catena* **87**: 216–255.
- DID and LAWO (1996) Western Johore integrated agricultural development project. Peat soil management study. Department of Irrigation and Drainage (DID), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and Land and Water Research Group (LAWO), Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Dinsmore, K.J., Billett, M.F. & Moore, T.R. (2009) Transfer of carbon dioxide and methane through the soil-water-atmosphere system at Mer Bleue peatland, Canada. *Hydrological Processes* **23**: 330–341.
- Dinsmore, K.J., Billett, M.F., Skiba, U.M., Rees, R.M., Drewer, J. & Helfter, C. (2010) Role of the aquatic pathway in the carbon and greenhouse gas budgets of a peatland catchment. *Global Change Biology* **16**: 2750–2762.
- Dobbie, K.E., McTaggart, I.P. & Smith, K.A. (1999) Nitrous oxide emissions from intensive agricultural systems: variations between crops and seasons, key driving variables, and mean emission factors. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **104**: 26891–26899.

- Drösler, M. (2005) Trace gas exchange and climatic relevance of bog ecosystems, Southern Germany. Technische Universität München, Freising, Germany. [www document] URL <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn:nbn:de:bvb:91-diss20050901-1249431017> (in German).
- Drösler, M., Adelmann, W., Augustin, J., Bergman, L., Beyer, C., Chojnicki, B., Förster, Ch., Freibauer, A., Giebel, M., Görlitz, S., Höper, H., Kantelhardt, J., Liebersbach, H., Hahn-Schöfl, M., Minke, M., Petschow, U., Pfadenhauer, J., Schaller, L., Schägner, Ph., Sommer, M., Thuille, A. & Wehrhan, M. (2013) Klimaschutz durch Moorschutz. Schlussbericht des BMBF-Vorhabens: Klimaschutz - Moornutzungsstrategien 2006–2010. [www document] URL <http://edok01.tib.uni-hannover.de/edoks/e01fb13/735500762.pdf>.
- Elsgaard, L., Gorres, C.-M., Hoffmann, C.C., Blicher-Mathiesen, G., Schelde, K. & Petersen, S.O. (2012) Net ecosystem exchange of CO<sub>2</sub> and carbon balance for eight temperate organic soils under agricultural management. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **162**: 52–67.
- Epting, J., Verbyla, D. & Sorbel, B. (2005) Evaluation of remotely sensed indices for assessing burn severity in interior Alaska using Landsat TM and ETM+. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **96**: 328–339.
- Ernfors, M., Rütting, T. & Klemetsson, L. (2011) Increased nitrous oxide emissions from a drained organic forest soil after exclusion of ectomycorrhizal mycelia. *Plant and Soil* **343**: 161–170.
- Fiedler, S., Höll, B.S., Freibauer, A., Stahr, K., Drösler, M., Schlöter, M. & Jungkunst, H.F. (2008) Particulate organic carbon (POC) in relation to other pore water carbon fractions in drained and rewetted fens in Southern Germany. *Biogeosciences* **5**: 1615–1623.
- Finér, L., Ohashi, M., Noguchi, K. & Hirano, Y. (2011) Fine root production and turnover in forest ecosystems in relation to stand and environmental characteristics. *Forest Ecology and Management* **262**: 2008–2023.
- Firestone, M.K. & Davidson, E.A. (1989) Microbiological basis of NO and N<sub>2</sub>O production and consumption in soil. In: *Exchange of Trace Gases between Terrestrial Ecosystems and the Atmosphere*, ed. M.O. Andreae & D.S. Schimel, pp. 7–21. New York, NY, USA: John Wiley.
- Flessa, H. & Beese, F. (1997) Einfluss unterschiedlicher Gülleapplikationstechnik auf die gasförmige Freisetzung von N<sub>2</sub>O; CH<sub>4</sub> und CO<sub>2</sub>. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Bodenkundlichen Gesellschaft* **85**(2): 883–887.
- Flessa, H., Wild, U., Klemisch, M. & Pfadenhauer, J. (1998) Nitrous oxide and methane fluxes from organic soils under agriculture. *European Journal of Soil Science* **49**: 327–335.
- French, N.H.F., Goovaerts, P. & Kasischke, E.S. (2004) Uncertainty in estimating carbon emissions from boreal forest fires. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **109**: D14. doi: 10.1029/2003JD003635.
- Furukawa, Y., Inubushi, K., Ali, M., Itang, A.M. & Tsuruta, H. (2005) Effect of changing groundwater levels caused by land-use changes on greenhouse gas emissions from tropical peatlands. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **71**: 81–91.
- Gaudinski, J., Torn, M., Riley, W., Dawson, T., Doslin, D. & Majdi, H. (2010) Measuring and modeling the spectrum of fine-root turnover times in three forests using isotopes, minirhizotrons, and the Radix model. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **24**: GB3029. doi: 10.1029/2009/GB003649.
- Gebhart, K.A., Kreidenweis, S.M. & Malm, W.C. (2001) Back-trajectory analyses of fine particulate matter measured at Big Bend National Park in the historical database and the 1996 scoping study. *Science of the Total Environment* **36**: 185–204.
- Giglio, L., Loboda, T., Roy, D.P., Quayle, B. & Justice, C.O. (2009) An active-fire based burned area mapping algorithm for the MODIS sensor. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **113**: 408–420.
- Gill, R.A. & Jackson, R.B. (2000) Global patterns of root turnover for terrestrial ecosystems. *New Phytologist* **147**: 13–31.
- Glagolev, M.V., Chistotin, M.V., Shnyrev, N.A. & Sirin, A.A. (2008) The emission of carbon dioxide and methane from drained peatlands changed by economic use and from natural mires during the summer-fall period (on example of a region of Tomsk oblast) *Agrokhimija* **5**: 46–58.
- Glatzel, S., Kalbitz, K., Dalva, M. & Moore, T. (2003) Dissolved organic matter properties and their relationship to carbon dioxide efflux from restored peat bogs. *Geoderma* **113**: 397–411.
- Glenn, S., Heyes, A. & Moore, T. (1993) Carbon dioxide and methane fluxes from drained peat soils, southern Quebec. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **7**: 247–257.

- Gorham, E. (1991) Northern peatlands: role in the carbon cycle and probable responses to climatic warming. *Ecological Applications* **1**: 182–195.
- Goulsbra, C., Evans, M. & Allott, T. (2013) Towards the estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with POC fluxes from drained and eroding peatlands. In: Emissions of greenhouse gases associated with peatland drainage waters. Report to Defra under project SP1205: Greenhouse gas emissions associated with non-gaseous losses of carbon from peatlands – fate of particulate and dissolved carbon. Report to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
- Gregoire, J.-M., Tansey, K.J. & Silva, J.M.N. (2003) The GBA2000 initiative: developing a global burnt area database from SPOT-VEGETATION imagery. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* **24**: 1369–1376.
- Grønlund, A., Hauge, A., Hovde, A. & Rasse, D.P. (2008) Carbon loss estimates from cultivated peat soils in Norway: a comparison of three methods. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **81**: 157–167.
- Grønlund, A., Sveistrup, T.E., Søvik, A.K., Rasse, D.P. & Kløve, B. (2006) Degradation of cultivated peat soils in Norway based on field scale CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emission measurements. *Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science* **52**: 149–159.
- GTOS-68 (2009) Assessment of the status of the development of the standards for the Terrestrial Essential Climate Variables. Fire Disturbance: Assessment report on available methodological standards and guides, 1 November 2009. [www document] URL [www.fao.org/gtos/doc/ECVs/T13/T13.pdf](http://www.fao.org/gtos/doc/ECVs/T13/T13.pdf)
- Guðmundsson, J. & Óskarsson, H. (2008) Summaries of GHG measurement studies. UNESCO/IHA greenhouse gas research project. Measurement Specification Workshop, London, 12–14 November.
- Hadi, A., Inubushi, K., Furukawa, Y., Purnomo, E., Rasmadi, M. & Tsuruta, H. (2005) Greenhouse gas emissions from tropical peatlands of Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **71**: 73–80.
- Hairiah, K., van Noordwijk, M. & Cadisch, G. (1999) Roots as part of the carbon and nitrogen input and output of three types of cropping systems on an Ultisol in North Lampung. In: *Proceedings of the Seminar Toward Sustainable Agriculture in Humid Tropics Facing 21st Century*, ed. C. Ginting, A. Gafur & FX Susilo, pp. 86–95. Bandar Lampung, Indonesia, 27–28 September. Bogor, Indonesia: International Centre for Research in Agroforestry.
- Hairiah, K., van Noordwijk, M. & Cadisch, G. (2000) Crop yield, C and N balance of three types of cropping systems on an Ultisol in Northern Lampung. *Netherlands Journal of Agricultural Science* **48**: 3–17.
- Hall, R.J., Freeburn, J.T., de Groot, W.J., Pritchard, J.M., Lynham, T.J. & Landry, R. (2008) Remote sensing of burn severity: experience from western Canada boreal fires. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* **17**: 476–489.
- Hamada, Y., Darung, U., Limin, S.H. & Hatano, R. (2013) Characteristics of fire-generated gas emission observed during a large peatland fire in 2009 at Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Atmospheric Environment* **74**: 177–181.
- Harrison, M.E., Cheyne, S.M., Sulistiyanto, Y. & Rieley, J.O. (2007) Biological effects of smoke from dry-season fires in non-burnt areas of the Sabangau peat swamp forest, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. Paper presented at International Symposium and Workshop Carbon–Climate–Human Interactions: Carbon Pools, Fire, Mitigation, Restoration and Wise Use, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 27–31 August. [www document] URL <http://www.geog.le.ac.uk/carbopeat/media/pdf/yogyapapers/p9.pdf>
- Heikkinen, K. (1990) Transport of organic and inorganic matter in river, brook and peat mining water in the drainage basin of the River Kiiminkijoki. *Aqua Fennica* **20**: 143–155.
- Heikkinen, J.E.P., Maljanen, M., Aurela, M., Hargreaves, K.J. & Martikainen, P. (2002) Carbon dioxide and methane dynamics in a sub-Arctic peatland in northern Finland. *Polar Research* **21**(1): 49–62.
- Heil, A., Langmann, B. & Aldrian, E. (2006) Indonesian peat and vegetation fire emissions: study on factors influencing large-scale smoke haze pollution using a regional atmospheric chemistry model. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* **12**: 113–133.
- Hendriks, D.M.D., van Huissteden, J. & Dolman, A.J. (2010) Multi-technique assessment of spatial and temporal variability of methane fluxes in a peat meadow. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **150**: 757–774.
- Hendriks, D.M.D., van Huissteden, J., Dolman, A.J. & van der Molen, M.K. (2007) The full greenhouse gas balance of an abandoned peat meadow. *Biogeosciences* **4**: 411–424.
- Henson, I.E. & Dolmat, M.T. (2003) Physiological analysis of an oil palm density trial on a peat soil. *Journal of Oil Palm Research* **15**: 1–27.

- Hergoualc'h, K. & Verchot, L.V. (2011) Stocks and fluxes of carbon associated with land-use change in Southeast Asian tropical peatlands: a review. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **25**: GB2001. doi: 10.1029/2009GB003718.
- Hergoualc'h, K. & Verchot, L.V. (2012) Changes in soil CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from the conversion of tropical peat swamp forests: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences* **9**: 93–101.
- Hergoualc'h, K. & Verchot, L.V. (2013) Greenhouse gas emission factors for land use and land-use change in Southeast Asian peatlands. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* doi: 10.1007/s11027-013-9511-x.
- Hertel, D., Harteveld, M.A. & Leuschner, C. (2009) Conversion of a tropical forest into agroforest alters the fine root-related carbon flux to the soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **41**: 481–490.
- Hirano, T., Jauhiainen, J., Inoue, T. & Takahashi, H. (2009) Controls on the carbon balance of tropical peatlands. *Ecosystems* **12**: 873–887.
- Hirano, T., Segah, H., Kusin, K., Limin, S., Takahashi, H. & Osaki, M. (2012) Effects of disturbances on the carbon balance of tropical peat swamp forests. *Global Change Biology* **18**: 3410–3422.
- Holden, J., Chapman, P.J., Palmer, S.M., Kay, P. & Grayson, R. (2012) The impacts of prescribed moorland burning on water colour and dissolved organic carbon: a critical synthesis. *Journal of Environmental Management* **101**: 92–103.
- Honrath, R.E., Owen, R.C., Val Martin, M., Reid, J.S., Lapina, K., Fialho, P., Dziobak, M.P., Kleissl, J. & Westphal, D.L. (2004) Regional and hemispheric impacts of anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions on summertime CO and O<sub>3</sub> in the North Atlantic lower free troposphere. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **109**: D24310. doi: 10.1029/2004JD005147.
- Hooijer, A., Page, S., Jauhiainen, J., Lee, W.A., Lu, X.X., Idris, A. & Anshari, G. (2012) Subsidence and carbon loss in drained tropical peatlands. *Biogeosciences* **9**: 1053–1071.
- Hope, D., Palmer, S.M., Billett, M.F. & Dawson, J.J.C. (2001) Carbon dioxide and methane evasion from a temperate Peatland stream. *Limnology and Oceanography* **46**: 847–857.
- Höper, H. (2002) Carbon and nitrogen mineralization rates in German agriculturally used fenlands. In: *Wetlands in Central Europe: Soil Organisms, Soil Ecological Processes, and Trace Gas Emissions*, ed. G. Broll, W. Merbach & E.-M. Pfeiffer, pp. 149–164. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Hoscilo, A., Tansey, K.J. & Page, S.E. (2013) Post-fire vegetation response as a proxy to quantify the magnitude of burn severity in tropical peatland. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* **34**: 412–433.
- Hyvönen, N.P., Huttunen, J.T., Shurpali, N.J., Lind, S.E., Marushchak, M.E., Heitto, L. & Martikainen, P.J. (2013) The role of drainage ditches in greenhouse gas emissions and surface leaching losses from a cutaway peatland cultivated with a perennial bioenergy crop. *Boreal Environment Research* **18**: 109–126.
- Hyvönen, N.P., Huttunen, J.T., Shurpali, N.J., Tavi, N.M., Repo, M.E. & Martikainen, P.J. (2009) Fluxes of nitrous oxide and methane on an abandoned peat extraction site: effect of reed canary grass cultivation. *Bioresource Technology* **100**: 4723–4730.
- Immirzi, C.P., Maltby, E. & Clymo, R.S. (1992) The global status of peatlands and their role in carbon cycling. Wetland Ecosystems Research Group, Department of Geography, University of Exeter, UK.
- Inubushi, K., Furukawa, Y., Hadi, A., Purnomo, E. & Tsuruta, H. (2003) Seasonal changes of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes in relation to land-use change in tropical peatlands located in coastal area of South Kalimantan. *Chemosphere* **52**: 603–608.
- Inubushi, K., Hadi, A., Okazaki, M. & Yonebayashi, K. (1998) Effect of converting wetland forest to sago palm plantations on methane gas flux and organic carbon dynamics in tropical peat soil. *Hydrological Processes* **12**: 2073–2080.
- IPCC (2010) Use of models and facility-level data in greenhouse gas inventories. In: Report of IPCC Expert Meeting on Use of Models and Measurements in Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Sydney, Australia, 9–11 August, ed. H.S. Eggleston, N. Srivastava, K. Tanabe, J. Baasansuren & M. Fukuda. IGES, Kanagawa, Japan.
- Ishida, T., Suzuki, S., Nagano, T., Osawa, K., Yoshino, K., Fukumura, K. & Nuyim, T. (2001) CO<sub>2</sub> emission rate from a primary peat swamp forest ecosystem in Thailand. *Environmental Control in Biology* **39**: 305–312.
- Ishizuka, S., Iswandi, A., Nakajima, Y., Yonemura, S., Sudo, S., Tsuruta, H. & Murdiyarso, D. (2005) The variation of greenhouse gas emissions from soils of various land-use/cover types in Jambi province, Indonesia. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **71**: 17–32.

- Itkonen, A. & Jantunen, M.J. (1986) Emissions and particle-size distribution of some metallic elements of two peat/oil-fired boilers. *Environmental Science and Technology* **20**: 335–341.
- Jaakkola, A. (1985) Lannoite ja kasviainestypen hyväksikäyttö ja häviö. Biologisen typensidonnan ja ravinnetyypen hyväksikäytön projekti. Suomen itsenäisyyden juhluvuoden 1967 rahasto. Julkaisu 13. Helsinki, Finland. 107 pp (in Finnish).
- Jacobs, C.M.J., Moors, E.J. & van der Bolt, F.J.E. (2003) Invloed van waterbeheer op gekoppelde broeikasgasemissies in het veenweidegebied by ROC Zegveld. Alterra-rapport 840. Alterra, Wageningen, The Netherlands (in Dutch).
- Jager, D.F., Wilmking, M. & Kukkonen, J.V.K. (2009) The influence of summer seasonal extremes on dissolved organic carbon export from a boreal peatland catchment: evidence from one dry and one wet growing season. *Science of the Total Environment* **407**: 1373–1382.
- Jauhiainen, J. & Silvennoinen, H. (2012) Diffusion GHG fluxes at tropical peatland drainage canal water surfaces. *Suo* **63**: 93–105.
- Jauhiainen, J., Hooijer, A. & Page, S.E. (2012a) Carbon dioxide emissions from an Acacia plantation on peatland in Sumatra, Indonesia. *Biogeosciences* **9**: 617–630.
- Jauhiainen, J., Hooijer, A. & Page, S.E. (2012c) Greenhouse gas emissions from a plantation on thick tropical peat. In: *Proceedings of the 14th International Peat Congress*. Stockholm, Sweden, 3–8 June.
- Jauhiainen, J., Limin, S., Silvennoinen, H. & Vasander, H. (2008) Carbon dioxide and methane fluxes in drained tropical peat before and after hydrological restoration. *Ecology* **89**: 3503–3514.
- Jauhiainen, J., Silvennoinen, H., Hämäläinen, R., Kusin, K., Limin, S., Raison, R.J. & Vasander, H. (2012b) Nitrous oxide fluxes from tropical peat with different disturbance history and management. *Biogeosciences* **9**: 1337–1350.
- Johnson, E.A. (1992) *Fire and Vegetation Dynamics: Studies from the North American Boreal Forest*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, T., Jones, D. & Evans, C. (2013) Conversion of waterborne DOC to CO<sub>2</sub> – results of laboratory experiments. In: Emissions of greenhouse gases associated with peatland drainage waters. Report to Defra under project SP1205: Greenhouse gas emissions associated with non-gaseous losses of carbon from peatlands – fate of particulate and dissolved carbon. Report to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
- Jonsson, A., Algesten, G., Bergström, A.-K., Bishop, K., Sobek, S., Tranvik, L.J. & Jansson, M. (2007) Integrating aquatic carbon fluxes in a boreal catchment carbon budget. *Journal of Hydrology* **334**: 141–150.
- Juutinen, S., Välimäki, M., Kuutti, V., Laine, A.M., Virtanen, T., Seppä, H., Weckström, J. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2013) Short-term and long-term carbon dynamics in a northern peatland-stream-lake continuum: a catchment approach. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* **118**: 171–183.
- Kajii, Y., Kato, S., Streets, D., Tsai, N., Shvidenko, A., Nilsson, S., McCallum, I., Minko, N., Abushenko, N., Altyntsev, D. & Khodzer, T. (2002) Boreal forest fires in Siberia in 1998: estimation of area burned and emissions of pollutants by advanced very high resolution radiometer satellite data. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **107**: D24. doi: 10.1029/2001JD001078.
- Kakuda, K.-I., Watanabe, A., Ando, H. & Jong, F.S. (2005) Effects of fertilizer application on the root and aboveground biomass of sago palm (*Metroxylon sagu* Rottb.) cultivated in peat soil. *Japanese Journal of Tropical Agriculture* **49**(4): 264–269.
- Kane, E.S., Turetsky, M.R., Harden, J.W., McGuire, A.D. & Waddington, J.M. (2010) Seasonal ice and hydrologic controls on dissolved organic carbon and nitrogen concentrations in a boreal-rich fen. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **115**: G04012. doi: 10.1029/2010JG001366.
- Kasimir-Klemetsson, Å., Klemetsson, L., Berglund, K., Martikainen, P., Silvola, J. & Oenema, O. (1997) Greenhouse gas emissions from farmed organic soils: a review. *Soil Use and Management* **13**: 245–250.
- Kasimir-Klemetsson, Å., Weslien, P. & Klemetsson, L. (2009) Methane and nitrous oxide fluxes from a farmed Swedish Histosol. *European Journal of Soil Science* **60**: 321–331.
- Kasischke, E.S. (2000) Boreal ecosystems in the carbon cycle. In: *Fire, Climate Change and Carbon Cycling in the North American Boreal Forest*, ed. E.S. Kasischke & B.J. Stocks, pp. 19–30. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag.
- Kasischke, E.S. & Bruhwiler, L.P. (2003) Emissions of carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide and methane from boreal forest fires in 1998. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **108**: 8146. doi: 10.1029/2001JD000461.

- Kasischke, E.S., Bourgeau-Chavez, L.L., Rober, A.R., Wyatt, K.H., Waddington, J.M. & Turetsky, M.R. (2009) Effects of soil moisture and water depth on ERS SAR backscatter measurements from an Alaskan wetland complex. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **113**: 1868–1873.
- Kasischke, E.S., Christensen, N.L. & Stocks, B.J. (1995) Fire, global warming, and the carbon balance of boreal forests. *Ecological Applications* **5**: 437–451.
- Kasischke, E.S., Loboda, T., Giglio, L., French, N.H.F., Hoy, E.E., de Jong, B. & Riaño, D. (2011) Quantifying burned area from fires in North American forests: implications for direct reduction of carbon stocks. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **116**: G4. doi: 10.1029/2011JG001707.
- Keeney, D.R., Fillery, I.R. & Marx, G.P. (1979) Effect of temperature on the gaseous nitrogen products of denitrification in a silty loam soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **43**: 1124–1128.
- Koehler, A.-K., Murphy, K., Kiely, G. & Sottocornola, M. (2009) Seasonal variation of DOC concentration and annual loss of DOC from an Atlantic blanket bog in South Western Ireland. *Biogeochemistry* **95**: 231–242.
- Koehler, A.-K., Sottocornola, M. & Kiely, G. (2011) How strong is the current carbon sequestration of an Atlantic blanket bog? *Global Change Biology* **17**: 309–319.
- Köhler, S., Buffam, I., Jonsson, A. & Bishop, K. (2002) Photochemical and microbial processing of stream and soil water dissolved organic matter in a boreal forested catchment in northern Sweden. *Aquatic Science* **64**: 1–13.
- Kolka, R.K., Grigal, D.F., Verry, E.S. & Nater, E.A. (1999) Mercury and organic carbon relationships in streams draining forested upland peatland watersheds. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **28**: 766–775.
- Komulainen, V.M., Nykänen, H., Martikainen, P.J. & Laine, J. (1998) Short-term effect of restoration on vegetation change and methane emissions from peatlands drained for forestry in southern Finland. *Canadian Journal of Forestry Research* **28**: 402–411.
- Koprivnjak, J.F. & Moore, T.R. (1992) Sources, sinks and fluxes of dissolved organic carbon in subarctic fen catchments. *Arctic and Alpine Research* **24**: 204–210.
- Kortelainen, P., Mattsson, T., Finér, L., Ahtiainen, M., Saukkonen, S. & Sallantausta, T. (2006) Controls on the export of C, N, P and Fe from undisturbed boreal catchments, Finland. *Aquatic Science* **68**: 453–468.
- Kreshtapova, V.N. & Maslov, B.S. (2004) Contents of carbon compounds in reclaimed peat soils as a function of the properties of peat organic matter. In: *Proceedings of 12th International Peat Congress, Vol. 2*, ed. J. Päivänen, pp. 988–992. Tampere, Finland, 6–11 June.
- Kroon, P.S., Schrier-Uijl, A.P., Hensen, A., Veenendaal, E.M. & Jonker, H.J.J. (2010) Annual balances of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O from a managed fen meadow using eddy covariance flux measurements. *European Journal of Soil Science* **61**: 773–784.
- Kuhry, P. (1994) The role of fire in the development of Sphagnum-dominated peatlands in western boreal Canada. *Journal of Ecology* **82**: 899–910.
- Kuntze, H. (1992) Peat losses by liming and fertilization of peatlands used as Grassland. In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Peat Congress, Vol. 2*, pp. 306–314.
- Laine, J., Minkkinen, K., Sinisalo, J., Savolainen, I. & Martikainen, P.J. (1996) Greenhouse impact of a mire after drainage for forestry. In: *Northern Forested Wetlands, Ecology and Management*, ed. C.C. Trettin, M.F. Jurgensen, D.F. Grigal, M.R. Gale & J.K. Jeglum, pp. 437–447. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Lewis Publishers.
- Lamade, E. & Bouillet, J.-P. (2005) Carbon storage and global change: the role of oil palm. *OCL: Oléagineux, Corps Gras, Lipides* **12**: 154–160.
- Langeveld, C.A., Segers, R., Dirks, B.O.M., van den Pol-van Dasselaar, A., Velthof, G.L. & Hensen, A. (1997) Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O from pasture on drained peat soils in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Agriculture* **7**: 35–42.
- Lapina, K., Honrath, R.E., Owen, R.C., Val Martin, M., Hyer, E.J. & Fialho, P. (2008) Late-summer changes in burning conditions in the boreal regions and their implications for NO<sub>x</sub> and CO emissions from boreal fires. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **113**: D11304. doi: 10.1029/2007JD009421.
- Laurila, T., Lohila, A., Aurela, M., Tuovinen, J.-P., Thum, T., Aro, L., Laine, J., Penttilä, T., Minkkinen, K., Riutta, T., Rinne, J., Pihlatie, M. & Vesala, T. (2007) Ecosystem-level carbon sink measurements on forested peatlands. In: *Greenhouse Impacts of the Use of Peat and Peatlands in Finland*, ed. S. Sarkkola, pp. 38–40. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry 11a/2007.

- Leifeld, J., Müller, M. & Fuhrer, J. (2011) Peatland subsidence and carbon loss from drained temperate fens. *Soil Use and Management* **27**: 170–176.
- Lloyd, C.R. (2006) Annual carbon balance of a managed wetland meadow in the Somerset Levels, UK. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **138**: 168–179.
- Lohila, A., Aurela, M., Tuovinen, J.-P. & Laurila, T. (2004) Annual CO<sub>2</sub> exchange of a peat field growing spring barley or perennial forage. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **109**: D18116. doi: 10.1029/2004JD004715.
- Lohila, A., Laurila, T., Aro, L., Aurela, M., Tuovinen, J.-P., Laine, J. & Minkkinen, K. (2007) Carbon dioxide exchange above a 30-year-old Scots pine plantation established on organic-soil Cropland. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**: 141–157.
- Lohila, A., Minkkinen, K., Aurela, M., Tuovinen, J.-P., Penttilä, T. & Laurila, T. (2011) Greenhouse gas flux measurements in a forestry-drained peatland indicate a large carbon sink. *Biogeosciences Discussions* **8**: 5787–5825.
- Lorenz, W.D., Sauerbrey, R., Eschner, D., Lehrkamp, H. & Zeitz, J. (1992) Zustand der landwirtschaftlich genutzten Niedermoore in der ehemaligen DDR. *Wasser und Boden* **44**: 58–61.
- Lucas, R.E. (1982) *Organic Soils (Histosols): Formation, Distribution, Physical and Chemical Properties and Management for Crop Production*. East Lansing, MI, USA: Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Mäkiranta, P., Hytönen, J., Aro, L., Maljanen, M., Pihlatie, M., Potila, H., Shurpali, N.J., Laine, J., Lohila, A., Martikainen, P.J. & Minkkinen, K. (2007) Soil greenhouse gas emissions from afforested organic soil Croplands and peat extraction peatlands. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**: 159–175.
- Malhi, Y., Aragão, L.E.O.C., Metcalfe, D.B., Paiva, R., Quesada, C.A., Almeida, S., Anderson, L., Brando, P., Chambers, J.Q., da Costa, A.C.L., Hutyra, L.R., Oliveira, P., Patiño, S., Pyle, E.H., Robertson, A.L. & Teixeira, L.M. (2009) Comprehensive assessment of carbon productivity, allocation and storage in three Amazonian forests. *Global Change Biology* **15**: 1255–1274.
- Maljanen, M., Alm, J., Martikainen, P.J. & Repo, T. (2010a) Prolongation of soil frost resulting from reduced snow cover increases nitrous oxide emissions from boreal forest soil. *Boreal Environment Research* **15**: 34–42.
- Maljanen, M., Hytönen, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (2001b) Fluxes of N<sub>2</sub>O, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> on afforested boreal agricultural soils. *Plant and Soil* **231**: 113–121.
- Maljanen, M., Hytönen, J., Mäkiranta, P., Alm, J., Minkkinen, K., Laine, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (2007) Greenhouse gas emissions from cultivated and abandoned organic Croplands in Finland. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**: 133–140.
- Maljanen, M., Hytönen, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (2010b) Cold-season nitrous oxide dynamics in a drained boreal peatland differ depending on land-use practice. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **40**: 565–572.
- Maljanen, M., Komulainen, V.-M., Hytönen, J., Martikainen, P.J. & Laine, J. (2004) Carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and methane dynamics in boreal organic agricultural soils with different soil management. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **36**: 1801–1808.
- Maljanen, M., Liikanen, A., Silvola, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (2003a) Methane fluxes on agricultural and forested boreal organic soils. *Soil Use Management* **19**: 73–79.
- Maljanen, M., Liikanen, A., Silvola, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (2003b) Nitrous oxide emissions from boreal organic soil under different land-use. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **35**: 689–700.
- Maljanen, M., Martikainen, P.J., Walden, J. & Silvola, J. (2001a) CO<sub>2</sub> exchange in an organic field growing barley or grass in eastern Finland. *Global Change Biology* **7**: 679–692.
- Maljanen, M., Nykänen, H., Moilanen, M. & Martikainen, P.J. (2006) Greenhouse gas fluxes of coniferous forest floors affected by wood ash fertilization. *Forest Ecology and Management* **237**: 143–149.
- Maljanen, M., Sigurdsson, B.D., Guomundsson, J., Oskarsson, H., Huttunen, J.T. & Martikainen, P.J. (2010c) Greenhouse gas balances of managed peatlands in the Nordic countries - present knowledge and gaps. *Biogeosciences* **7**: 2711–2738.
- Maljanen, M., Virkajärvi, P., Hytönen, J., Öquist, M., Sparrman, T. & Martikainen, P.J. (2009) Nitrous oxide production in boreal soils with variable organic matter content at low temperature snow manipulation experiment. *Biogeosciences* **6**: 2461–2473.

- Marsden, K. & Ebmeier, S. (2012) Peatlands and climate change. SPICe briefing 12/28 [www document] URL [www.scottish.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/S4/SB\\_12-28.pdf](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/S4/SB_12-28.pdf).
- Martikainen, P.J., Nykänen, H., Alm, J. & Silvola, J. (1995a) Change in fluxes of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide due to forest drainage of mire sites of different trophic. *Plant and Soil* **168–169**: 571–577.
- Martikainen, P.J., Nykänen, H., Crill, P. & Silvola, J. (1992) The effect of changing water table on methane fluxes at two Finnish mire sites. *Suo* **43**: 237–240.
- Martikainen, P.J., Nykänen, H., Crill, P. & Silvola, J. (1993) Effect of a lowered water table on nitrous oxide fluxes from northern peatlands. *Nature* **366**: 51–53.
- Martikainen, P.J., Nykänen, H., Regina, K., Lehtonen, M. & Silvola, J. (1995b) Methane fluxes in a drained and forested peatland treated with different nitrogen compounds. In: *Northern Peatlands in Global Climatic Change: Proceedings of the International Workshop Held in Hyttälä, Finland, 1/96*, ed. R. Laiho, J. Laine & H. Vasander, pp. 105–109. Academy of Finland, Helsinki, Finland.
- Marwanto, S. & Agus, F. (2013) Is CO<sub>2</sub> flux from oil palm plantations on peatland controlled by water table, soil moisture, day/night rhythm and/or temperature? *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* doi 10.1007/s11027-013-9518-3.
- Matthews, R.B., Wassmann, R., Buendia, L.V. & Knox, J.W. (2000) Using a crop/soil simulation model and GIS techniques to assess methane emissions from rice fields in Asia: II. Model validation and sensitivity analysis. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **58**: 161–177.
- McNamara, N. (2013) CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from ditches in a drained lowland peat Grassland, Somerset, UK. In: Emissions of greenhouse gases associated with peatland drainage waters. Report to Defra under project SP1205: Greenhouse gas emissions associated with non-gaseous losses of carbon from peatlands – fate of particulate and dissolved carbon. Report to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
- McNeil, P. & Waddington, J.M. (2003) Moisture controls on Sphagnum growth and CO<sub>2</sub> exchange on a cutover bog. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **40**: 354–367.
- Melling, L., Chaddy, A., Goh, K.J. & Hatano, R. (2013) Soil CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from different ages of oil palm in tropical peatland of Sarawak, Malaysia as influenced by environmental and soil properties. *Acta Horticulturae* **982**: 25–35.
- Melling, L., Goh, K.J., Beauvais, C. & Hatano, R. (2007a) Carbon flow and budget in a young mature oil palm agroecosystem on deep tropical peat. International Symposium and Workshop on Tropical Peatland, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 27–31 August.
- Melling, L., Hatano, R. & Goh, K.J. (2005a) Soil CO<sub>2</sub> flux from three ecosystems in tropical peatland of Sarawak, Malaysia. *Tellus* **57B**: 1–11.
- Melling, L., Hatano, R. & Goh, K.J. (2005b) Methane fluxes from three ecosystems in tropical peatland of Sarawak, Malaysia. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **37**: 1445–1453.
- Melling, L., Hatano, R. & Goh, K.J. (2007b) Nitrous oxide emissions from three ecosystems in tropical peatland of Sarawak, Malaysia. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition* **53**: 792–805.
- Meyer, K., Höper, H. & Blankenburg, J. (2001) Spurengashaushalt und Klimabilanz von Niedermooren unter dem Einfluß des Vernässungsmanagements. In: *Ökosystemmanagement für Niedermoore. Strategien und Verfahren zur Renaturierung*, ed. R. Kratz & J. Pfadenhauer, pp. 104–111. Stuttgart, Germany: Ulmer.
- Milner, L., Boom, A., Page, S.E., Moore, S. & Matthews, R. (forthcoming) Effects of fire on the organic matter composition of a tropical peatland in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Journal of Organic Geochemistry*.
- Minkinen, K. & Laine, J. (1998) Long-term effect of forest drainage on the peat carbon stores of pine mires in Finland. *Canadian Journal of Forestry Research* **28**: 1267–1275.
- Minkinen, K. & Laine, J. (2006) Vegetation heterogeneity and ditches create spatial variability in methane fluxes from peatlands drained for forestry. *Plant and Soil* **285**: 289–304.
- Minkinen, K., Laine, J., Shurpali, N., Mäkiranta, P., Alm, J. & Penttilä, T. (2007b) Heterotrophic soil respiration in forestry drained peatlands. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**: 115–126.
- Minkinen, K., Penttilä, T. & Laine, J. (2007a) Tree stand volume as a scalar for methane fluxes in forestry-drained peatlands in Finland. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**: 127–132.
- Minkinen, K., Vasander, H., Jauhiainen, S., Karsisto, M. & Laine, J. (1999) Post-drainage changes in vegetation composition and carbon balance in Lakkasuo mire, Central Finland. *Plant and Soil* **207**: 107–120.



- Moore, S., Evans, C.D., Page, S.E., Garnett, M.G., Jones, T.G., Freeman, C., Hooijer, A., Wiltshire, A., Limin, S. & Gauci, V. (2013) Deep instability of deforested tropical peatlands revealed by fluvial organic carbon fluxes. *Nature* **493**: 660–664.
- Moore, T.R. (2003) Dissolved organic carbon in a northern boreal landscape. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **17**: 1109. doi: 10.1029/2003GB002050.
- Moore, T.R. & Clarkson, B.R. (2007) Dissolved organic carbon in New Zealand peatlands. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* **41**: 137–141.
- Moore, T.R. & Knowles, R. (1990) Methane emissions from fen, bog and swamp peatlands in Quebec. *Biogeochemistry* **11**: 45–61.
- Moore, T.R., Matos, L. & Roulet, N.T. (2003) Dynamics and chemistry of dissolved organic carbon in Precambrian Shield catchments and an impounded wetland. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science* **60**: 612–623.
- Morrison, R., Cumming, A., Taft, H., Page, S., Kaduk, J., Harding, R., Jones, D. & Balzter, H. (2013) Carbon dioxide budget of a drained and intensively cultivated lowland fen in the East Anglian fen. In: Emissions of greenhouse gases from UK managed lowland peatlands. Report to Defra under project SP1210: Lowland peatland systems in England and Wales – evaluating greenhouse gas fluxes and carbon balances. Report to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
- NCDENR (1998) Smoke from peat fire could pose health concerns in Craven County. [www document] URL <http://www.ehnr.state.nc.us/newsrels/presrels.htm>.
- Nieveen, J.P., Campbell, D.I., Schipper, L.A. & Blair, I.J. (2005) Carbon exchange of grazed pasture on a drained peat soil. *Global Change Biology* **11**: 607–618.
- Nilsson, M., Sagerfors, J., Buffam, I., Laudon, H., Eriksson, T., Grelle, A., Klemetsson, L., Weslien, P. & Lindroth, A. (2008) Contemporary carbon accumulation in a boreal oligotrophic minerogenic mire – a significant sink after accounting for all C-fluxes. *Global Change Biology* **14**: 2317–2332.
- Nouvellon, Y., Laclau, J.-P., Epron, D., Le Maire, G., Bonnefond, J.-M., Gonçalves, J.L.M. & Bouillet, J.-P. (2012) Production and carbon allocation in monocultures and mixed-species plantations of *Eucalyptus grandis* and *Acacia mangium* in Brazil. *Tree Physiology* **32**: 680–695.
- Nykänen, H., Alm, J., Lang, K., Silvola, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (1995) Emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> from a virgin fen and a fen drained for Grassland in Finland. *Journal of Biogeography* **22**: 351–357.
- Nykänen, H., Alm, J., Silvola, J., Tolonen, K. & Martikainen, P.J. (1998) Methane fluxes on boreal peatlands of different fertility and the effect of long term experimental lowering of the water table on flux rates. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **12**: 53–69.
- Nykänen, H., Silvola, J., Alm, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (1996) Fluxes of greenhouse gases CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O on some peat mining areas in Finland. In: *Northern Peatlands in Global Climatic Change: Proceedings of the International Workshop Held in Hyttiälä, Finland, 1/96*, ed. R. Laiho, J. Laine & H. Vasander, pp. 141–147. Academy of Finland, Helsinki, Finland.
- Ojanen, P., Minkinen, K., Alm, J. & Penttilä, T. (2010) Soil-atmosphere CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes in boreal forestry-drained peatlands. *Forest Ecology and Management* **260**: 411–421.
- Ojanen, P., Minkinen, K., Lohila, A., Badorek, T. & Penttilä, T. (2012) Chamber measured soil respiration: a useful tool for estimating the carbon balance of peatland forest soils? *Forest Ecology and Management* **277**: 132–140.
- Ojanen, P., Minkinen, K. & Penttilä, T. (2013) The current greenhouse impact of forestry-drained peatlands. *Forest Ecology and Management* **289**: 201–208.
- Okrusko, H. (1989) Wirkung der Bodennutzung auf die Niedermoorentwicklung. Ergebnisse eines längjährigen Feldversuches. *Zf Kulturtechnik und Landentwicklung* **30**: 167–176.
- Opsahl, S. & Benner, R. (1997) Distribution and cycling of terrigenous dissolved organic matter in the ocean. *Nature* **386**: 480–482.
- Opsahl, S. & Benner, R. (1998) Photochemical reactivity of dissolved lignin in river and ocean waters. *Limnology and Oceanography* **43**: 1297–1304.
- Page, S.E., Rieley, J.O. & Banks, C.J. (2011) Global and regional importance of the tropical peatland carbon pool. *Global Change Biology* **17**: 798–818.

- Page, S.E., Siegert, F., Rieley, J.O., Bohm, H.-D.V., Jaya, A. & Limin, S. (2002) The amount of carbon released from peat and forest fires in Indonesia during 1997. *Nature* **420**: 61–65.
- Pawson, R.R., Lord, D.R., Evans, M.G. & Allott, T.E.H. (2008) Fluvial organic carbon flux from an eroding peatland catchment, southern Pennines, UK. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* **12**: 625–634.
- Petersen, S.O., Hoffmann, C.C., Schafer, C.-M., Blicher-Mathiesen, G., Elsgaard, L., Kristensen, K., Larsen, S.E., Torp, S.B. & Greve, M.H. (2012) Annual emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O, and ecosystem respiration, from eight organic soils in Western Denmark managed by agriculture. *Biogeosciences* **9**: 403–422.
- Pihlatie, M., Rinne, J., Lohila, A., Laurila, T., Aro, L. & Vesala, T. (2004) Nitrous oxide emissions from an afforested peat field using eddy covariance and enclosure techniques. In: *Proceedings of 12th International Peat Congress Vol. 2*, ed. J. Päivänen, pp. 1010–1014. Tampere, Finland, 6–11 June.
- Pitkänen, A., Turunen, J. & Tolonen, K. (1999) The role of fire in the carbon dynamics of a mire, eastern Finland. *Holocene* **9**: 453–462.
- Poulter, B., Christensen, N.L. & Halpin, P.N. (2006) Carbon emissions from a temperate peat fire and its relevance to interannual variability of trace atmospheric greenhouse gases. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **111**: D06301. doi: 06310.01029/02005JD006455.
- Rahajoe, J.S., Kohyama, T. & Limin, S.H. (2000) Litter decomposition process in two contrastive nutrient limited forest types in central Kalimantan. In: *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Tropical Peatlands*, ed. T. Iwakuma, pp. 223–231. Bogor, Indonesia, 22–23 November 1999. Hokkaido University and Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Ramadan, Z., Song, X.H. & Hopke, P.K. (2000) Identification of sources of Phoenix aerosol by positive matrix factorization. *Journal of Air Waste Management* **50**: 1308–1320.
- Rantakari, M., Mattsson, T., Kortelainen, P., Piirainen, S., Finér, L. & Ahtiainen, M. (2010) Organic and inorganic carbon concentrations and fluxes from managed and unmanaged boreal first-order catchments. *Science of the Total Environment* **408**: 1649–1658.
- Raymond, P.A. & Bauer, J.E. (2001) Riverine export of aged terrestrial organic matter to the North Atlantic Ocean. *Nature* **497**: 497–500.
- Regina, K., Nykänen, H., Maljanen, M., Silvola, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (1998) Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O and NO and net nitrogen mineralization in a boreal forested peatland treated with different nitrogen compounds. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **28**: 132–140.
- Regina, K., Nykänen, H., Silvola, J. & Martikainen, P.J. (1996) Fluxes of nitrous oxide from boreal peatlands as affected by peatland type, water table level and nitrification capacity. *Biogeochemistry* **35**: 401–418.
- Regina, K., Pihlatie, M., Esala, M. & Alakukku, L. (2007) Methane fluxes on boreal arable soils. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **119**: 346–352.
- Regina, K., Syväsalö, E., Hannukkala, A. & Esala, M. (2004) Fluxes of N<sub>2</sub>O from farmed peat soils in Finland. *European Journal of Soil Science* **55**: 591–599.
- Rein, G., Cleaver, N., Ashton, C., Pironi, P. & Torero, J.L. (2008) The severity of smouldering peat fires and damage to the forest soil. *Catena* **74**: 304–309.
- Roulet, N.T. & Moore, T.R. (1995) The effect of forestry drainage practices on the emission of methane from northern peatlands. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **25**: 491–499.
- Roulet, N.T., LaFleur, P.M., Richards, P.J., Moore, T.R., Humphreys, E.R. & Bubier, J. (2007) Contemporary carbon balance and late Holocene carbon accumulation in a northern peatland. *Global Change Biology* **13**: 397–411.
- Rowson, J.G., Gibson, H.S., Worrall, F., Ostle, N., Burt, T.P. & Adamson, J.K. (2010) The complete carbon budget of a drained peat catchment. *Soil Use and Management* **26**: 261–273.
- Roy, D.P., Boschetti, L., Justice, C.O. & Ju, J. (2008) The collection 5 MODIS burned area product—Global evaluation by comparison with the MODIS active fire product. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **112**: 3690–3707.
- Ruser, R., Flessa, H., Schilling, R., Beese, F. & Munch, J.C. (2001) Effect of crop-specific field management and N fertilization on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from a fine-loamy soil. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **59**: 177–191.
- Ryden, J.C. & Lund, L.J. (1980) Nitrous oxide evolution from irrigated land. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **9**: 387–393.

- Saari, P., Saarnio, S., Kukkonen, J.V.K., Akkanen, J., Heinonen, J., Saari, V. & Alm, J. (2009) DOC and N<sub>2</sub>O dynamics in upland and peatland forest soils after clear-cutting and soil preparation. *Biogeochemistry* **94**: 217–231.
- Saarnio, S., Morero, M., Shurpali, N.J., Tuittila, E.-S., Makila, M. & Alm, J. (2007) Annual CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes of pristine boreal mires as a background for lifecycle analyses of peat energy. *Boreal Environmental Research* **12**: 101–113.
- Sah, S.P., Jungner, H., Oinonen, M., Kukkola, M. & Helmisaari, H.-S. (2011) Does the age of fine root carbon indicate the age of fine roots in boreal forests? *Biogeochemistry* **104**: 91–102.
- Saharjo, B.H. & Munoz, C.P. (2005) Controlled burning in peat lands owned by small farmers: a case study in land preparation. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **13**: 105–110.
- Saharjo, B.H. & Nurhayati, A.D. (2005) Changes in chemical and physical properties of hemic peat under fire-based shifting cultivation. *Tropics* **14**: 263–269.
- Schothorst, C.J. (1977) Subsidence of low moor peat soils in the Western Netherlands. In: *Proceedings of the 5th International Peat Congress, Poznan, Vol. 1*, pp. 206–217.
- Schrier-Uijl, A.P., Hendriks, D.M.D., Kroon, P.S., Hensen, A., van Huissteden, J., Leffelaar, P.A., Nol, L., Veenendaal, E.M. & Berendse, F. (2010c) Flushing meadows: the influence of management alternatives on the greenhouse gas balance of fen meadow areas [Academic thesis]. Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- Schrier-Uijl, A.P., Kroon, P.S., Hensen, A., Leffelaar, P.A., Berendse, F. & Veenendaal, E.M. (2010a) Comparison of chamber and eddy covariance based CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emission estimates in a heterogeneous grass ecosystem on peat. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **150**: 825–831.
- Schrier-Uijl, A.P., Kroon, P.S., Leffelaar, P.A., van Huissteden, J.C., Berendse, F. & Veenendaal, E.M. (2010b) Methane emissions in two drained peat agro-ecosystems with high and low agricultural intensity. *Plant and Soil* **329**: 509–520.
- Schrier-Uijl, A.P., Veraart, A.J., Leffelaar, P.J., Berendse, F. & Veenendaal, E.M. (2011) Release of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> from lakes and drainage ditches in temperate wetlands. *Biogeochemistry* **102**: 265–279.
- Shimamura, T. & Momose, K. (2005) Organic matter dynamics control plant species coexistence in a tropical peat swamp forest. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **272**: 1503–1510.
- Shurpali, N.J., Hyvönen, N.P., Huttunen, J.T., Biasi, C., Nykänen, H., Pekkarinen, N. & Martikainen, P.J. (2008) Bare soil and reed canary grass ecosystem respiration in peat extraction sites in Eastern Finland. *Tellus* **60B**: 200–209.
- Shurpali, N.J., Hyvönen, N., Huttunen, J.T., Clement, R., Reichstein, M., Nykänen, H., Biasi, C. & Martikainen, P.J. (2009) Cultivation of perennial grass for bioenergy use on a boreal organic soil – carbon sink or source? *Global Change Biology Bioenergy* **1**: 35–50.
- Sikström, U., Björk, R.G., Ring, E., Ernfors, M., Jacobson, S., Nilsson, M. & Klemetsson, L. (2009) Tillförsel av aska i skog på dikad torvmark i södra Sverige. Effekter på skogsproduktion, flöden av växthusgaser, torvegenskaper, markvegetation och grundvattenkemi. VÄRMEFORSK Service AB, Stockholm (in Swedish).
- Simola, H., Pitkänen, A. & Turunen, J. (2012) Carbon loss in drained forestry peatlands in Finland, estimated by re-sampling peatlands surveyed in the 1980s. *European Journal of Soil Science* **63**: 798–807.
- Simon, M., Plummer, S., Fierens, F., Hoelzemann, J.J. & Arino, O. (2004) Burnt area detection at global scale using ATSR-2: the GLOBSCAR products and their qualification. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **109**: D14S02. doi: 10.1029/2003JD003622.
- Sinsabaugh, R.L. & Findlay, S. (1995) Microbial production, enzyme activity, and carbon turnover in surface sediments of the Hudson River estuary. *Microbes and Ecology* **30**: 127–141.
- Sirin, A.A., Suvorov, G.G., Chistotin, M.V. & Glagolev, M.V. (2012) Values of methane emission from drainage ditches. *Environmental Dynamics and Climate Change* **3**(2(6)): 1–10. [www document] URL [www.ugrasu.ru/uploads/files/EDCC\\_3\\_2\\_Sirin.pdf](http://www.ugrasu.ru/uploads/files/EDCC_3_2_Sirin.pdf) (in Russian).
- Sobek, S., Algesten, G., Bergström, A.-K., Jansson, M. & Tranvik, J. (2003) The catchment and climate regulation of pCO<sub>2</sub> in boreal lakes. *Global Change Biology* **9**: 630–641.

- Stehfest, E. & Bouwman, L. (2006) N<sub>2</sub>O and NO emission from agricultural fields and soils under natural vegetation: summarizing available measurement data and modelling of global annual emissions. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **74**: 207–228.
- Stephens, J.C., Allen, L.H. & Chen, E. (1984) Organic soil subsidence. *Reviews in Engineering Geology* **6**: 107–122.
- Strack, M. & Zuback, Y.C.A. (2013) Annual carbon balance of a peatland 10 yr following restoration. *Biogeosciences* **10**: 2885–2896.
- Strack, M., Waddington, J.M., Bourbonniere, R.A., Buckton, L., Shaw, K., Whittington, P. & Price, J.S. (2008) Effect of water table drawdown on peatland dissolved organic carbon export and dynamics. *Hydrological Processes* **22**: 3373–3385.
- Strack, M., Waddington, J.M. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2004) Effect of water table drawdown on northern peatland methane dynamics: implications for climate change. *Global Biogeochemistry Cycles* **18**: GB4003. doi: 10.1029/2003GB002209.
- Stutter, M.I., Baggaley, N., Barry, C., Chapman, S., Dawson, J.J.C., Helliwell, R.C., Higgins, A., Howden, L., Jackson-Blake, L., Lumsdon, D.G., Malcolm, I., Sample, J., Potts, J. & Worrall, F. (2011) Assessment of the contribution of aquatic carbon fluxes to carbon losses from UK peatlands. SNIFFER Report, Project ER18. James Hutton Institute, Aberdeen, UK.
- Sulistiyo, Y. (2004) Nutrient dynamics in different sub-types of peat swamp forest in central Kalimantan, Indonesia [PhD thesis]. University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.
- Sundari, S., Hirano, T., Yamada, H., Kusin, K. & Limin, S. (2012) Effects of groundwater level on soil respiration in tropical peat swamp forests. *Journal of Agricultural Meteorology* **68**: 121–134.
- Sundh, I., Nilsson, M., Mikkilä, C., Granberg, G. & Svensson, B.H. (2000) Fluxes of methane and carbon dioxide on peat-mining areas in Sweden. *Ambio* **29**: 499–503.
- Swetnam, T.W. (1993) Fire history and climate change in giant sequoia groves. *Science* **262**: 885–889.
- Taft, H., Cross, P. & Jones, D. (2013) Annual emission cycle of greenhouse gases from peat soils managed for horticultural production. In: Emissions of greenhouse gases from UK managed lowland peatlands. Report to Defra under project SP1210: Lowland peatland systems in England and Wales – evaluating greenhouse gas fluxes and carbon balances. Report to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
- Takakai, F., Morishita, T., Hashidoko, Y., Darung, U., Kuramochi, K., Dohong, S., Limin, S.H. & Hatano, R. (2006) Effects of agricultural land use change and forest fire on N<sub>2</sub>O emission from tropical peatlands, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Soil Science and Plant Nutrition* **53**: 662–674.
- Tansey, K., Grégoire, J.-M., Defourny, P., Leigh, R., Pekel, J.-F., van Bogaert, E. & Bartholomé, E. (2008) A new, global, multi-annual (2000–2007) burnt area product at 1 km resolution. *Geophysical Research Letters* **35**: L01401. doi: 10.1029/2007GL031567.
- Teh, Y.A., Silver, W.L., Sonnentag, O., Detto, M., Kelly, M. & Baldocchi, D.D. (2011) Large greenhouse gas emissions from a temperate peatland pasture. *Ecosystems* **14**: 311–325.
- Treat, C.C., Bubier, J.L., Varner, R.K. & Crill, P.M. (2007) Timescale dependence of environmental and plant-mediated controls on CH<sub>4</sub> flux in a temperate fen. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* **112**: G01014. doi: 10.1029/2006JG000210.
- Tuittila, E.-S. & Komulainen, V.-M. (1995) Vegetation and CO<sub>2</sub> balance in an abandoned harvested peatland in Aitoneva, southern Finland. *Suo* **46**: 69–80.
- Tuittila, E.S., Komulainen, V.M., Vasander, H., Nykänen, H., Martikainen, P.J. & Laine, J. (2000) Methane dynamics of a restored cut-away peatland. *Global Change Biology* **6**: 569–581.
- Tuittila, E.-S., Vasander, H. & Laine, J. (2004) Sensitivity of C sequestration in reintroduced sphagnum to water-level variation in a cutaway peatland. *Restoration Ecology* **12**: 483–493.
- Turetsky, M.R. & Wieder, R.K. (2001) A direct approach to quantifying organic matter lost as a result of peatland fire. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **31**: 363–366.
- Turetsky, M.R., Donahue, W.F. & Benscoter, B.W. (2011b) Experimental drying intensifies burning and carbon losses in a northern peatland. *Nature Communications* **2**: 514. doi: 10.1038/ncomms1523.
- Turetsky, M.R., Kane, E.S., Harden, J.W., Ottmar, R.D., Manies, K.L., Hoy, E. & Kasischke, E.S. (2011a) Recent acceleration of biomass burning and carbon losses in Alaskan forests and peatlands. *Nature Geoscience* **4**: 27–31.

- Turunen, J., Roulet, N.T. & Moore, T.R. (2004) Nitrogen deposition and increased carbon accumulation in ombrotrophic peatlands in eastern Canada. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **18**: GB3002. doi: 10.1029/2003GB002154.
- Urban, N.R., Bayley, S.E. & Eisenreich, S.J. (1989) Export of dissolved organic carbon and acidity from peatlands. *Water Resources Research* **25**: 1619–1628.
- Urbanová, Z., Pícek, T. & Bárta, J. (2011) Effect of peat re-wetting on carbon and nutrient fluxes, greenhouse gas production and diversity of methanogenic archaeal community. *Ecological Engineering* **37**: 1017–1026.
- Usup, A., Hashimoto, Y., Takahashi, H. & Hayasaka, H. (2004) Combustion and thermal characteristics of peat fire in tropical peatland in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Tropics* **14**: 1–19.
- Val Martin, M., Honrath, R.E., Owen, R.C., Pfister, G., Fialho, P. & Barata, F. (2006) Significant enhancements of nitrogen oxides, black carbon, and ozone in the North Atlantic lower free troposphere resulting from North American boreal wildfires. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **111**: D23S60. doi: 10.1029/2006JD007530.
- van Beek, C.L., Pleijter, M., Jacobs, C.M.J., Velthof, G.L., van Groenigen, J.W. & Kuikman, J. (2010) Emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from fertilized and grazed Grassland on organic soil in relation to groundwater level. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **86**: 331–340.
- van den Bos, R.M. (2003) Restoration of former wetlands in the Netherlands: effect on the balance between CO<sub>2</sub> sink and CH<sub>4</sub> source. *Netherlands Journal of Geosciences* **82**: 325–332.
- van den Pol-van Dasselaar, A., van Beusichem, M.L. & Oenema, O. (1997) Effects of grassland management on the emission of methane from intensively managed grasslands on peat soil. *Plant and Soil* **189**: 1–9.
- van den Pol-van Dasselaar, A., van Beusichem, M.L. & Oenema, O. (1999a) Methane emissions from wet Grasslands on peat soil in a nature preserve. *Biogeochemistry* **44**: 205–220.
- van den Pol-van Dasselaar, A., van Beusichem, M.L. & Oenema, O. (1999b) Determinants of spatial variability of methane emissions from wet Grasslands on peat soil. *Biogeochemistry* **44**: 221–237.
- van den Pol-van Dasselaar, A., van Beusichem, M.L. & Oenema, O. (1999c) Effects of nitrogen input and grazing on methane fluxes of extensively and intensively managed Grasslands in the Netherlands. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* **29**: 24–30.
- van Huissteden, J., van den Bos, R. & Marticorena Alvarez, I. (2006) Modelling the effect of water-table management on CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from peat soils. *Netherlands Journal of Geosciences* **85**: 3–18.
- van Wagtenonk, J.W., Root, R.R. & Key, C.H. (2004) Comparison of AVIRIS and Landsat ETM+ detection capabilities for burn severity. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **92**: 397–408.
- Veenendaal, E.M., Kolle, O., Leffelaar, P.A., Schrier-Uijl, A.P., van Huissteden, J., van Walsem, J., Moller, F. & Berendse, F. (2007) CO<sub>2</sub> exchange and carbon balance in two grassland sites on eutrophic drained peat soils. *Biogeosciences* **4**: 1027–1040.
- Velthof, G.L., Brader, A.B. & Oenema, O. (1996) Seasonal variations in nitrous oxide losses from managed grasslands in The Netherlands. *Plant and Soil* **181**: 263–274.
- Verchot, L.V., Davidson, E.A., Cattânio, J.H., Ackerman, I.L., Erickson, H.E. & Keller, M. (1999) Land-use change and biogeochemical controls of nitrogen oxide emissions from soils in eastern Amazonia. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **13**: 31–46.
- Verchot, L.V., Hutabarat, L., Hairiah, K. & van Noordwijk, M. (2006) Nitrogen availability and soil N<sub>2</sub>O emissions following conversion of forests to coffee in southern Sumatra. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **20**: GB4008. doi: 10.1029/2005GB002469.
- Vermaat, J.E., Hellmann, F., Dias, A.T.C., Hoorens, B., van Logtestijn, R.S.P. & Aerts, R. (2011) Greenhouse gas fluxes from Dutch peatland water bodies: importance of the surrounding landscape. *Wetlands* **31**: 493–498.
- von Arnold, K., Nilsson, M., Hånell, B., Weslien, P. & Klemetsson, L. (2005a) Fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O from drained organic soils in deciduous forests. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **37**: 1059–1071.
- von Arnold, K., Weslien, P., Nilsson, M., Svensson, B.H. & Klemetsson, L. (2005b) Fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O from drained coniferous forests on organic soils. *Forest Ecology and Management* **210**: 239–254.
- Waddington, J.M. & Day, S.M. (2007) Methane emissions from a peatland following restoration. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **112**: G3. doi: 10.1029/2007JG000400.

- Waddington, J.M., Strack, M. & Greenwood, M.J. (2010) Toward restoring the net carbon sink function of degraded peatlands: short-term response in CO<sub>2</sub> exchange to ecosystem-scale restoration. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **115**: G1. doi: 10.1029/2009JG001090.
- Wallage, Z.E., Holden, J. & McDonald, A.T. (2006) Drain blocking: an effective treatment for reducing dissolved organic carbon loss and water discolouration in a drained peatland. *Science of the Total Environment* **367**: 811–821.
- Wallin, M.B., Öquist, M.G., Buffam, I., Billett, M.F., Nisell, J. & Bishop, K.H. (2011) Spatiotemporal variability of the gas transfer coefficient (KCO<sub>2</sub>) in boreal streams; implications for large scale estimates of CO<sub>2</sub> evasion. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **25**: GB3025. doi: 10.1029/2010GB003975.
- Ward, D.E. & Hardy, C.C. (1984) Advances in the characterization and control of emissions from prescribed fires. 77th Annual Meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association. San Francisco, CA, USA.
- Ward, S.E., Bardgett, R.D., McNamara, N.P., Adamson, J.K. & Ostle, N.J. (2007) Long-term consequences of grazing and burning on northern peatland carbon dynamics. *Ecosystems* **10**: 1069–1083.
- Warren, M.W., Kauffmann, J.B., Murdiyarso, D., Anshari, G., Hergoualc'h, K., Kurnianto, S., Purbopuspito, J., Gusmayanti, E., Afifudin, M., Rahajoe, J., Alhamd, L., Limin, S. & Iswandi, A. (2012) A cost-efficient method to assess carbon stocks in tropical peat soil. *Biogeosciences* **9**: 4477–4485.
- Watanabe, A., Purwanto, B.H., Ando, H., Kakuda, K.-i. & Jong, F.-S. (2009) Methane and CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from an Indonesian peatland used for sago palm (*Metroxylon sagu* Rottb.) cultivation: effects of fertilizer and groundwater level management. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* **134**: 14–18.
- Weinzierl, W. (1997) Niedermoore in Baden-Württemberg – Bilanzierung der CO<sub>2</sub>-Emission am Beispiel des Donaureds. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Bodenkundlichen Gesellschaft* **85**: 1059–1062.
- Weslien, P., Kasimir-Klemetsson, Å., Börjesson, G. & Klemetsson, L. (2009) Strong pH influence on N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from forested organic soils. *European Journal of Soil Science* **60**: 311–320.
- Wickland, K.P., Neff, J.C. & Aiken, G.R. (2007) Dissolved organic carbon in Alaskan boreal forest: sources, chemical characteristics, and biodegradability. *Ecosystems* **10**: 1323–1340.
- Wild, U., Kampp, T., Lenz, A., Heinz, S. & Pfadenhauer, J. (2001) Cultivation of *Typha* spp. in constructed wetlands for peatland restoration. *Ecological Engineering* **17**: 49–54.
- Worrall, F., Armstrong, A. & Adamson, J.K. (2007) The effects of burning and sheep-grazing on water table depth and soil water quality in an upland peat. *Journal of Hydrology* **339**: 1–14.
- Worrall, F., Clay, G., Marrs, R. & Reed, M.S. (2010) Impacts of burning management on peatlands. Report to IUCN UK Peatland Programme, Edinburgh.
- Worrall, F., Moody, C., Jones, T. & Evans, C. (2013) Conversion of waterborne DOC to CO<sub>2</sub> – results of field experiments. In: Emissions of greenhouse gases associated with peatland drainage waters. Report to Defra under project SP1205: Greenhouse gas emissions associated with non-gaseous losses of carbon from peatlands – fate of particulate and dissolved carbon. Report to the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, UK.
- Worrall, F., Rowson, J.G., Evans, M.G., Pawson, R., Daniels, S. & Bonn, A. (2011) Carbon fluxes from eroding peatlands – the carbon benefit of revegetation following wildfire. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **36**: 1487–1498.
- Wösten, J.M.H., Ismail, A.B. & van Wijk, A.L.M. (1997) Peat subsidence and its practical implications: a case study in Malaysia. *Geoderma* **78**: 25–36.
- Yallop, A.R., Clutterbuck, B. & Thacker, J. (2010) Increases in humic dissolved organic carbon export from upland peat catchments: the role of temperature, declining sulfate deposition and changes in land management. *Climate Research* **45**: 43–56.
- Yamulki, S., Anderson, R., Peace, A. & Morison, J.I.L. (2013) Soil CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes from an afforested lowland raised peatbog in Scotland: implications for drainage and restoration. *Biogeosciences* **10**: 1051–1065.
- Yefremova, T.T. & Yefremov, S.P. (1996) Ecological effects of peat fire on forested bog ecosystems. In: *Fire in Ecosystems of Boreal Eurasia*, ed. J.G. Goldammer & V.V. Furyaev, pp. 350–357. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Yokelson, R.J., Burling, I.R., Gilman, J.B., Warneke, C., Stockwell, C.E., de Gouw, J., Akagi, S.J., Urbanski, S.P., Veres, P., Roberts, J.M., Kuster, W.C., Reardon, J., Griffith, D.W.T., Johnson, D.T., Hosseini, S., Miller, J.W., Cocker III, D.R., Jung, D. & Weise, D.R. (2013) Coupling field and laboratory measurements to

- estimate the emission factors of identified and unidentified trace gases for prescribed fires. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **13**: 89–116.
- Yokelson, R.J., Karl, T., Artaxo, P., Blake, D.R., Christian, T.J., Griffith, D.W.T., Guenther, A. & Hao, W.M. (2007) The tropical forest and fire emissions experiment: overview and airborne fire emission factor measurements. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* **7**: 5175–5196.
- Yokelson, R.J., Susott, R., Ward, D.E., Reardon, J. & Griffith, D.W.T. (1997) Emissions from smoldering combustion of biomass measured by open-path Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **102**: 18865–18877.
- Yule, C.M. & Gomez, L.N. (2009) Leaf litter decomposition in a tropical peat swamp forest in Peninsular Malaysia. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **17**: 231–241.
- Zoltai, S.C., Morrissey, L.A., Livingston, G.P. & de Groot, W.J. (1998) Effects of fires on carbon cycling in North American boreal peatlands. *Environmental Reviews* **6**: 13–24.
- Zulkifli, Y. (2002) Hydrological attributes of a disturbed peat swamp forest. In: *Prevention and Control of Fire in Peatlands: Proceedings of Workshop on Prevention and Control of Fire in Peatlands*, ed. F. Parish, E. Padmanabhan, C.L. Lee & H.C. Thang, pp. 51–55. Kuala Lumpur, 19–21 March. Global Environment Centre and Forestry Department Peninsular Malaysia, Cetaktama, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

# **CHAPTER 3**

---

## **REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**



### **Coordinating Lead Authors**

Dominique Blain (Canada) and Daniel Murdiyarso (CIFOR)

### **Lead Authors**

John Couwenberg (EC/WI/Germany/Netherlands), Osamu Nagata (Japan), Florence Renou-Wilson (Ireland), Andrey Sirin (Russian Federation), Maria Strack (Canada), Eeva-Stiina Tuittila (Finland), and David Wilson (Ireland)

### **Contributing Authors**

Christopher David Evans (UK), Maya Fukuda (IPCC TFI TSU) and Faizal Parish (Malaysia)

### **Review Editors**

Jens Leifeld (Switzerland) and María José Sanz Sánchez (FAO)

## Contents

3	Rewetted Organic Soils .....	5
3.1	Introduction .....	5
3.2	Greenhouse gas emissions and removals.....	6
3.2.1	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils.....	7
3.2.2	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils.....	15
3.2.3	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from rewetted organic soils.....	19
3.2.4	Choice of activity data .....	19
3.2.5	Sources of uncertainty.....	21
3.3	Completeness, time series consistency, and QA/QC.....	22
3.3.1	Completeness.....	22
3.3.2	Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) .....	22
Annex 3A.1	Estimation of default emission factors for CO <sub>2</sub> -C in rewetted organic soils.....	23
Annex 3A.2	Estimation of default emission factors for off-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions via waterborne carbon losses (CO <sub>2</sub> -DOC) from rewetted organic soils .....	28
Annex 3A.3	Estimation of default emission factors for CH <sub>4</sub> -C in rewetted organic soils.....	31
References	.....	34

## Equations

Equation 3.1	Net gains or losses of C resulting from the balance between CO <sub>2</sub> and CH <sub>4</sub> emissions and removals .....	7
Equation 3.2	Net CH <sub>4</sub> flux .....	7
Equation 3.3	CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils.....	7
Equation 3.4	Annual on-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils .....	9
Equation 3.5	Annual off-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions due to DOC losses from rewetted organic soils.....	9
Equation 3.6	Emission factor for annual emissions of C as CO <sub>2</sub> due to doc export from rewetted organic soils .....	13
Equation 3.7	CH <sub>4</sub> -C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils.....	15
Equation 3.8	Annual CH <sub>4</sub> -C emissions from rewetted organic soils.....	16
Equation 3.9	N <sub>2</sub> O-N emissions from rewetted organic soils .....	19

## Figures

Figure 3.1	Decision tree to estimate CO <sub>2</sub> -C and CH <sub>4</sub> -C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils .....	11
Figure 3A.1	Ranges of CO <sub>2</sub> flux values (g CO <sub>2</sub> m <sup>-2</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) found in the published literature for natural/undrained and rewetted organic soils in (a) boreal and (b) temperate climate zones. Positive flux values indicate CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from the ecosystem to the atmosphere and negative flux values indicate removal of CO <sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere by the ecosystem. References used to compile graph are to be found in Table 3.1. ....	24
Figure 3A.2	Relationship between annual CO <sub>2</sub> fluxes and mean annual water table depth (cm) for both undrained and rewetted organic soils in (a) boreal and (b) temperate climate zones .....	26
Figure 3A.3	Subsidence rates as measured in drained tropical organic soils in relation to water table depth. From Hooijer <i>et al.</i> 2012. ....	27
Figure 3A.4	Methane flux from boreal and temperate rewetted and undrained organic soils in relation to mean annual water table. Fluxes are expressed as <sup>10</sup> log(1+measured flux) [kg CH <sub>4</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ].....	31
Figure 3A.5	Methane flux from boreal and temperate, poor and rich, rewetted (rw) and undrained (un) organic soils. Fluxes (in kg CH <sub>4</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) are expressed on a logarithmic scale. ....	32

## Tables

Table 3.1	Default emission factors (EF <sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> ) and associated uncertainty, for CO <sub>2</sub> -C from rewetted organic soils (all values in tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ). ....	12
Table 3.2	Default DOC emission factors (EF <sub>DOC_REWETTED</sub> in tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) for rewetted organic soils .....	14
Table 3.3	Default emission factors for CH <sub>4</sub> from rewetted organic soils (all values in kg CH <sub>4</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ).....	18
Table 3A.1	DOC concentration (above) or flux (below) comparisons between drained and rewetted organic soils with changes in DOC following rewetting.....	29
Table 3A.2	Annual DOC flux estimates from natural/undrained and rewetted organic soils used to derive default values for DOC <sub>flux</sub> .....	29
Table 3A.3	CH <sub>4</sub> -C flux data from wet swamp forest on organic soils.....	33

## Box

Box 3.1	Controls on CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted organic soils.....	17
---------	--	----

## 3 REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

#### **What is rewetting, restoration, rehabilitation and how rewetting affects GHG**

Definitions of wetlands and organic soils are provided elsewhere in this supplement (Chapter 1 and Glossary), and will not be repeated here. As in the remainder of this supplement, this chapter considers peatlands to be included in '(land with) organic soil'. Unless stated otherwise, statements referring to organic soils will include soils made of peat; in some instances, examples are provided that are specific to peat soils or peatlands and in such cases peatlands will be mentioned specifically.

Rewetting is the deliberate action of raising the water table on drained soils to re-establish water saturated conditions, e.g. by blocking drainage ditches or disabling pumping facilities. Rewetting can have several objectives, such as wetland restoration or allowing other management practices on saturated organic soils such as paludiculture.

Wetland restoration aims to permanently re-establish the pre-disturbance wetland ecosystem, including the hydrological and biogeochemical processes typical of water saturated soils, as well as the vegetation cover that pre-dated the disturbance (FAO, 2005; Nellemann & Corcoran, 2010). Normally, the restoration of previously drained wetlands is accompanied by rewetting, while the restoration of undrained, but otherwise disturbed wetlands may not require rewetting.

Rehabilitation, as defined by FAO (2005) and Nellemann & Corcoran (2010), can involve a large variety of practices on formerly drained organic soils, which may or may not include rewetting. The re-establishment of a vegetation cover on a drained site without rewetting is a form of site rehabilitation.

The focus of this chapter is the rewetting of organic soils; restoration and other management practices on rewetted organic soils are not specifically addressed. Rehabilitation as an activity separate from rewetting is not covered by this chapter. This chapter does not provide default guidance for the management of undrained inland organic soils or for restoration that does not necessitate rewetting.

The position of the water table is a major control of the biogeochemical processes responsible for GHG fluxes from wetlands (Reddy & DeLaune 2008, pages 162-163). Generally, rewetting decreases CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from organic soils compared to the drained condition, and under certain conditions leads to the recovery of a net ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> sink (Komulainen *et al.*, 1999; Tuittila *et al.*, 1999; Waddington *et al.*, 2010). Re-establishing the vegetation cover on rewetted organic soils is necessary to reinstate the carbon sink function that ultimately leads to soil C sequestration. After a vegetation succession promoted by rewetting, the CO<sub>2</sub> sink may reach the level typical of undrained ecosystems. However, during the first years after rewetting a site can remain a CO<sub>2</sub> source (Petrone *et al.*, 2003; Waddington *et al.*, 2010); upon restoration the ecosystem sink can temporarily be significantly larger (Soini *et al.*, 2010; Wilson *et al.*, 2013). The time needed for the recovery of the sink function may vary from years to several decades (Tuittila *et al.*, 1999; Samaritani *et al.*, 2011) depending on restoration methods and pre-rewetting and climate conditions.

Rewetting generally increases CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (e.g. Augustin & Chojnicki, 2008; Waddington & Day, 2007), although in some cases lower emissions have been measured (Tuittila *et al.*, 2000; Juottonen *et al.*, 2012) compared to the drained state. If all the other conditions (e.g. vegetation composition, site fertility) are equal, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted sites are generally comparable to undrained sites after the first years following rewetting as shown later in this chapter. In temperate regions N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are found to rapidly decrease close to zero after rewetting (Augustin & Merbach, 1998; Wilson *et al.*, 2013).

Carbon is also lost from rewetted organic soils via water mainly in a form of dissolved organic carbon (DOC). Most of this carbon is eventually released into the atmosphere as CO<sub>2</sub>. Rewetting is thought to decrease DOC leaching to a level comparable with undrained organic soil.

Generally the likelihood of fire occurrence in rewetted ecosystems is low, but real. The reader is referred to the default approach provided in Chapter 2 of this supplement to quantify this source of emissions for all GHGs.

High spatial variation in microtopography, water level and vegetation cover is typical of undrained organic soils and is also observed in GHG fluxes (Strack *et al.*, 2006; Laine *et al.*, 2007; Riutta *et al.*, 2007; Maanaviija *et al.*, 2011). Rewetting recreates this natural heterogeneity with blocked ditches forming the wetter end of the variation (Strack & Zuback, 2013; Maanaviija *et al.*, submitted). For this reason, in this chapter, (and in contrast to the approach in Chapter 2), former ditches are included as a part of rewetted sites and not treated separately.

**Scope of this guidance: wetland types covered, gases, pools**

This chapter provides guidance on rewetting of organic soils, with a focus on the soil pool. Organic soils can also support perennial woody vegetation. To avoid repeating guidance already provided, wherever appropriate the reader will be referred to the existing guidance in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, especially on C stock changes in the woody biomass and dead wood pools.

The distinction between C pools in some wetland ecosystems can be difficult, especially between the herbaceous biomass (mosses, sedges, grasses), the dead organic matter derived from this biomass and soil pools. For example, the dead portion of mosses characteristic of many peatlands could be included in the dead organic matter or soil pool. The non-woody biomass on rewetted organic soils cannot be ignored as it is essential in the restoration of the carbon sink function that in turn results in the sequestration over time of large quantities of soil carbon. Because the default emission factors in this chapter were all derived from flux measurements over wetlands on organic soils with moss and/or herbaceous vegetation and/or dwarf shrubs, these default EFs integrate all C fluxes from the soil and the above- and belowground vegetation components other than trees. In all cases the guidance in this chapter will clarify which C pools are included in default EFs.

In this chapter boreal and temperate organic soil wetlands are divided into “nutrient poor” and “nutrient rich” categories (Rydin & Jeglum, 2006). Most nutrient poor wetlands, whether undrained or rewetted, receive water and nutrients from precipitation only, while nutrient rich wetlands also receive water from their surroundings.

Tropical wetlands on organic soils include a great variety of contrasting ecosystems, from papyrus dominated sites in Africa to peat swamp forests in South East Asia. In general much less information is available for wetlands on organic soils in tropical regions than in temperate or boreal regions.

Rewetting activities in tropical regions have been reported from the USA, South Africa and Indonesia. Southeast Asia harbours the largest extent of tropical peatlands (Page *et al.*, 2011) and several attempts at large scale rewetting have been undertaken here. Although successful rewetting of organic soils in tropical regions has been demonstrated, flux data from such sites are lacking. Therefore, a default EF for rewetted tropical organic soils was developed based on surrogate data. It is *good practice*, where significant areas of tropical organic soils have been rewetted, to develop science-based, documented, country-specific emission factors for CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

As in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, guidance is provided for three GHGs: CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O.

**How to use guidance in this chapter and relationship to reporting categories**

Depending on circumstances and practices, rewetting may or may not involve a change in land use. Hence pre- and post-rewetting land use of organic soils can vary according to national circumstances, and be reported as Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands or Settlements. The guidance in this chapter should be applied regardless of the reporting categories. In particular, no recommendation is provided in relation to transition periods between land-use categories; countries can apply the existing transition period of appropriate land-use categories to rewetted organic soils. Because the functioning of these ecosystems has already been deeply altered due to management, reporting rewetted organic soils as unmanaged land is not consistent with *good practice*.

## 3.2 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS

Equation 2.3 in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* illustrates how in general carbon-containing GHGs from an ecosystem can be calculated from the sum of C stock changes in each of the ecosystem carbon pools. This chapter provides additional guidance specifically for the soil pool term  $\Delta C_{so}$  of equation 2.3 - in particular for water-saturated organic soils. When practices for the rewetting of organic soils also involve C stock changes in woody biomass or dead organic matter (DOM) pools, the appropriate default assumptions will be provided along with references to existing equations in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for the Tier 1 estimation of C stock changes for these pools.

With respect to the soil pool, this chapter elaborates on the estimations of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions or removals and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from organic soils, regardless of the ultimate goal of the rewetting activity (e.g. restoration or other land management practices).

In the context of this chapter, Equation 3.1 below replaces Equations 2.24 and 2.26 in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*; Equations 2.24 and 2.26 implicitly assumed that organic soils can only lose carbon, while in fact undrained or rewetted organic soils can accumulate soil organic carbon if covered with vegetation.

Assuming that rewetting is successful in establishing the C sink function, the rewetted organic soils can gain substantial quantities of carbon. Equation 3.1 reflects the fact that the net C stock change of rewetted organic soils results from net gains or losses of C resulting from the balance between CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and removals.

In large carbon pools, such as organic soils, net CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (or removals via uptake by vegetation) are more accurately measured directly as a CO<sub>2</sub> flux (an emission is a positive flux, a removal a negative flux), as opposed to being derived from a change in C stocks. Likewise, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are generally measured as fluxes. In this chapter these fluxes are denoted CO<sub>2</sub>-C and CH<sub>4</sub>-C, for the net C flux as CO<sub>2</sub> and as CH<sub>4</sub> respectively. This notation is consistent with that used in Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

**EQUATION 3.1**  
**NET GAINS OR LOSSES OF C RESULTING FROM THE BALANCE BETWEEN CO<sub>2</sub> AND CH<sub>4</sub>**  
**EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS**

$$\Delta C_{\text{rewetted org soil}} = CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}} + CH_4\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$  = Net C gain or loss in rewetted organic soils (tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>)

$CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$  = Net flux of CO<sub>2</sub> -C (emissions or removals) from the rewetted organic soil (tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>)

$CH_4\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$  = Net flux of CH<sub>4</sub> -C (commonly emissions) from the rewetted organic soil (tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>)

The notations CO<sub>2</sub>-C and CH<sub>4</sub>-C will facilitate reconciling net fluxes with C stock changes for estimation purposes. However, the reporting convention remains that used in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, where emissions and removals of CO<sub>2</sub> are reported as C stock changes, and emissions and removals of CH<sub>4</sub> in tonnes of CH<sub>4</sub>. CH<sub>4</sub>-C is converted to CH<sub>4</sub> using Equation 3.2.

**EQUATION 3.2**  
**NET CH<sub>4</sub> FLUX**

$$CH_4_{\text{rewetted org soil}} = CH_4\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}} \cdot 16/12$$

Where:

$CH_4_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$  = net flux of CH<sub>4</sub> from the rewetted organic soil (tonnes CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>)

$CH_4\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$  = flux of CH<sub>4</sub> -C from the rewetted organic soil (tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>)

### 3.2.1 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils

CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils have the following components:

**EQUATION 3.3**  
**CO<sub>2</sub>-C EMISSIONS/REMOVALS FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}} = CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{composite}} + CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{DOC}} + L_{\text{fire}}\text{-}CO_2\text{-}C$$

Where:

$CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$  = CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{composite}}$  = CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions/removals from the soil and non-tree vegetation, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$CO_2\text{-}C_{\text{DOC}}$  = off-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions from dissolved organic carbon exported from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$L_{\text{fire}}\text{-}CO_2\text{-}C$  = CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions from burning of rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

### On-site emissions/removals: $\text{CO}_2\text{-C}_{\text{composite}}$

Since the default  $\text{CO}_2\text{-C}$  EFs in this chapter are all derived from flux measurements (see Annex 3A.1), the  $\text{CO}_2\text{-C}_{\text{composite}}$  results from the net flux, emissions or removals, from the soil and non-tree vegetation taken together.  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions are produced during the decomposition of the organic soil by heterotrophic organisms and are strongly controlled by oxygen availability within the soil and by soil temperature. The contribution from non-tree vegetation occurs via the two processes of photosynthesis ( $\text{CO}_2$  uptake) and above- and below-ground autotrophic respiration ( $\text{CO}_2$  emissions).

Consistent with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, the Tier 1 or default approaches assume that the woody biomass and woody DOM stocks and fluxes are zero on all lands except on Forest Land and on Cropland with perennial woody biomass. For rewetting on Forest Land or on Cropland with woody crops, the woody biomass and woody DOM pools are potentially significant and should be estimated in a way consistent with the guidance provided in Chapters 2 (generic methods), 4 (Forest Land) and 5 (Cropland) in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Inventory compilers are directed to Equations 2.7, 2.8 and the subsequent equations in Chapter 2 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* which split the C stock changes in the biomass pool or  $\Delta C_B$  into the various gains and losses components, including harvest and fires.

If rewetting is accompanied by a change in land use that involves Forest Land or Cropland with perennial woody biomass, changes in C stocks in biomass and dead wood and litter pools are equal to the difference in C stocks in the old and new land-use categories (see Section 2.3.1.2, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). These changes occur mostly in the year of the conversion (carbon losses), or are uniformly distributed over the length of the transition period (carbon gains). Default values for C stocks in forest litter can be found in Chapter 4 (Forest Land), Chapter 5 (Cropland) and Chapter 2 (Table 2.2 for forest litter) in Volume 4, of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

### Off-site $\text{CO}_2$ emissions: $\text{CO}_2\text{-C}_{\text{DOC}}$

The importance of waterborne carbon export (in all its different forms) as a pathway linking the organic soil C pool to the atmosphere is described in Chapter 2 of this supplement and the various sources, behaviour and fate of the different forms of waterborne C following rewetting can be found in Annex 3A.2. In all types of organic soils, including natural and rewetted ones, DOC has been shown to be the largest component of waterborne carbon loss that will be processed and almost entirely returned eventually to the atmosphere. It is therefore *good practice* to include DOC in flux-based carbon estimation methods to avoid under-estimation of soil C losses.  $\text{CO}_2\text{-C}_{\text{DOC}}$  is produced from the decomposition of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) lost from organic soils via aquatic pathways and results in off-site  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions; a Tier 1 methodology is described below. Other forms of waterborne carbon (Particulate Organic Carbon and dissolved  $\text{CO}_2$ ) may also be significant in the early years following rewetting but few data exist (see Annex 3A.2). It should be noted also that although generally not significant, DOC imports (e.g. from precipitation) should in theory be removed from net DOC fluxes.

### Emissions from burning: $L_{\text{fire}}\text{-CO}_2\text{-C}$

While the likelihood of fires on rewetted organic soils is considered low (particularly in comparison to drained organic soils), fire risk may still be real. Any emissions from the burning of biomass, dead organic matter as well as from soil ( $L_{\text{fire}}\text{-CO}_2\text{-C}$ ) should be included. Generic methodologies for estimating  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions from the burning of vegetation and dead organic matter are provided in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, while methodologies specific to vegetation and DOM burning in Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland and Wetlands are provided in Chapters 4-7 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Emissions from the burning of organic soils can be estimated following the methodologies in Equation 2.8 of Chapter 2 (this supplement) using the fuel consumption values estimated for undrained organic soils given in Table 2.6 (same value for all climates) as well as emission factors from Table 2.7.

## CHOICE OF METHOD

The decision tree in Figure 3.1 presents guidance in the selection of the appropriate Tier for the estimation of GHG emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils.

### Tier 1

Under Tier 1, the basic methodology for estimating annual C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils was presented in Equation 3.3 and can be compiled using Equations 3.4 and 3.5 where the nationally derived area of rewetted organic soils is multiplied by an emission factor, which is disaggregated by climate zone and where applicable by nutrient status (nutrient poor and nutrient rich).

Tier 1 methodology is applicable from the year of rewetting.

**EQUATION 3.4**  
**ANNUAL ON-SITE CO<sub>2</sub>-C EMISSIONS/REMOVALS FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$CO_2-C_{composite} = \sum_{c, n} (A \cdot EF_{CO_2})$$

Where:

$CO_2-C_{composite}$  = CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions/removals from the soil and non-tree vegetation, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$A_{c,n}$  = area of rewetted organic soils in climate zone  $c$  and nutrient status  $n$ , ha

$EF_{CO_2 c, n}$  = CO<sub>2</sub>-C emission factor for rewetted organic soils in climate zone  $c$ , nutrient status  $n$ , tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

**EQUATION 3.5**  
**ANNUAL OFF-SITE CO<sub>2</sub>-C EMISSIONS DUE TO DOC LOSSES FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$CO_2-C_{DOC} = \sum_c (A \cdot EF_{DOC\_REWETTED})$$

Where:

$CO_2-C_{DOC}$  = off-site CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions from dissolved organic carbon exported from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$A_c$  = area of rewetted organic soils in climate zone  $c$ , ha

$EF_{DOC\_rewetted, c}$  = CO<sub>2</sub>-C emission factor from DOC exported from rewetted organic soils in climate zone  $c$  tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

## Tier 2

A Tier 2 methodology uses country-specific emission factors and parameters, spatially disaggregated to reflect regionally important practices and dominant ecological dynamics. It may be appropriate to sub-divide activity data and emission factors according to the present vegetation composition which is a representation of the water table depth and soil properties or by land use prior to rewetting (e.g. Forest, Grassland, Cropland, Wetland).

Available datasets from rewetted organic soils generally cover a period of 10 years or less after rewetting; for this reason it is difficult to identify clear temporal patterns in CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes. Available data demonstrate that the strength of the CO<sub>2</sub> sink may vary over a number of years. In the period immediately following rewetting, it is expected that soil oxidation rates are low as a consequence of the anoxic conditions, while most of the newly sequestered C is still contained within the non-woody biomass pool (leaves, stems, and roots). Over longer time frames (a few decades) a decrease in the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> that is sequestered annually might be expected as the biomass pool eventually approaches a steady state C sequestration saturation point typical of natural, undrained organic soils. Countries are encouraged to develop more detailed EFs for rewetted organic soils that capture fully the transient nature of CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in the time since rewetting and reflect the time needed for the ecosystem to reach CO<sub>2</sub> dynamics typical of natural, undrained organic soils. In particular, countries with a significant non-vegetated (bare organic soil) component (e.g. industrial cutaways or cutovers) at the time of rewetting are encouraged to develop detailed EFs that capture the expected decline in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions following rewetting (e.g. Tuittila *et al.*, 1999; Bortoluzzi *et al.*, 2006; Kivimäki *et al.*, 2008; Waddington *et al.*, 2010; Wilson *et al.*, 2013).

A Tier 2 methodology to derive an estimation of emissions from the decomposition of DOC should utilise country-specific information if experimental data are available to refine the emission factor, especially with regard to different types of natural/undrained and rewetted organic soils (e.g. peatlands with various nutrient status and development, such as raised bogs, blanket bogs, fens). Refined approaches to calculate  $EF_{DOC}$  are suggested below under Choice of EF:  $EF_{DOC\_rewetted}$ . On-site flux measurements will not capture C losses as DOC so it is *good practice* to explicitly add C losses as DOC to flux-based C estimation methods. If a soil subsidence approach is used to derive  $CO_2-C_{composite}$  of Equation 3.3, DOC losses are included in the subsidence data and should not be added a second time.

Tier 2 (as well as Tier 3) methodologies may capture changes in the woody biomass pool as fluxes instead of separately reported stock changes; in such cases the woody biomass component is integrated with the other




components of Equation 3.3. However, it is *good practice* to ensure that double counting does not take place in regard to the woody biomass and DOM pools on rewetted organic soils. Data collection using eddy covariance techniques (EC tower) and chamber measurements are adequate at higher tiers; however when CO<sub>2</sub> flux data have been collected with such techniques the C stock changes in perennial woody biomass and woody DOM may already be included and should not be added a second time.

### **Tier 3**

A Tier 3 methodology involves a comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions and removals on rewetted organic soils, including the effect of site characteristics, soil characteristics, vegetation composition, soil temperature and mean water table depth. These could be integrated into a dynamic, mechanistic-based model or through a measurement-based approach (see choice of EF, Tier 3 below for examples of such models). These parameters, in addition to further parameters such as water flows and residence time of water, could also be used to describe fluvial C (DOC) lost from the system using process-based models that incorporate hydrology amongst other factors. A Tier 3 methodology might also include the entire DOC export from rewetted sites and consideration of the temporal variability in DOC release in the years following rewetting, which will also be dependent on the rewetting techniques used.

**Figure 3.1**      **Decision tree to estimate CO<sub>2</sub>-C and CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils**



Note:

1. Detailed information typically includes national area of rewetted organic soils disaggregated by climate and nutrient status, complemented with documentation on previous land management and rewetting practices, and with associated measurements of GHG emissions and removals at high spatial and temporal resolution.
2. A key source/sink category is defined in Chapter 4, Volume 1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, “as one that is prioritised within the national inventory system because its estimate has a significant influence on a country’s total inventory of greenhouse gases in terms of the absolute level, the trend, or the uncertainty in emissions and removals”. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines recommend that the *key category* analysis be performed at the level of land remaining in or converted to a land-use category. If CO<sub>2</sub> or CH<sub>4</sub> emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils are subcategories to a *key category*, these subcategories should be considered significant if they individually account for 25-30% of emissions/removals for the overall *key category* (see Figures 1.2 and 1.3 in Chapter 1, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.)

## CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

### EF<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub>

#### Tier 1

The implementation of the Tier 1 method requires the application of default EFs provided in Table 3.1, where they are disaggregated by climate zone (boreal, temperate, tropical) and for boreal and temperate organic soils only, by nutrient status (nutrient poor and nutrient rich).

Nutrient poor organic soils predominate in boreal regions, while in temperate regions nutrient rich sites are more common. In some cases, nutrient poor soil organic layers are underlain by nutrient rich layers; in some situations, after industrial extraction of the nutrient poor top layers the rewetted residual soil layers may be considered nutrient rich due to the influence of incoming water and the high nutrient status of the bottom layers.

If the nutrient status of rewetted organic soils in boreal or temperate zones is not known, countries should use the default nutrient poor EF for sites in the boreal zone, and nutrient rich EF for sites in the temperate zone (Table 3.1).

The derivation of the default EF values for CO<sub>2</sub> is fully described in Annex 3A.1, including the quality criteria for data selection. In summary, robust data indicated that CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from both natural/undrained and rewetted organic soils are correlated with mean water table depth. Furthermore, it was ascertained that, in temperate and boreal regions, these correlations were not significantly different between the natural/undrained group and the rewetted group. These conclusions were also valid when the analysis was performed for sites under each of these climatic regions. Therefore in these regions CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from natural/undrained sites were used in addition to CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from rewetted sites to provide a robust estimation of the EFs shown in Table 3.1. There is currently insufficient evidence to support the use of different default EF values for different site conditions, previous land-use or time since rewetting.

Since no data are available for rewetted tropical organic soils, a default EF of zero is provided; this value is supported by observations in undrained sites and reflects the fact that successful rewetting effectively reduces the decay of soil organic matter stops the oxidation of soil organic material, but does not necessarily re-establish a soil C sequestration function (see Annex 3A.1).

TABLE 3.1 DEFAULT EMISSION FACTORS (EF <sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> ) AND ASSOCIATED UNCERTAINTY, FOR CO <sub>2</sub> -C FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS (ALL VALUES IN TONNES CO <sub>2</sub> -C HA <sup>-1</sup> YR <sup>-1</sup> ).			
Climate zone	Nutrient status	EF <sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub>	95% range
Boreal*	Poor	-0.34 (n=26)	-0.59 – -0.09
	Rich	-0.55 (n=39)	-0.77 – -0.34
Temperate**	Poor	-0.23 (n=43)	-0.64 – +0.18
	Rich	+0.50 (n=15)	-0.71 – +1.71
Tropical***		0	
<p>Note: Negative values indicate removal of CO<sub>2</sub>-C from the atmosphere. n = number of sites. 95% confidence interval is used to give the 95% range.</p> <p>* Emission factors for boreal rewetted organic soils derived from the following source material (see Annex 3A.1 for details): Bubier <i>et al.</i>, 1999; Komulainen <i>et al.</i>, 1999; Soegaard &amp; Nordstroem, 1999; Tuittila <i>et al.</i>, 1999; Waddington &amp; Price, 2000; Waddington &amp; Roulet, 2000; Alm <i>et al.</i>, 1997; Laine <i>et al.</i>, 1997; Suyker <i>et al.</i>, 1997; Whiting &amp; Chanton, 2001; Heikkinen <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Harazono <i>et al.</i>, 2003; Nykänen <i>et al.</i>, 2003; Yli-Petäys <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Kivimäki <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Nilsson <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Sagerfors <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Aurela <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Drewer <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Soini <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Maanavilja <i>et al.</i>, 2011.</p> <p>** Emission factor for temperate rewetted organic soils derived from the following source material but is not significantly different from zero (see Annex 3 A.1 for details): Shurpali <i>et al.</i>, 1995; Lafleur <i>et al.</i>, 2001; Wickland, 2001; Aurela <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Schulze <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Petrone <i>et al.</i>, 2003; Roehm &amp; Roulet, 2003; Billett <i>et al.</i>, 2004; Drösler, 2005; Nagata <i>et al.</i>, 2005; Bortoluzzi <i>et al.</i>, 2006; Hendriks <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Jacobs <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Lund <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Riutta <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Roulet <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Wilson <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Augustin &amp; Chojnicki, 2008; Cagampan &amp; Waddington, 2008; Golovatskaya &amp; Dyukarev, 2009; Kurbatova <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Drewer <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Waddington <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Adkinson <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Augustin <i>et al.</i> in Couwenberg <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Koehler <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Christensen <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Urbanová, 2012; Strack &amp; Zuback, 2013; Drösler <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Herbst <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Wilson <i>et al.</i>, 2013.</p> <p>*** For tropical rewetted organic soils where decayed organic material is not oxidised due to saturated conditions.</p>			

Given the limitations in the available scientific literature, the Tier 1 basic methodology assumes that there is no *transient period* and that rewetted organic soils immediately behave like undrained/natural organic soils in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> flux dynamics. Combining observations in the temperate and boreal regions soon after rewetting with long-term ones was the simplest way to avoid any bias.

The default EF of rewetted tropical organic soils applies to sites where water saturation prevents further oxidation of the soil organic matter. Due to the lack of published scientific literature on CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from rewetted tropical organic soils, the emission factor was derived from undrained tropical organic soils (Annex 3A.1). When rewetted tropical organic soils are a significant component of a *key category*, it is *good practice* to use country-specific EFs as opposed to the default EF in Table 3.1.

### Tier 2 and 3

Countries applying Tier 2 methods should use country-specific emission factors. Empirical flux measurements (eddy covariance or chamber methods) should be carried out at temporal resolutions sufficiently defined to capture as wide a range as possible of the abiotic (e.g. irradiation, soil properties including soil temperature, mean water table depth) and biotic (e.g. vegetation composition) factors that drive CO<sub>2</sub> dynamics in rewetted organic soils. Subsidence measurements can also be used to determine the medium to long term losses/gains from rewetted organic soils. Emission factors could be developed further by taking into account other factors, such as ‘previous land use’ or current vegetation composition as well as disaggregation by ‘time since rewetting’.

Countries where perennial woody biomass plays a significant role in the net CO<sub>2</sub>-C exchange between rewetted organic soils and the atmosphere should develop country-specific methods that reflect C stock changes in the tree biomass and tree DOM pools under typical management practices and their interaction with the soil pool. Guidance can be found in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Tier 3 methods involve a comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals in rewetted organic soils, including the impacts of management practices. The methodology includes the fate of C in all pools and C transfers between pools upon conversion. In particular, the fate of the C contained within the biomass pool must also be taken into account, including its eventual release on-site through the decay of DOM, or off-site following harvest of woody biomass (e.g. paludiculture). Woody biomass is not accounted for in this chapter and care should be taken to avoid double-counting when using whole ecosystem data (e.g. eddy covariance measurements). Tier 3 methodologies may also distinguish between immediate and delayed emissions following rewetting. A Tier 3 approach could include the development of flux based monitoring systems and the use of advanced models which require a higher level of information of processes than required in Tier 2. It is *good practice* to ensure that the models are calibrated and validated against field measurements (Chapter 2, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*).

## EF<sub>DOC\_rewetted</sub>

### Tier 1

Data show that natural/undrained organic soils export some DOC and these fluxes increase following drainage (see Chapter 2 in this supplement). Available data from rewetted sites is scant but suggest that the level of DOC reduction after rewetting approximately equates to the DOC increase after drainage (Glatzel *et al.*, 2003; O’Brien *et al.*, 2008; Waddington *et al.*, 2008; Armstrong *et al.*, 2010; Strack and Zuback, 2013; Turner *et al.*, 2013). Consequently, it is assumed that rewetting leads to a reversion to natural DOC flux levels (see Annex 3A.2). Therefore, to make best use of available data, EFs for rewetted organic soils have been calculated using data from natural/undrained sites as well as from rewetted ones following Equation 3.6:

**EQUATION 3.6**  
**EMISSION FACTOR FOR ANNUAL EMISSIONS OF C AS CO<sub>2</sub> DUE TO DOC EXPORT FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$EF_{DOC\_REWETTED} = DOC_{FLUX} * Frac_{DOC-CO_2}$$

Where:

EF<sub>DOC\_REWETTED</sub> = Emission factor for DOC from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

DOC<sub>FLUX</sub> = Net flux of DOC from natural (undrained) and rewetted organic soils, tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

Frac<sub>DOC\_CO<sub>2</sub></sub> = Conversion factor for proportion of DOC converted to CO<sub>2</sub> following export from site and equates to 0.9

A detailed description of the derivation of default values for Tier 1 is provided in Annex 2A.3. In summary, data show clear differentiation of natural DOC fluxes between boreal, temperate and tropical organic soils. Therefore, the  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX}}$  values were calculated for each climate zone integrating data from rewetted sites where available (all DOC fluxes measured from rewetted sites were located in the temperate zone). The current data did not support disaggregation by nutrient status. The parameter  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC\_CO}_2}$  sets the proportion of DOC exported from organic soils that is ultimately emitted as  $\text{CO}_2$ . An understanding of the fate of DOC export, i.e. whether it is returned to the atmosphere as  $\text{CO}_2$  (or  $\text{CH}_4$ ), is still poor but the form and amount are of significance in terms of GHG reporting. A value of zero would coincide with all the DOC export being deposited in stable forms in lake or marine sediments; as this would simply represent a translocation of carbon between stable stores, it would not need to be estimated. However, most data on DOC processing do indicate that a high proportion is converted to  $\text{CO}_2$  in headwaters, rivers, lakes and coastal seas (see Annex 2A.3 for discussion). Reflecting this current scientific uncertainty, a Tier 1 default  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC\_CO}_2}$  value of 0.9 is proposed, with an uncertainty range of 0.8 to 1.

$\text{EF}_{\text{DOC\_REWETTED}}$  values are provided in Table 3.2 and the derivation of these values is fully described in Annex 3A.2.

TABLE 3.2 DEFAULT DOC EMISSION FACTORS ( $\text{EF}_{\text{DOC\_REWETTED}}$ IN TONNES $\text{CO}_2\text{-C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ) FOR REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS			
Climate zone	$\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX}}$ (tonnes $\text{C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ )	Number of sites	$\text{EF}_{\text{DOC\_REWETTED}}$ (tonnes $\text{CO}_2\text{-C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ )
Boreal*	0.08 (0.06 – 0.11)	10 undrained	0.08 (0.05 – 0.11)
Temperate**	0.26 (0.17 – 0.36)	12 undrained and 3 rewetted	0.24 (0.14 – 0.36)
Tropical***	0.57 (0.49 – 0.64)	4 undrained	0.51 (0.40 – 0.64)
<p>Values in parentheses represent 95% confidence intervals.</p> <p>*Derived from the following source material (see Annex 3 A.2 for details): Koprivnjak &amp; Moore, 1992; Moore <i>et al.</i>, 2003; Kortelainen <i>et al.</i>, 2006; Agren <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Nilsson <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Jager <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Rantakari <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Juutinen <i>et al.</i>, 2013.</p> <p>**Derived from the following source material (see Annex 3 A.2 for details): Urban <i>et al.</i>, 1989; Kolka <i>et al.</i>, 1999; Clair <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Moore <i>et al.</i>, 2003; Dawson <i>et al.</i>, 2004; Roulet <i>et al.</i>, 2007; O'Brien <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Strack <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Waddington <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Koehler <i>et al.</i>, 2009; 2011; Billett <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Dinsmore <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Di Folco &amp; Kirkpatrick, 2011; Turner <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Strack &amp; Zuback, 2013.</p> <p>***Derived from the following source material (see Annex 3 A.2 for details): Zulkifli, 2002; Alkhatib <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Baum <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Yule <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Moore <i>et al.</i>, 2013.</p>			

## Tier 2

A Tier 2 approach for estimation of DOC may follow the Tier 1 methodology provided above, but should use country-specific information where possible to refine the emission factors used as well as the conversion factor. Refinements could entail greater disaggregation as follows:

- Use of country-level measurements from natural and rewetted organic soils to obtain more accurate values of  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX}}$  for that country. Since DOC production has been observed to vary with different vegetation composition and productivity as well as soil temperature, it would be important to develop specific values for different types of natural and rewetted organic soils (nutrient rich versus nutrient poor and for example raised bogs as well as blanket bogs).
- Use of country-level measurements from rewetted organic soils with various restoration techniques and initial status (peat degradation, previous land use) as well as time since rewetting. When sufficient long-term direct measurements of DOC fluxes from rewetted organic soils have been gathered, this could be used solely in Equation 3.6 to replace  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX}}$  values with  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX\_REWETTED}}$  thus replacing the default assumption that rewetted organic soils revert to pre-drainage DOC fluxes.
- Use of alternative values for the conversion factor  $\text{Frac}_{\text{DOC\_CO}_2}$  where evidence is available to estimate the proportion of DOC exported from rewetted organic soils that is transferred to stable long-term carbon stores, such as lake or marine sediments.

### Tier 3

A Tier 3 methodology might include the use of process models that describe DOC release as a function of hydrology (in particular discharge), vegetation composition, nutrient levels, water table level, as well as temporal variability in DOC release in the years following rewetting and on-going management activity. Differences in DOC fluxes between undisturbed and rewetted organic soils could occur due to the presence or absence of vegetation on rewetted sites, the land-use category prior to rewetting, soil properties (fertility), vegetation composition that differs from the undisturbed organic soils or factors associated with restoration techniques, such as the creation of pools, the application of mulch to support vegetation re-establishment, or the use of biomass to infill ditches.

## 3.2.2 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and removals from the soils of rewetted organic soils result from 1) the balance between CH<sub>4</sub> production and oxidation and 2) emission of CH<sub>4</sub> produced by the combustion of soil organic matter during fire (Equation 3.7).

<p><b>EQUATION 3.7</b></p> <p><b>CH<sub>4</sub>-C EMISSIONS/REMOVALS FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS</b></p> $CH_4-C_{\text{rewetted org soil}} = CH_4-C_{\text{soil}} + L_{\text{fire}}-CH_4-C$
--

Where:

$CH_4-C_{\text{rewetted org soil}}$  = CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$CH_4-C_{\text{soil}}$  = emissions/removals of CH<sub>4</sub>-C from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$L_{\text{fire}}-CH_4-C$  = emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>-C from burning of rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

The default EFs provided in this section will only cover CH<sub>4</sub>-C<sub>soil</sub>. These CH<sub>4</sub> emissions result from the decomposition of the organic soil by microbes under anaerobic conditions and are strongly controlled by oxygen availability within the soil and by soil temperature. Methane emissions also originate from the decay of non-tree vegetation, since these pools cannot be easily separated on organic soils they are combined here as CH<sub>4</sub>-C<sub>soil</sub>.

The probability of fire occurrence in rewetted organic soils is likely small if water table position is near the surface, but possible soil emissions from fires are included here for completeness. If rewetting or restoration practices involve biomass burning, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from biomass burning must be estimated in a way consistent with the guidance provided in Chapters 2 (generic methods), 4 (Forest Land) and 5 (Cropland), Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Emissions from soil burning ( $L_{\text{fire}}-CH_4-C$ ) should be estimated using the guidance provided in Section 2.2.2.3 of this supplement applying the fuel consumption value for wildfire on undrained organic soil (Table 2.6) and CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors given in Table 2.7. The EF of Table 2.7 should be multiplied by 12/16 to obtain tonnes of CH<sub>4</sub>-C yr<sup>-1</sup>.

Care should be taken to report fire emissions only once to avoid double-counting fire emissions.

### CHOICE OF METHOD

Refer to Figure 3.1 for the decision tree to select the appropriate Tier for the estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions or removals from rewetted organic soils.

#### Tier 1

The default methodology covers CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted organic soils (Equation 3.7).

As in Section 3.2.1, the basic approach makes no distinction on the basis of the objectives of site rewetting (restoration or other management activities). In addition, as in Section 3.2.1 the Tier1 methodology assumes there is no transient period for rewetted organic soils and therefore default EFs are applicable from the year of rewetting.

**EQUATION 3.8**  
**ANNUAL CH<sub>4</sub>-C EMISSIONS FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$CH_4\text{-}C_{soil} = \frac{\sum_{c,n} (A \cdot EF_{CH_4\text{ soil}})_{c,n}}{1000}$$

Where:

$CH_4\text{-}C_{soil}$  = CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions from rewetted organic soils, tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$A_{c,n}$  = area of rewetted organic soils in climate zone c and nutrient status n, ha

$EF_{CH_4\text{ soil}}$  = emission factor from rewetted organic soils in climate zone c and nutrient status n, kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

Rewetted areas should be subdivided by climate zone (boreal, temperate or tropical) and the appropriate emission factors should be applied. Thus far flux data on CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions from successfully rewetted tropical sites are lacking. Thus, the default EF has been developed from data on undrained tropical peat swamp forests in Southeast Asia which represent the largest extent of peatland in the tropics (Joosten, 2009; Page *et al.*, 2010). The representativeness of this default EF should be assessed prior to its application outside peat swamp in Southeast Asia. Annex 3A.3 describes the derivation method. Data on methane fluxes from other tropical organic soils, for example the *Papyrus* marshes of Africa or the peatlands of Panama, the Guianas and other parts of the Americas, are lacking. When information is available on the nutrient status of the organic soil, it is recommended to further subdivide the rewetted area into nutrient-poor and nutrient-rich, multiply each one by the appropriate emission factor and sum the products for the total CH<sub>4</sub> emissions.

### **Tier 2 and 3**

Tier 2 calculations use country-specific emission factors and parameters, spatially disaggregated to reflect regionally important ecosystems or practices such as papyrus, Sago palm or reed cultivation, and dominant ecological dynamics. In general, CH<sub>4</sub>-C fluxes from wet organic soils are extremely skewed, approaching a log-normal (right-tailed) distribution (see Annex 3A.3). This asymmetry towards rare, but high efflux values causes high mean values compared to the most likely encountered median values. Nevertheless, use of the mean value will give an unbiased estimate of total emissions from the area in question. For countries where rewetted organic soils are a significant component of a *key category* it is *good practice* to develop EFs based on measurements or experiments within the country and thus contribute to better scientific understanding of CH<sub>4</sub> effluxes from rewetted organic soils. Possible factors to consider for disaggregation of rewetted organic soil area include water table depth, the prior land use, time since rewetting, and the presence/absence of vegetation cover and of ditches (see Box 3.1).

**Box 3.1****CONTROLS ON CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from organic soils strongly depend on the depth of the water table (Annex 3A.3). Both low and high flux values have been observed from saturated organic soils (Augustin & Chojnicki, 2008; Couwenberg & Fritz, 2012; Glatzel *et al.*, 2011). It is *good practice*, when developing and using country-specific CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors, to examine their relationship with water table position. In this case, activity data on mean annual water table position and its distribution in space would also be required.

Prior land use (e.g. agriculture, peat extraction, forestry) can influence CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from rewetted organic soils. For example, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions following the flooding of some agricultural land with nutrient enriched top-soil appear higher compared to average emission factors (Augustin & Chojnicki, 2008; Glatzel *et al.*, 2011) whereas rewetted boreal cutover peatlands may have CH<sub>4</sub> emissions below the average emission factors (Waddington and Day, 2007). It may therefore increase accuracy to subdivide activity data and emission factors according to previous land use. The influence of previous land use may diminish over time and countries are encouraged to monitor emissions/removals of CH<sub>4</sub> from rewetted organic soils to evaluate this effect.

As noted in Chapter 2, emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>-C from drainage ditches can be much higher than the surrounding drained fields. Few data are available on CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions from ditches of rewetted organic soils and in some cases ditches are filled during rewetting activities. Moreover, rewetting reduces the hydrological differences between fields and neighboring ditches creating a more homogeneous surface from which CH<sub>4</sub> is emitted/removed. In some cases rewetting practices may retain ditches (e.g. Waddington *et al.*, 2010) and when ditches remain, it is *good practice* to include estimates of CH<sub>4</sub>-C ditch emissions using methodology provided in Chapter 2 (Equation 2.6) and country-specific emission factors. Table 2A.1 can also be consulted for guidance on emission factors for remaining ditches.

The number of long-term rewetting studies is limited and changes in CH<sub>4</sub> flux over time remain unclear. Research on restored cutover peatlands in Canada indicates a steady increase in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in the years immediately after rewetting as the emerging vegetation cover provides fresh substrates for CH<sub>4</sub> production (Waddington and Day, 2007). In contrast, rewetting of intensively used grassland on fen peat suggests that CH<sub>4</sub> emissions may decline over time as litter inundated during rewetting activities is rapidly decomposed in the first few years (Limpens *et al.* 2008). Changes in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and removals over time appear to be linked to vegetation succession (e.g. Tuittila *et al.*, 2000) and thus understanding the pattern of emissions over time would require the inclusion of vegetation information.

Several studies in both undisturbed and rewetted organic soils indicate the important role that vegetation may play for providing substrate for CH<sub>4</sub> production and for transporting CH<sub>4</sub> from the saturated soil to the atmosphere (e.g. Bubier, 1995; Shannon *et al.*, 1996; Marinier *et al.*, 2004; Tuittila *et al.*, 2000; Wilson *et al.*, 2009; Dias *et al.*, 2010). Species known to transport CH<sub>4</sub> from the soil to the atmosphere include, but are not limited to *Alnus*, *Calla*, *Carex*, *Cladium*, *Eleocharis*, *Equisetum*, *Eriophorum*, *Glyceria*, *Nuphar*, *Nymphaea*, *Peltandra*, *Phalaris*, *Phragmites*, *Sagittaria*, *Scheuchzeria*, *Scirpus*, *Typha* and various peat swamp forest trees (Sebacher *et al.*, 1985; Brix *et al.*, 1992; Chanton *et al.*, 1992; Schimel, 1995; Shannon *et al.*, 1996; Frenzel & Rudolph, 1998; Rusch & Rennenberg, 1998; Verville *et al.*, 1998; Yavitt & Knapp, 1998; Grünfeld & Brix, 1999; Frenzel & Karofeld, 2000; Tuittila *et al.*, 2000; Arkebauer *et al.*, 2001; Gauci *et al.*, 2010; Armstrong & Armstrong, 2011; Askaer *et al.*, 2011; Konnerup *et al.*, 2011; Pangala *et al.*, 2012). The presence of these aerenchymous shunt species has a significant effect on CH<sub>4</sub> efflux from organic soils (Couwenberg & Fritz, 2012). Countries are encouraged to develop nationally specific emission factors that address vegetation composition (see Riutta *et al.*, 2007; Dias *et al.*, 2010; Couwenberg *et al.*, 2011; Forbrich *et al.*, 2011). The effect of biomass harvesting on CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from rewetted organic soils has thus far remained unstudied.

A Tier 3 approach involves a comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions on rewetted organic soils, including the representation of interactions between the dominant drivers of CH<sub>4</sub> dynamics, as described above and potentially addressing different flux pathways, including ebullition (Strack *et al.*, 2005). Possible methods include detailed country-specific monitoring of CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions/removals across rewetted organic soils representing a variety of water table positions, prior land use and time since rewetting.



CH<sub>4</sub> emissions/removals could also be estimated using process-based models including factors described above (see e.g. Walter *et al.*, 2001; Frolking *et al.*, 2002; Van Huissteden *et al.*, 2006; Baird *et al.*, 2009; Li *et al.*, 2009; Meng *et al.*, 2012).

## CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

### Tier 1

The implementation of the Tier 1 method requires the application of default emission factors EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub> provided in Table 3.3, where they are disaggregated by climate zone (boreal, temperate, tropical) and nutrient status (nutrient poor, rich). If the nutrient status of rewetted organic soils in boreal or temperate zones is not known, countries should use the default nutrient poor EF for sites in the boreal zone, and the nutrient rich EF for sites in the temperate zone. The emission factor for rewetted tropical organic soils assumes a near surface water table throughout the year. For tropical areas experiencing a distinct dry season, where water tables drop below 20 cm below surface, the emission factor in Table 3.3 should be multiplied by the number of wet months divided by 12. Annex 3A.3 provides more details on the derivation of the default EFs and references used for their determination.

TABLE 3.3 DEFAULT EMISSION FACTORS FOR CH <sub>4</sub> FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS (ALL VALUES IN KG CH <sub>4</sub> -C HA <sup>-1</sup> YR <sup>-1</sup> )			
Climate zone	Nutrient Status	EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub>	95% range
Boreal*	Poor	41 (n=39 sites)	0.5 – 246
	Rich	137 (n=35 sites)	0 – 493
Temperate**	Poor	92 (n=42 sites)	3 – 445
	Rich	216 (n=37 sites)	0 – 856
Tropical***		41 (n=11 sites)	7 – 134
<p>* Derived from the following source material (see Annex 3 A.3 for details): Alm <i>et al.</i>, 1997; Bubier <i>et al.</i>, 1993; Clymo &amp; Reddaway, 1971; Drewer <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Gauci <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Juottonen <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Komulainen <i>et al.</i>, 1998; Laine <i>et al.</i>, 1996; Nykänen <i>et al.</i>, 1995; Tuittila <i>et al.</i>, 2000; Urbanová <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Verma <i>et al.</i>, 1992; Waddington &amp; Roulet, 2000; Whiting &amp; Chanton, 2001; Yli-Petäys <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Strack &amp; Zuback, 2013.</p> <p>** Augustin &amp; Merbach, 1998; Augustin, 2003; Augustin <i>et al.</i>, 1996; Augustin in Couwenberg <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Bortoluzzi <i>et al.</i>, 2006; Cleary <i>et al.</i>, 2005; Crill in Bartlett &amp; Harris, 1993; Dise &amp; Gorham, 1993; Drösler, 2005; Drösler <i>et al.</i>, 2013; Flessa <i>et al.</i>, 1997; Glatzel <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Harriss <i>et al.</i>, 1982; Hendriks <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Jungkunst &amp; Fiedler, 2007; Koehler <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Nagata <i>et al.</i>, 2005; Nilsson <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Roulet <i>et al.</i>, 2007; Scottish Executive, 2007; Shannon &amp; White, 1994; Sommer <i>et al.</i>, 2003; Tauchnitz <i>et al.</i>, 2008; Von Arnold, 2004; Waddington &amp; Price, 2000; Wickland, 2001; Wild <i>et al.</i>, 2001; Wilson <i>et al.</i>, 2009, 2013; Beetz <i>et al.</i>, 2013.</p> <p>*** Derived from the following source material from undrained sites (see Annex 3 A.3 for details): Furukawa <i>et al.</i>, 2005; Hadi <i>et al.</i>, 2001, 2005; Inubushi <i>et al.</i>, 1998; Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i>, 2001, 2004, 2005, 2008; Melling <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Pangala <i>et al.</i>, 2012.</p>			

### Tier 2 and 3

It is *good practice* to develop country-specific emission factors for each climate zone and nutrient status. Differences in water table position explain a large proportion of variation in annual CH<sub>4</sub> flux between sites (Annex 3A.3). Thus, estimation of CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions/removals using country-specific EFs related to water table position will greatly improve estimation. Estimates of CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils can be further improved by implementing scientific findings relating CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions to specific cropping practices, prior land use, vegetation cover and time since rewetting.

Default emission factors are not provided for specific wet cropping practices, such as for Sago, Taro or reed plantations on wet organic soils where the scientific evidence is insufficient to support a globally applicable EF. Where such practices are nationally important, it is *good practice* to derive country-specific emission factors from pertinent publications (e.g. Inubushi *et al.*, 1998; Melling *et al.*, 2005; Watanabe *et al.*, 2009; Chimner & Ewel 2004), taking into account water table dynamics. Emission factors for rice cropping on organic soils should follow the guidance provided in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

### 3.2.3 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetted organic soils

The emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O from rewetted organic soils are controlled by the quantity of N available for nitrification and denitrification, and the availability of the oxygen required for these chemical reactions. Oxygen availability is in turn controlled by the depth of the water table. Raising the depth of the water table will cause N<sub>2</sub>O emissions to decrease rapidly, and fall practically to zero if the depth of the water table is less than 20cm below the surface (Couwenberg *et al.*, 2011). Saturated conditions may promote denitrification and the consumption of N<sub>2</sub>O, but in practice this effect is very small and considered negligible in this chapter. This is because anoxic conditions and low NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> availability reduce the rates of mineralisation and nitrification, two processes that are prerequisites for denitrification.

Equation 3.9 includes the essential elements for estimating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetted organic soils:

**EQUATION 3.9**

**N<sub>2</sub>O-N EMISSIONS FROM REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS**

$$N_2O_{\text{rewetted org soil-N}} = N_2O_{\text{soil-N}} + L_{\text{fire-N}}N_2O-N$$

Where:

$N_2O_{\text{rewetted org soil-N}}$  = N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from rewetted organic soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$N_2O_{\text{soil-N}}$  = N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from the soil pool of rewetted organic soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

$L_{\text{fire-N}}N_2O-N$  = N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from burning of rewetted organic soils, kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

Generic methodologies for estimating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the burning of vegetation and dead organic matter are provided in Chapter 2, Volume 4 in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, while methodologies specific to vegetation and DOM burning in Forest land, Cropland, Grassland and Wetlands are provided in Chapters 4-7, Volume 4 in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. If rewetting practices involve burning, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the burning of organic soils should in theory be estimated. Published data are insufficient to develop default N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors for the burning of organic soils (See Chapter 2 in this supplement); therefore  $L_{\text{fire-N}}N_2O-N$  of Equation 3.9 is not considered in this section.

#### Tier 1

Under Tier 1, emissions of nitrous oxides from rewetted soils are assumed to be negligible (Hendriks *et al.*, 2007; Wilson *et al.*, 2013).

#### Tier 2 & 3

Countries where rewetted organic soils are a significant component of a *key category* should take into account patterns of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from these sites, particularly where the nitrogen budget of the watershed is potentially influenced by significant local or regional N inputs such as in large-scale farmland development.

Country-specific emission factors should take into account fluctuations of the water table depth, which controls oxygen availability for nitrification, and previous land use, which may have resulted in top soil enrichment (Nagata *et al.*, 2005; 2010). The development of country-specific emission factors should take into consideration that significant N inputs into rewetted ecosystems may originate from allochthonous (external) sources, such as fertilizer use in the surrounding watershed. Measurement protocols should be designed in such a way as to allow separating such inputs, to avoid double-counting N<sub>2</sub>O emissions that may already be reported as indirect emissions from anthropogenic N input within the watershed (Chapter 11, Volume 4 of *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soil fires on rewetted organic soils should be estimated on the basis of scientific evidence.

### 3.2.4 Choice of activity data

All methodological Tiers require data on areas of rewetted organic soils, broken down by climate zone and nutrient status (nutrient poor or nutrient rich) as appropriate. This section clarifies further data requirements and suggests potential data sources.

Activity data used in the calculations can be obtained from various sources: scientific publications, databases and soil map references, reports on rewetting projects, official communications. This information may have been developed in government agencies, conservation organizations, research institutions and industry, subject to any confidentiality considerations. It is *good practice*, when collecting activity data, to also obtain protocols for data collection (frequency, measurement methods and time span), estimation methods, and estimates of accuracy and precision. Reasons for significant changes in activity data and inter-annual fluctuations should be explained.

### Tier 1

The default methodology assumes that a country has data on the area of rewetted organic soils, the nutrient status of organic soils in temperate and boreal climates, and basic information on rewetting practices – such as the duration of the phase without vegetation and any remnant ditches – consistent with the guidance above on the applicability of default emission factors.

Rewetted organic soils have been previously drained. A potential first step to determine the occurrence and location of rewetted organic soils is to investigate historical information on drained organic soils; chapter 2 provides guidance to identify such information.

Depending on national circumstances, it may be more effective to directly identify rewetted organic soils. The data can be obtained from domestic soil statistics and databases, spatial or not, land cover (in particular wetlands), land use and agricultural crops (for example specialty crops typically grown on organic soils); this information can be used to identify areas with significant coverage of organic soils. Useful information on existing or planned activities may be available from the domestic peat extraction industry, regional or national forestry or agricultural agencies or conservation organisations. Agricultural, forestry or other type of government extension services may be able to provide specific information on common management practices on organic soils, for example for certain crop production, forest or plantation management or peat extraction. Information relative to rewetting practices is more likely available from regional practitioners, either in extension services, conservation organizations or environmental engineering firms. Data may also exist on water monitoring or management, including water management plans, areas where water level is regulated, floodplains or groundwater monitoring data. Such information could be available from government agencies involved in water management or the insurance industry, and be used in the determination of areas where the water level is naturally high, has been lowered or is managed for various purposes.

Remote sensing can also be used for wet area detection and mapping of vegetation type, biomass, and other characteristics. Time series of remotely-sensed imagery (e.g. aerial photography, satellite imagery etc.) can assist in the detection of rewetted organic soils and in the determination of time since rewetting. Such imagery may be produced either by research institutes, departments or agencies, universities or by the private sector.

In the absence of domestic data on soils, it is recommended to consult the International Soil Reference and Information Centre (ISRIC; [www.isric.org](http://www.isric.org); FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC, 2012. Harmonized World Soil Database (version 1.2). FAO, Rome, Italy and IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria). Inventory compilers should also investigate available documentation on rewetting or restoration projects with the International Peat Society (Commission V: Restoration, rehabilitation and after-use of peatlands, [www.peatociety.org](http://www.peatociety.org)), the International Mire Conservation Group ([www.imcg.net](http://www.imcg.net)) and the Verified Carbon Standard ([v-c-s.org](http://v-c-s.org)).

When information is gathered from a variety of sources, cross-checks should be made to ensure complete and consistent representation of land management practices and areas. For example, an area should not be counted twice if it is subject to several management practices over the course of a year. Rather, the combined effect of these practices should be estimated as a single rewetting for the area in question.

### Tier 2

Tier 2 methodology is likely to involve a more detailed spatial stratification than in Tier 1, and further sub-divisions based on time since rewetting, previous land use history, current land use and management practices as well as vegetation composition. It is *good practice* to further sub-divide default classes based on empirical data that demonstrate significant differences in GHG fluxes among the proposed categories. At Tier 2, higher spatial resolution of activity data is expected and can be obtained by disaggregating global data in country-specific categories, or by collecting country-specific activity data.

Domestic data sources are generally more appropriate than international ones to support higher tiered estimation approaches. In some cases relevant information must be created; it is *good practice* to investigate potential institutional arrangements to optimize the efficiency and effectiveness of data creation efforts, as well as plan for regular updates and long-term maintenance of a domestic information system.

To make use of remote sensing data for inventories, and in particular to relate land cover to land use, it is *good practice* to complement the remotely sensed data with ground reference data (often called ground truth data). Land uses that are rapidly changing over the estimation period or that are easily misclassified should be more intensively ground-truthed than other areas. This can only be done by using ground reference data, preferably from actual ground surveys collected independently. High-resolution aerial photographs or satellite imagery may also be useful. Further guidance can be found in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

More sophisticated estimation methodologies will require the determination of annual average water table depth; land use and management practices prior to rewetting; and vegetation composition and the succession changes in vegetation community composition and biomass with time since rewetting. This type of information can be obtained by long-term monitoring of rewetted sites under various conditions, and should be combined with an

enhanced understanding of the processes linking GHG emissions or removals to these factors. Depending on climate and site conditions, it may be appropriate to assess variations in water table depth over annual, seasonal, monthly or even weekly period; the development of cost-effective higher tier methods may involve both monitoring and modelling of water table variations over time.

### Tier 3

For application of a direct measurement-based inventory in Tier 3, similar or more detailed data on the combinations of climate, soil, topographic and management data are needed, relative to the Tier 1 and 2 methods. Comprehensive field sampling, where appropriate combined with remote sensing systems repeated at regular time intervals, will provide high spatial resolution on organic soils, time since rewetting, and land-use and management activity data.

Scientific teams are usually actively involved in the development of Tier 3 methods. The viability of advanced estimation methodologies relies in part on well-designed information systems that are able to provide relevant activity data with the appropriate spatial and temporal coverage and resolution, have well-documented data collection protocols and quality control, and are supported by a long-term financial commitment for update and maintenance.

## 3.2.5 Sources of uncertainty

Uncertainty in estimated GHG emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils will arise from uncertainties in EFs and other parameters, uncertainties in activity data, and model structure/parameter error for Tier 3 model-based methods. Further guidance on error estimation and the combination of errors is given in Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

For Tier 1, uncertainty level for default emission factors represent the 95% confidence interval for CO<sub>2</sub>-C and DOC as presented in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. Due to the skewed distribution of CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions/removals data, the uncertainty is given as the (asymmetric) range of 95% of the data as outlined in Chapter 3, Volume 1 of the *2006 Guidelines*. While there may be still considerable uncertainty around each datapoint used in the derivation of the EFs, the 95% confidence interval values presented in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 primarily reflect the uncertainty of the use of a single default EF that has been derived from many rewetted and undrained sites that may vary considerably from each other in terms of (1) their current abiotic and biotic characteristics and (2) their land use prior to rewetting. The confidence intervals also capture the uncertainty associated with the spatial variation reported in fluxes from the various study sites. Uncertainty also arises from inter-annual variability, although it has been reduced by using the mean of multi-year datasets from the same site.

Sources of uncertainty when using default emission factors also include under-represented environmental conditions in the dataset (including initial conditions and rewetting practices), lack of data representative of various phases and end-points of the rewetting process (e.g. a transient period).

Countries developing emission factors for their inventories at higher tiers should assess the uncertainty of these factors. Possible sources of uncertainty in country-specific emission factors include limited data for GHG emissions/removals on rewetted organic soils in a given region, application of emission factors measured in a small number of rewetted areas to wide areas with different land-use and rewetting histories, application of emission factors derived from short duration studies regardless of the time since rewetting. It is *good practice* for countries using numerical models for estimating GHG emissions/removals at Tier 3 to estimate uncertainty of these models.

Uncertainty in activity data will depend on its source. Aggregated land-use area statistics for activity data (e.g. FAO), may require a correction factor to minimize possible bias. Sources of uncertainty about activity data may include the omission or duplication of rewetted areas, especially if data are gathered from a variety of sources, missing historical data on rewetted organic soils, insufficient information on rewetting practices, post-rewetting vegetation succession, variation on the water table depths, and on the end-point(s) of the rewetting process. Accuracy can be improved by using country-specific activity data from various national, regional and local institutions, with uncertainty estimated based on data collection method and expert judgment. When information regarding activity data is gathered from a variety of sources, cross-checks should be made to ensure complete and consistent representation of land management practices and areas.

## 3.3 COMPLETENESS, TIME SERIES CONSISTENCY, AND QA/QC

### 3.3.1 Completeness

Complete GHG inventories include estimates of emissions from all GHG emissions and removals on rewetted organic soils for which Tier 1 guidance is provided in this chapter, for all types of organic soils that occur on the national territory.

Not all drained soils in the national territory may have been rewetted, but all rewetted sites were drained at some point in the past. A complete inventory will include all drained organic soils, as well as those that have been subsequently rewetted.

Information should be provided, for each land-use category, on the proportion of drained and rewetted areas with organic soils. Overall, the sum of rewetted areas with organic soils reported under each land-use categories should equal the total national area of rewetted organic soils.

### 3.3.2 Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC)

Quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures should be developed and implemented as outlined in Chapter 7 of this supplement.

It is *good practice* that countries using Tier 1 methods critically assess the applicability of the default assumptions to their national circumstances. For example, countries are encouraged to determine in what way, if any, drainage or rewetting with no change in land use affects biomass and dead-organic matter pools and adjust assumptions or methods to incorporate their findings in estimates. In light of their strong influence on GHG emissions, the frequency and any periodicity of possible water table fluctuations in rewetted ecosystems should be factored into the assessment or development of emission factors.

Higher tier methods should be carefully designed to ensure that resulting estimates are compatible across different pools. In particular, potential double-counting of emissions or removals could occur if estimates derived from flux-based emission factors are combined with estimates calculated from stock change; this could occur for example if C uptake by vegetation is included in both a net flux to/from the atmosphere and the stock change in the biomass pool. Likewise, a net flux and the stock change of the dead organic matter pool could both include emissions to the atmosphere as a result of DOM decay. It is useful to incorporate scientific expertise actively in the design of domestic methods and the development of country-specific parameter values to ensure that C transfers to and from carbon pools, and between the biosphere and the atmosphere, are all captured to the extent possible and not double-counted. Where country-specific emission factors are being used, they should be based on high quality field data, developed using a rigorous measurement programme, and be adequately documented, preferably in the peer-reviewed, scientific literature. Documentation should be provided to establish the representativeness and applicability of country-specific emission factors to the national circumstances, including regionally significant rewetting and restoration practices and relevant ecosystems.

It is *good practice* to develop additional, category-specific quality control and quality assurance procedures for emissions and removals in this category. Examples of such procedures include, but are not limited to, examining the time series of the total area of managed land on organic soils across all land-use categories to ensure there is no unexplained gains or losses of land; conducting a comparative analysis of emission factors applied to rewetted land on organic soils and fluxes from un-drained similar ecosystems; ensuring consistency of the area and location of rewetted organic soils with the information provided on drained organic soils.

## Annex 3A.1 Estimation of default emission factors for CO<sub>2</sub>-C in rewetted organic soils

### Methodologies

An extensive literature review was conducted to collate all CO<sub>2</sub> studies that are currently available for (1) rewetted organic soils (as defined in the Introduction of this chapter and including rewetted, restored and wet managed sites) and (2) natural/undrained organic soils. Literature sources included both published and non-peer reviewed (grey literature) studies. In the case of the latter the study was reviewed by all Lead Authors in this chapter and expert judgement was exercised as to whether the study was scientifically acceptable for inclusion. In total, 3 non-peer reviewed studies were included.

All studies included in the database reported CO<sub>2</sub> flux based estimation methodologies using either the chamber or eddy covariance (EC) techniques. The chamber method involves the measurement of gas fluxes at high spatial resolution and is widely employed in conditions where the vegetation is either low or absent. The EC towers are typically used at sites that are relatively flat and homogeneous which includes open and treed organic soils. For a more detailed description of both methodologies see Alm *et al.* (2007). A detailed database of annual CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes was then constructed to determine the main drivers (if any) of CO<sub>2</sub> dynamics in rewetted organic soils. When available, the following parameters were extracted from the literature source and included in the database for analysis: climate zone (see Table 4.1, Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), nutrient status, mean water table depth (WTD), median water table depth (as well as minimum and maximum), soil pH, thickness of the organic soil layer, C/N ratio, degree of humification, soil moisture, soil bulk density, plant cover and species, previous land use and time since rewetting.

The CO<sub>2</sub> flux database initially contained a total of 216 annual flux estimates taken from 52 locations. At each study location a number of sites could be identified with similar dominant vegetation and hydrology, and each as such represented an entry in the database. For multi-year studies from the same site, annual flux estimates were averaged over the years. The final number of entries came to 123 and was distributed as follows:

- (i) Degradation status (Natural/undrained = 74; Rewetted = 49)
- (ii) Climate zone (Boreal = 65; Temperate = 58)
- (iii) Nutrient status (Nutrient rich = 54; Nutrient poor = 69).

The criteria for inclusion in the database were as follows: (1) the study reported CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from either rewetted organic soils, abandoned and naturally rewetted organic soils or natural undrained organic soils. All natural sites that had a water table deeper than 30 cm were not included in the final database to calculate the EF, as these were assessed as not being 'wet'. In other words, only natural sites with a WTD of -30 cm (negative values indicate a mean WTD below the peat/soil surface) or shallower (i.e. close to or above the soil surface) were deemed suitable as a proxy for rewetted sites since the mean water table depths recorded at all the rewetted sites in our database was always at, or shallower than -30 cm. The mean WTD is calculated over one year where the flux measurements cover the full 12 months. In boreal regions, the mean WTD applies to the growing season only. (2) The study had to report either seasonal or annual CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes. Studies in the database that reported daily CO<sub>2</sub> flux values were not used as upscaling to an annual flux value would have led to very high under- or over-estimations. Seasonal CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes (typically reported for the snow free May to October growing period) were converted to annual fluxes using 15% of the seasonal ecosystem respiration data from each study to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from the non-growing season, although this may represent a slight overestimation given that photosynthesis (and hence C uptake) may have occurred for a short time following the ending of those seasonal studies. For studies where such data were not available, a value of 30g CO<sub>2</sub>-C m<sup>-2</sup> for non-growing season fluxes was used. (3) Studies had to indicate a mean WTD for each annual CO<sub>2</sub> flux reported. In some cases, this information was available from other publications and the CO<sub>2</sub> flux value was accepted for inclusion. (4) For studies using the EC technique, care was taken not to use annual CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes that included a woody biomass pool (e.g. treed organic soils) as this would have resulted in double accounting at the Tier 1 level. Calculated default EFs for CO<sub>2</sub> exclude woody biomass.

### Results


To determine Tier 1 CO<sub>2</sub>-C EFs, descriptive statistics allowed the data to be grouped by (1) *climate zone* and in some cases by (2) *nutrient status* (poor or rich) and descriptive analysis for each group was computed.

#### **1) Temperate and boreal sites**

A comparison was made between individual annual net CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from rewetted sites and natural/undrained sites as found in the literature (see reference list in footnote of Table 3.1 in the main text). The wide range of fluxes recorded in rewetted sites can be explained by a number of factors such as 1) vegetation cover (includes

non-vegetated surfaces), 2) average annual water table depth, 3) restoration practices (other than rewetting). While noting this large variation, especially within the temperate climate zone ( $-2115$  to  $2786$  g CO<sub>2</sub>-C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>), the array from both groups, natural/undrained vs rewetted is analogous (Figure 3A.1a and b).

**Figure 3A.1** Ranges of CO<sub>2</sub> flux values (g CO<sub>2</sub> m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) found in the published literature for natural/undrained and rewetted organic soils in (a) boreal and (b) temperate climate zones. Positive flux values indicate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the ecosystem to the atmosphere and negative flux values indicate removal of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere by the ecosystem. References used to compile graph are to be found in Table 3.1.




Mean water table depth (WTD) was plotted against annual CO<sub>2</sub> flux. The fitted regression lines (CO<sub>2</sub> flux =  $a + b_1 \cdot \text{WTD}$ ) were compared between rewetted and natural/undrained organic soils for each climate zone (see Figures 3A.2a and b). The groups were treated as being non-significantly different when it was ascertained statistically that  $b_1 \pm \text{S.E. (rewetted)}$  fitted within  $b_1 - \text{S.E.}$  and  $b_1 + \text{S.E.}$  for the natural/undrained group. This was the case for both boreal and temperate organic soils. Therefore, EFs were calculated using rewetted and natural/undrained data points for each climatic zone. Means of fluxes with their 95% confidence interval were calculated for each of the categories.




**Figure 3A.2 Relationship between annual CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes and mean annual water table depth (cm) for both undrained and rewetted organic soils in (a) boreal and (b) temperate climate zones**

**a) Boreal climate zone**



**b) Temperate climate zone**



Note:

1. fitted regression line is CO<sub>2</sub> flux = a+b1\*WTD.
2. Negative water table values indicate a mean water table position below the soil surface and positive values indicate a mean water table position above the soil surface.

Nutrient rich sites generally display a wider range of flux values than nutrient-poor sites. This wider range can be explained by the higher diversity of nutrient rich sites. For example, plant associations in rich fens are diverse, commonly dominated by brown mosses, sedges and grasses. The majority of the nutrient rich organic soils used in the calculation of the EF for the boreal zone are sedge rich fens which are known to be highly productive ecosystems (Bellisario *et al.*, 1998, Alm *et al.*, 1997, Bubier *et al.*, 1999, Yli-Petäys *et al.*, 2007). The wider range of flux values can also be explained by the diversity of previous land-uses as nutrient rich organic soils have been used more intensively than nutrient poor sites, especially across the temperate zone.


Some studies on natural/undrained nutrient rich organic soils in the temperate zone have reported net annual carbon sources (Nagata *et al.* 2005, Wickland 2001, Drösler *et al.* 2013), although this may appear inconsistent with the fact that they hold large, long-term stores of carbon. Considerable uncertainty is attached to individual data points used in the derivation of the default EF, as the studies are generally of a short duration (1-2 years) and do not take into account the longer-term natural variation. It should be re-affirmed that over longer time-scales, natural and successfully rewetted nutrient rich organic soils (i.e. with vegetation that accumulates SOM) are CO<sub>2</sub> sinks unless another anthropogenic activity is impacting on the site (e.g. pollution, atmospheric deposition, climate change).

By contrast, nutrient poor organic soils displayed less variation in CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes across both boreal and temperate zones; the associated EFs suggest that for both boreal and temperate (Table 3.1), they are net long-term sinks for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, confirming that natural/undrained and rewetted nutrient poor organic soils play as important a role in the contemporary global C cycle as they have in the past.

## 2) Tropical sites

Data on net CO<sub>2</sub>-C fluxes from successfully rewetted tropical organic soils are lacking. Subsidence measurements provide a good measure of carbon losses from drained organic soils (see Chapter 2 of this supplement) and in tropical organic soils subsidence is near zero when the water table approaches the surface (Figure 3A.3; Hooijer *et al.*, 2012, see also Couwenberg *et al.*, 2010). In undrained/natural conditions tropical organic soils constitute a CO<sub>2</sub>-C sink of 0.3 – 1.1 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> (Lähteenoja *et al.*, 2009, 2011; Dommain *et al.*, 2011). In light of the available evidence the Tier1 default EF is set at 0 t CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>. This value is consistent with observations on subsidence and reflects the fact that rewetting effectively stops soil organic matter oxidation but does not necessarily re-establish the soil C sink function.

**Figure 3A.3** Subsidence rates as measured in drained tropical organic soils in relation to water table depth. From Hooijer *et al.* 2012.



## **Annex 3A.2      Estimation of default emission factors for off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions via waterborne carbon losses (CO<sub>2</sub>-DOC) from rewetted organic soils**

Waterborne carbon export has been found to be an important pathway linking the organic soils carbon pool to the atmosphere as there is a growing evidence that aquatic system is characterised by high levels of allochthonous Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC), a high proportion of which is processed and converted to CO<sub>2</sub>. A full characterisation of waterborne C losses comprises not only DOC, but also particulate organic carbon (POC), the dissolved gases CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> and the dissolved carbonate species: HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>. Particulate inorganic carbon (PIC) losses are considered negligible from all types of organic soils.

The various sources, behaviour and fate of these different forms of waterborne C within organic soil systems are further described in Chapter 2 (Annex 2A.3). However, in temperate and boreal, natural/undrained sites, as well as rewetted organic soils, DOC has been found to be by far the major component of fluvial C export, while POC, DIC and dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> are minor components of the total land-atmosphere CO<sub>2</sub> exchange and are therefore not estimated here.

Very little data exist pertaining to POC losses from rewetted organic soils and these losses are likely to be site-specific. However, while in-stream processing of POC (respiration/evasion) may be occurring, the greater proportion may be simply translocated from the rewetted organic soil to other stable C stores, such as freshwater or marine sediments where it will not lead to CO<sub>2</sub> emission. Therefore, due to current scientific uncertainty of the ultimate fate of POC export, no estimation methodology is presented here for emissions produced from the decomposition of POC lost from rewetted organic soils (see Appendix 2a.1 for future methodological development to estimate POC).

This section describes the methodology that has been used to derive emission factors for DOC losses from rewetted organic soils as this has been shown to be the largest component of waterborne carbon loss from all types of organic soils (see Chapter 2). Collated data from seven rewetting studies suggest a median DOC reduction of 36%, with a range of 1-83% (Table 3A.1). While the number of studies is limited, and results are variable, the median reduction is almost exactly equivalent to the observed increase following drainage (a 33% decrease in DOC would be required to fully reverse a 50% increase).

Some studies observed similar DOC concentrations in rewetted and restored bogs (previously used for peat extraction) as in a nearby intact reference bog. Therefore, there is some evidence to suggest that rewetting will return DOC loss fluxes to natural levels. It should be noted here that this reversal is likely to occur after an initial pulse of DOC associated with disturbance during the rewetting process, depending on the techniques used. This hypothesis is proposed as an explanation behind the variability shown in Table 3A.1, where some measurements were made less than a year or during the first two years after rewetting.

While there are a limited number of published studies of rewetting impact on DOC loss, a larger number of studies are available that provide reliable DOC flux estimates from natural/undrained organic soils. These were combined with rewetted sites to derive best estimates of the DOC flux (Table 3A.2).

Finally, the proportion of DOC exported from organic soils which is ultimately converted to CO<sub>2</sub>, called here (Frac<sub>DOC-CO<sub>2</sub></sub>) is also explained in Annex 2A.3 of Chapter 2.

**TABLE 3A.1**  
**DOC CONCENTRATION (ABOVE) OR FLUX (BELOW) COMPARISONS BETWEEN DRAINED AND REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS WITH CHANGES IN DOC FOLLOWING REWETTING**

Previous land-use	Climate zone	Study	DOC (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )		$\Delta\text{DOC}_{\text{Rewetting}}$ (%)
			Drained	Rewetted	
Peat extraction bog	Boreal	Glatzel <i>et al.</i> (2003)	110	70	-36%
Drained blanket bog	Temperate	Wallage <i>et al.</i> (2006)	43	13	-69%
Drained blanket bog	Temperate	Armstrong <i>et al.</i> (2010)	34	30	-10%
Drained blanket bog	Temperate	Gibson <i>et al.</i> (2009)	39	39	-1%
Drained agricultural fen	Temperate	Höll <i>et al.</i> (2009)	86	57	-34%
Drained extraction bog	Temperate	Strack & Zuback (2013)	100	86	-14%
			DOC (g C m <sup>-2</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )		
			Drained	Rewetted	
Peat extraction bog	Temperate	Waddington <i>et al.</i> (2008) Strack & Zuback (2013)	7.5 29	3.5 5	-53% -83%
Drained blanket bog	Temperate	O'Brien <i>et al.</i> (2008)	7.0	4.1	-41%
Drained blanket bog	Temperate	Turner <i>et al.</i> (2013)	79	61	-23%

**TABLE 3A.2**  
**ANNUAL DOC FLUX ESTIMATES FROM NATURAL/UNDRAINED AND REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS USED TO DERIVE DEFAULT VALUES FOR  $\text{DOC}_{\text{FLUX}}$**

Climate zone	Country	Study	Status	DOC flux (t C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
Boreal	Finland	Juutinen <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Natural/undrained	0.037
Boreal	Canada	Moore (2003)	Natural/undrained	0.043
Boreal	Canada	Koprivnjak & Moore (1992)	Natural/undrained	0.052
Boreal	Canada	Moore (2003)	Natural/undrained	0.060
Boreal	Finland	Kortelainen <i>et al.</i> (2006)	Natural/undrained	0.060
Boreal	Finland	Jager <i>et al.</i> (2009)	Natural/undrained	0.078
Boreal	Sweden	Agren <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Natural/undrained	0.099
Boreal	Finland	Rantakari <i>et al.</i> (2010)	Natural/undrained	0.120
Boreal	Sweden	Nilsson <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Natural/undrained	0.130
Boreal	Finland	Kortelainen <i>et al.</i> (2006)	Natural/undrained	0.159
Temperate	Canada	Strack <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Natural/undrained	0.053
Temperate	Canada	Roulet <i>et al.</i> (2007)	Natural/undrained	0.164
Temperate	USA	Urban <i>et al.</i> (1989)	Natural/undrained	0.212
Temperate	USA	Kolka <i>et al.</i> (1999)	Natural/undrained	0.235
Temperate	Canada	Moore <i>et al.</i> (2003)	Natural/undrained	0.290
Temperate	Canada	Clair <i>et al.</i> (2002)	Natural/undrained	0.360
Temperate	UK	Dawson <i>et al.</i> (2004)	Natural/undrained	0.194
Temperate	UK	Dinsmore <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Natural/undrained	0.260
Temperate	UK	Billett <i>et al.</i> (2010)	Natural/undrained	0.234
Temperate	UK	Billett <i>et al.</i> (2010)	Natural/undrained	0.276
Temperate	Ireland	Koehler <i>et al.</i> (2009,2011)	Natural/undrained	0.140

Temperate	Australia	Di Folco & Kirkpatrick (2011)	Natural/undrained	0.134
Temperate	Canada	Waddington <i>et al.</i> (2008), Strack & Zuback (2013)	Rewetted	0.043
Temperate	UK	O'Brien <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Rewetted	0.041
Temperate	UK	Turener <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Rewetted	0.609
Tropical	Indonesia	Baum <i>et al.</i> (2007)	Natural/undrained	0.470
Tropical	Indonesia	Alkhatib <i>et al.</i> (2007)	Natural/undrained	0.549
Tropical	Malaysia	Yule <i>et al.</i> (2009), Zulkifli (2002)	Natural/undrained	0.632
Tropical	Indonesia	Moore <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Natural/undrained	0.625


### Annex 3A.3 Estimation of default emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub>-C in rewetted organic soils

The same literature database and general approach were used to develop default CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors as was described in Annex 3A.1. A detailed database of annual CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes was constructed to determine the main drivers (if any) of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in rewetted organic soils. The collated data are based on closed chamber and eddy covariance flux measurements with a temporal coverage of at least one measurement per month during the snow-free period. Seasonal fluxes (typically May to October) were converted to annual fluxes by assuming that 15% of the flux occurs in the non-growing season (Saarnio *et al.*, 2007). For tropical Southeast Asia, annual data are scarce and direct, non-annualized measurement values were used. Similar to CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurements, data from undrained organic soils only were available and used as proxy for rewetted organic soils.

Where possible, the analysis considered the same parameters as those described in Annex 3A.1: climate zone (latitude), nutrient status, mean annual water table, median annual water table (as well as minimum and maximum), soil pH, organic soil thickness, soil C/N ratio, degree of humification, soil moisture, soil bulk density, plant cover and species, previous land use and time since rewetting. For all subsets mentioned below the collected data show a near log-normal distribution, which, however, did not allow for derivation of standard deviation as a measure of variance. Variance pertains to the 95% interval of the observed data.

Methane fluxes from rewetted boreal organic soils (mean 76.3 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; variance -0.1 – 338.7; n=17<sup>1</sup>) are not significantly different from undrained sites (mean 80.6 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; variance 0.3 – 420.0; n=68<sup>2</sup>). The increase in efflux with rising water table (Figure 3A.4) does not differ significantly between undrained (n=41 data pairs) and rewetted sites (n= 11 pairs). Methane efflux from rewetted nutrient rich organic soils (mean 161.6 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; variance -0.1 – 338.7; n=6) is half an order of magnitude higher than efflux from rewetted nutrient poor organic soils (mean 36.5 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; variance 3.6 – 155; n=8), which is mirrored by efflux values from undrained nutrient rich organic soils (mean 131.5 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; variance 0.2 – 492.8; n=29) and poor organic soils (42.5 kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>; variance 0.3 – 245.9; n=31). The derived emission factors for nutrient rich (n=35) and poor sites (n=39) are based on the total respective datasets.

**Figure 3A.4 Methane flux from boreal and temperate rewetted and undrained organic soils in relation to mean annual water table. Fluxes are expressed as <sup>10</sup>log(1+measured flux) [kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>].**




<sup>1</sup> Juottonen *et al.*, 2012; Komulainen *et al.*, 1998; Tuittila *et al.*, 2000 ; Urbanová *et al.*, 2012 ; Yli-Petäys *et al.*, 2007 ; Strack & Zuback, 2013

<sup>2</sup> Alm *et al.*, 1997; Bubier *et al.*, 1993; Clymo & Reddaway, 1971; Drewer *et al.*, 2010; Gauci *et al.*, 2002; Laine *et al.*, 1996 ; Nykänen *et al.*, 1995 ; Verma *et al.*, 1992 ; Waddington & Roulet, 2000 ; Whiting & Chanton, 2001 ; Strack & Zuback, 2013

Whereas methane fluxes from rewetted temperate organic soils (mean  $173.8 \text{ kg CH}_4\text{-C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ; variance  $0 - 856.3$ ;  $n=38$ )<sup>3</sup> are considerably higher than from undrained organic soils (mean  $117.6 \text{ kg CH}_4\text{-C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ; variance  $0 - 528.4$ ;  $n=48$ )<sup>4</sup>, this finding is based mainly on inclusion of sites that were slightly flooded during rewetting. Extremely high efflux values from sites on enriched agricultural soil that were turned into shallow lakes during rewetting are not included (Augustin & Chojnicki, 2008; Glatzel *et al.*, 2011). The increase in efflux with rising water table is not significantly different between undrained ( $n=33$  pairs) and rewetted sites ( $n=33$  pairs). Methane effluxes from rewetted temperate nutrient poor organic soils (mean  $69.1 \text{ kg CH}_4\text{-C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ; variance  $3.5 - 444.5$ ;  $n=15$ ) are lower than from rewetted nutrient rich organic soils (mean  $242.2 \text{ kg CH}_4\text{-C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ; variance  $-0.5 - 1027.5$ ;  $n=23$ ). Combined, the increase in efflux with rising water table in undrained and rewetted sites does not show a significant difference between nutrient poor organic soils ( $n=32$  pairs) and nutrient rich ones ( $n=33$  pairs). The emission factors presented are based on the total dataset of rewetted and undrained nutrient poor ( $n=42$ ) and nutrient rich sites ( $n=37$ ). Because nutrient poor sites have more relatively dry microsites and the dataset for nutrient rich sites includes the high values mentioned above, the EF for temperate nutrient poor sites is lower than for nutrient rich sites.

**Figure 3A.5** Methane flux from boreal and temperate, poor and rich, rewetted (rw) and undrained (un) organic soils. Fluxes (in  $\text{kg CH}_4\text{-C ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ) are expressed on a logarithmic scale.



Note:

1. Negative and zero flux values are not included in the graph ( $n=9$ ).
2. Bars indicate mean values.
3. Note that in derivation of EFs, data for rewetted and undrained sites were lumped.

Similar to boreal and temperate organic soils, methane fluxes from tropical swamp forest organic soils in Southeast Asia depend on water table with high methane efflux restricted to high water tables (Couwenberg *et al.*, 2010). To derive the emission factor for rewetted swamp forest peat in Southeast Asia, flux data were compiled from literature. Data were limited to measurements associated with wet conditions (water table  $\leq 30$  cm below surface), either based on actual water table data or if wet conditions could reasonably be assumed (Table 3A.3). Flux data from rice paddy on organic soil are comparable to current IPCC estimates (Couwenberg 2011) and

<sup>3</sup> Augustin & Merbach, 1998; Augustin, 2003; Augustin in Couwenberg *et al.*, 2011; Cleary *et al.*, 2005; Drösler, 2005; Drösler *et al.*, 2013; Flessa *et al.*, 1997; Glatzel *et al.*, 2011; Hendriks *et al.*, 2007; Jungkunst & Fiedler, 2007; Waddington & Price, 2000; Wild *et al.*, 2001; Wilson *et al.*, 2009; Wilson *et al.*, 2013

<sup>4</sup> Augustin & Merbach, 1998; Augustin, 2003; Augustin *et al.*, 1996; Augustin in Couwenberg *et al.*, 2011; Bortoluzzi *et al.*, 2006; Crill in Bartlett & Harris, 1993; Dise & Gorham, 1993; Drösler, 2005; Drösler *et al.*, 2013; Harriss *et al.*, 1982; Koehler *et al.*, 2011; Nagata *et al.*, 2005; Nilsson *et al.*, 2008; Roulet *et al.*, 2007; Scottish Executive, 2007; Shannon & White, 1994; Sommer *et al.*, 2003; Tauchnitz *et al.*, 2008; Von Arnold, 2004; Waddington & Price, 2000; Wickland, 2001; Wilson *et al.*, 1989

were excluded from the analysis. Methane flux data from tropical organic soils outside Southeast Asia are currently not available. Because of the recalcitrance of the woody peat, methane fluxes from tropical swamp forest organic soils in Southeast Asia are considerably lower than from boreal and temperate organic soils (Couwenberg *et al.*, 2010).

**TABLE 3A.3**  
**CH<sub>4</sub>-C FLUX DATA FROM WET SWAMP FOREST ON ORGANIC SOILS**

Site	mg CH <sub>4</sub> -C m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> (range)	n	Reference
Drained forest	0.13 (0 – 0.35)	9*	Furukawa <i>et al.</i> , 2005
Swamp forest	0.67	1	
Swamp forest	0.74 (0.58 – 0.91)	2	
Secondary forest	0.14	1	Hadi <i>et al.</i> , 2001
Secondary forest	0.46 (0 – 2.29)	13	Hadi <i>et al.</i> , 2005
Secondary forest	0.85	1	Inubushi <i>et al.</i> , 1998
Conservation swamp forest	0.22 (0.03 – 0.70)	20*	Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2001, 2005
Drained and selectively logged forest	0.05 (-0.09 – 0.38)	76*	Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2004, 2008
Young secondary forest	0.19 (0.10 – 0.26)	6*	Jauhiainen <i>et al.</i> , 2004
Tropical peat swamp forest	1.53 (1.28 – 1.78)	2	Melling <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Conservation swamp forest	0.14	1	Pangala <i>et al.</i> , 2012
<b>Mean</b>	<b>0.47 (0.05 – 1.53)</b>		
	<b>kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>)</b>		
<b>Annual flux</b>	<b>41.2 (7.0 – 134.0)</b>		
Note:			
n denotes number of observations			
*only measurements pertaining to wet site conditions (water table ≤30 cm below the surface) are considered			



## References

- Adkinson, A. C., Syed, K. H. & Flanagan, L. B. (2011) Contrasting responses of growing season ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange to variation in temperature and water table depth in two peatlands in northern Alberta, Canada. *J. Geophys. Res.* **116**(G1): G01004.
- Alkhatib, M., Jennerjahn, T. C. & Samiaji, J. (2007) Biogeochemistry of the Dumai River estuary, Sumatra, Indonesia, a tropical blackwater river. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **52**: 2410–2417.
- Alm, J., Shurpali, N., Tuittila, E., Laurila, T., Maljanen, M., Saarnio, S. & Minkinen, K. (2007) Methods for determining emission factors for the use of peat and peatlands - flux measurements and modelling. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**(2): 85-100.
- Alm, J., Talanov, A., Saarnio, S., Silvola, J., Ikkonen, E., Aaltonen, H., Nykänen, H. & Martikainen, P. J. (1997) Reconstruction of the carbon balance for microsites in a boreal oligotrophic pine fen, Finland. *Oecologia* **110**: 423 - 431.
- Agren, A., Jansson, M., Ivarsson, H., Bishop, K. & Seibert, J. (2008) Seasonal and runoff-related changes in total organic carbon concentrations in the River Öre, Northern Sweden. *Aquatic Sciences* **70**(1): 21-29.
- Arkebauer, T. J., Chanton, J. P., Verma, S. B. & Kim, J. (2001) Field measurements of internal pressurization in *Phragmites australis* (Poaceae) and implications for regulation of methane emissions in a midlatitude prairie wetland. *American Journal of Botany* **88**(4): 653-658.
- Armstrong, A., Holden, J., Kay, P., Francis, B., Foulger, M., Gledhill, S., McDonald, A. & Walker, A. (2010) The impact of peatland drain-blocking on dissolved organic carbon loss and discolouration of water; results from a national survey. *Journal of Hydrology* **381**(1-2): 112-120.
- Armstrong, J. & Armstrong, W. (2011) Reasons for the presence or absence of convective (pressurized) ventilation in the genus *Equisetum*. *New Phytologist* **190**(2): 387-397.
- Askaer, L., Elberling, B., Friborg, T., Jorgensen, C. & Hansen, B. (2011) Plant-mediated CH<sub>4</sub> transport and C gas dynamics quantified in-situ in a *Phalaris arundinacea*-dominant wetland. *Plant and Soil* **343**(1-2): 287-301.
- Augustin. unpubl., cited in Couwenberg, J., Thiele, A., Tanneberger, F., Augustin, J., Bärish, S., Dubovik, D., Liashchynskaya, N., Michaelis, D., Minke, M., Skuratovich, A. & Joosten, H. 2011. Assessing greenhouse gas emissions from peatlands using vegetation as a proxy. *Hydrobiologia*, 674, 67–89.
- Augustin, J. (2003) Gaseous emissions from constructed wetlands and (re)flooded meadows. *publicationes instituti geographici universitatis tartuens* **94**: 3-8.
- Augustin, J. & Chojnicki, B. (2008) Austausch von klimarelevanten Spurengasen, Klimawirkung und Kohlenstoffdynamik in den ersten Jahren nach der Wiedervernässung von degradiertem Niedermoorgrünland. In: *Phosphor- und Kohlenstoff-Dynamik und Vegetationsentwicklung in wiedervernässten Mooren des Peenetales in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern - Status, Steuergrößen und Handlungsmöglichkeiten.*, eds. J. Gelbrecht, D. Zak & J. Augustin, pp. 50-67. Berichte des IGB Heft 26. IGB, Berlin.
- Augustin, J. & Merbach, W. (1998) Greenhouse gas emissions from fen mires in Northern Germany: quantification and regulation. In: *Beiträge aus der Hallenser Pflanzenernährungsforschung*: pp. 97-110.
- Augustin, J., Merbach, W., Käding, H., Schmidt, W. & Schalitz, G. (1996) Lachgas- und Methanemission aus degradierten Niedermoorstandorten Nordostdeutschlands unter dem Einfluß unterschiedlicher Bewirtschaftung. In: *Von den Ressourcen zum recycling*, ed. Alfred-Wegener-Stiftun, pp. 131-139. Berlin: Verlag Ernst & Sohn.
- Aurela, M., Laurila, T. & Tuovinen, J.-P. (2002) Annual CO<sub>2</sub> balance of a subarctic fen in northern Europe: Importance of the wintertime efflux. *J. Geophys. Res.* **107**(D21): 4607.
- Aurela, M., Lohila, A., Tuovinen, J., Hatakka, J., Riutta, T. & Laurila, T. (2009) Carbon dioxide exchange on a northern boreal fen. *Boreal Environment Research* **14**: 699-710.
- Baird, A. J., Belyea, L. R. & Morris, P. J. (2009) Upscaling of peatland-atmosphere fluxes of methane: small-scale heterogeneity in process rates and the pitfalls of "bucket-and-slab" models. In: *Carbon Cycling in Northern Peatlands*, eds. A. J. Baird, L. R. Belyea, X. Comas, A. S. Reeve & L. D. Slater, pp. 37-43. Washington: American Geophysical Union.
- Baum, A., Rixen, T. & Samiaji, J. (2007) Relevance of peat draining rivers in central Sumatra for the riverine input of dissolved organic carbon into the ocean. *Estuarine Coastal Shelf Science* **73**(3-4): 563-570.

- Beetz, S., Liebersbach, H., Glatzel, S., Jurasinski, G., Buczko, U. & Höper, H. (2013) Effects of land use intensity on the full greenhouse gas balance in an Atlantic peat bog. *Biogeosciences* **10**: 1067-1082.
- Bellisario, L., Moore, T. & Bubier, J. (1998) Net ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange in a boreal peatland, northern Manitoba. *Ecoscience* **5**(4): 534-541.
- Billett, M. F., Charman, D. J., Clark, J. M., Evans, C. D., Evans, M. G., Ostle, N. J., Worrall, F., Burden, A., Dinsmore, K. J., Jones, T., McNamara, N. P., Parry, L., Rowson, J. G. & Rose, R. (2010) Carbon balance of UK peatlands: current state of knowledge and future research challenges. *Climate Research* **45**(1): 13-29.
- Billett, M. F., Palmer, S. M., Hope, D., Deacon, C., Storeton-West, R., Hargreaves, K. J., Flechard, C. & Fowler, D. (2004) Linking land-atmosphere-stream carbon fluxes in a lowland peatland system. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **18**(1): GB1024.
- Bortoluzzi, E., Epron, D., Siegenthaler, A., Gilbert, D. & Buttler, A. (2006) Carbon balance of a European mountain bog at contrasting stages of regeneration. *New Phytologist* **172**(4): 708-718.
- Brix, H., Sorrell, B. K. & Orr, P. T. (1992) Internal pressurization and convective gas flow in some emergent freshwater macrophytes. *Limnology and Oceanography* **37**(7): 1420-1433.
- Bubier, J., Frohling, S., Crill, P. & Linder, E. (1999) Net ecosystem productivity and its uncertainty in a diverse boreal peatland. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **104**(D22): 27683-27692.
- Bubier, J. L. (1995) The relationship of vegetation to methane emission and hydrochemical gradients in northern peatlands. *Journal of Ecology* **83**(3): 403-420.
- Bubier, J. L., Moore, T. R. & Roulet, N. T. (1993) Methane emissions from wetlands in the midboreal region of Northern Ontario, Canada. *Ecology* **74**(8): 2240-2254.
- Cagampan, J. & Waddington, J. M. (2008) Net ecosystem CO<sub>2</sub> exchange of a cutover peatland rehabilitated with a transplanted acrotelm. *Ecoscience* **15**(2): 258-267.
- Chanton, J. P., Martens, C. S., Kelley, C. A., Crill, P. M. & Showers, W. J. (1992) Methane transport mechanisms and isotopic fractionation in emergent macrophytes of an Alaskan tundra lake. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* **97**(D15): 16681-16688.
- Chimner, R. A. & Ewel, K. C. (2004) Differences in carbon fluxes between forested and cultivated micronesia tropical peatlands. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **12**(5): 419-427.
- Christensen, T. R., Jackowicz-Korczyński, M., Aurela, M., Crill, P., Heliasz, M., Mastepanov, M. & Friborg, T. (2012) Monitoring the Multi-Year Carbon Balance of a Subarctic Palsa Mire with Micrometeorological Techniques. *Ambio* **41**(3): 207-217.
- Clair, T. A., Arp, P., Moore, T. R., Dalvac, M. & Meng, F.-R. (2002) Gaseous carbon dioxide and methane, as well as dissolved organic carbon losses from a small temperate wetland under a changing climate. *Environ. Pollut.* **116**: S143-S148.
- Cleary, J., Roulet, N. & Moore, T. (2005) Greenhouse gas emissions from Canadian peat extraction, 1990-2000: A life-cycle analysis. *Ambio* **34**(6): 456-461.
- Clymo, R. S. & Reddaway, E. J. F. (1971) Productivity of Sphagnum (Bog-moss) and peat accumulation. *Hydrobiologia* **12**: 181-192 (cited in: Bartlett K.B. & Harris R.C. 1993. Review and assessment of Methane Emissions from Wetlands. Chemosphere. Vol.1926, Nos. 1991-1994: 1261-1320.).
- Couwenberg, J. (2011) Greenhouse gas emissions from managed peat soils: is the IPCC reporting guidance realistic? *Mires and Peat* **8**, Article 2: 1-10.
- Couwenberg, J., Dommain, R. & Joosten, H. (2010) Greenhouse gas fluxes from tropical peatlands in south-east Asia. *Global Change Biology* **16**(6): 1715-1732.
- Couwenberg, J. & Fritz, C. (2012) Towards developing IPCC methane 'emission factors' for peatlands (organic soils). *Mires and Peat* **10**(3): 1-17.
- Couwenberg, J., Thiele, A., Tanneberger, F., Augustin, J., Barisch, S., Dubovik, D., Liashchynskaya, N., Michaelis, D., Minke, M., Skuratovich, A. & Joosten, H. (2011) Assessing greenhouse gas emissions from peatlands using vegetation as a proxy. *Hydrobiologia* **674**(1): 67-89.
- Crill. unpublished data. (cited in: Bartlett K.B. & Harris R.C. 1993. Review and assessment of Methane Emissions from Wetlands. Chemosphere. Vol.26, Nos. 1-4: 261-320.).
- Dawson, J. J. C., Billett, M. F., Hope, D., Palmer, S. M. & Deacon, C. M. (2004) Sources and sinks of aquatic carbon in a peatland stream continuum. *Biogeochemistry* **70**: 71-92.

- di Folco, M.-B. & Kirkpatrick, J. B. (2011) Topographic variation in burning-induced loss of carbon from organic soils in Tasmanian moorlands. *Catena* **87**: 216-255.
- Dias, A. T. C., Hoorens, B., Van Logtestijn, R. S. P., Vermaat, J. E. & Aerts, R. (2010) Plant species composition can be used as a proxy to predict methane emissions in peatland ecosystems after land-use changes. *Ecosystems* **13**(4): 526-538.
- Dinsmore, K. J., Smart, R. P., Billett, M. F., Holden, J., Baird, A. J. & Chapman, P. J. (2011) Greenhouse gas losses from peatland pipes: A major pathway for loss to the atmosphere? *Journal of Geophysical Research* **116**(G0341).
- Dise, N. B., Gorham, E. & Verry, E. S. (1993) Environmental factors controlling methane emissions from peatlands in northern Minnesota. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **98**(D6): 10583-10594.
- Dommain, R., Couwenberg, J. & Joosten, H. (2011) Development and carbon sequestration of tropical peat domes in south-east Asia: links to post-glacial sea-level changes and Holocene climate variability. *Quaternary Science Reviews* **30**(7-8): 999-1010.
- Drewer, J., Lohila, A., Aurela, M., Laurila, T., Minkkinen, K., Penttilä, T., Dinsmore, K. J., McKenzie, R. M., Helfter, C., Flechard, C., Sutton, M. A. & Skiba, U. M. (2010) Comparison of greenhouse gas fluxes and nitrogen budgets from an ombrotrophic bog in Scotland and a minerotrophic sedge fen in Finland. *European Journal of Soil Science* **61**: 640-650.
- Drösler, M. (2005) Trace gas exchange and climatic relevance of bog ecosystems, southern Germany. Ph.D thesis. In: *Department für Ökologie*, p. 182. Universität München.
- Drösler, M., Adelmann, W., Augustin, J., Bergman, L., Beyer, C., Chojnicki, B., Förster, C., Freibauer, A., Giebels, M., S., G., Höper, H., Kantelhardt, J., Liebersbach, H., Hahn-Schöfl, M., Minke, M., Petschow, U., Pfadenhauer, J., Schaller, L., Schägner, P., Sommer, M., Thuille, A. & Wehrhan, M. (2013) Klimaschutz durch Moorschutz. Schlussbericht des BMBF-Vorhabens: Klimaschutz - Moornutzungsstrategien 2006-2010. published online at TIB/UB-Hannover: <http://edok01.tib.uni978hannover.de/edoks/e01fb13/735500762.pdf>: 201.
- FAO. (2005) Helping Forests Take Cover. RAP Publication. 2005/13. [/www.fao.org/docrep/008/ae945e/ae945e05.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/ae945e/ae945e05.htm).
- Flessa, H., Wild, U., Klemisch, M. & Pfadenhauer, J. (1997) C- und N-Stoffflüsse auf Torfstichsimulationsflächen im Donaumoos. *Zeitschrift für Kulturtechnik und Landentwicklung* **38**: 11-17.
- Forbrich, I., Kutzbach, L., Wille, C., Becker, T., Wu, J. & Wilmking, M. (2011) Cross-evaluation of measurements of peatland methane emissions on microform and ecosystem scales using high-resolution landcover classification and source weight modelling. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **151**(7): 864-874.
- Frenzel, P. & Karofeld, E. (2000) CH<sub>4</sub> emission from a hollow-ridge complex in a raised bog: The role of CH<sub>4</sub> production and oxidation. *Biogeochemistry* **51**(1): 91-112.
- Frenzel, P. & Rudolph, J. (1998) Methane emission from a wetland plant: the role of CH<sub>4</sub> oxidation in *Eriophorum*. *Plant and Soil* **202**(1): 27-32.
- Frolking, S., Roulet, N. T., Moore, T. R., Lafleur, P. M., Bubier, J. L. & Crill, P. M. (2002) Modeling seasonal to annual carbon balance of Mer Bleue Bog, Ontario, Canada. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **16**(3).
- Furukawa, Y., Inubushi, K., Ali, M., Itang, A. M. & Tsuruta, H. (2005) Effect of changing groundwater levels caused by land-use changes on greenhouse gas fluxes from tropical peat lands. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **71**(1): 81-91.
- Gauci, V., Dise, N. & Fowler, D. (2002) Controls on suppression of methane flux from a peat bog subjected to simulated acid rain sulfate deposition. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **16**(1): 4-1 to 4-12.
- Gauci, V., Gowing, D., Hornibrook, E., Davis, J. & Dise, N. (2010) Woody stem methane emission in mature wetland alder trees. *Atmospheric Environment* **44**(17): 2157-2160.
- Gibson, H. S., Worrall, F., Burt, T. P. & Adamson, J. K. (2009) DOC budgets of drained peat catchments implications for DOC production in peat soils. *Hydrological Processes* **23**(13): 1901-1911.
- Glatzel, S., Kalbitz, K., Dalva, M. & Moore, T. (2003) Dissolved organic matter properties and their relationship to carbon dioxide efflux from restored peat bogs. *Geoderma* **113**(3-4): 397-411.
- Glatzel, S., Koebsch, F., Beetz, S., Hahn, J., Richter, P. & Jurasinski, G. (2011) Maßnahmen zur Minderung der Treibhausgase Freisetzung aus Mooren im Mittleren Mecklenburg. *Telma* **4**: 85-106.

- Golovatskaya, E. & Dyukarev, E. (2009) Carbon budget of oligotrophic mire sites in the Southern Taiga of Western Siberia. *Plant and Soil* **315**(1): 19-34.
- Grünfeld, S. & Brix, H. (1999) Methanogenesis and methane emissions: effects of water table, substrate type and presence of *Phragmites australis*. *Aquatic Botany* **64**(1): 63-75.
- Hadi, A., Haradi, M., Inubushi, K., Purnomo, E., Razie, F. & Tsuruta, H. (2001) Effects of land-use change in tropical peat soil on the microbial population and emission of greenhouse gases. *Microbes and Environment* **16**(2): 79-86.
- Hadi, A., Inubushi, K., Furukawa, Y., Purnomo, E., Rasmadi, M. & Tsuruta, H. (2005) Greenhouse gas emissions from tropical peatlands of Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems* **71**(1): 73-80.
- Harazono, Y., Mano, M., Miyata, A., Zulueta, R. & Oechel, W. C. (2003) Inter-annual carbon dioxide uptake of a wet sedge tundra ecosystem in the Arctic. *Tellus* **55B**: 215-231.
- Harriss, R. C., Sebachner, D. I. & Day, F. P. (1982) Methane flux in the Great dismal Swamp. *Nature* **297**(5868): 673-674 (cited in: Bartlett K.B. & Harris R.C. 1993. Review and assessment of Methane Emissions from Wetlands. Chemosphere. Vol.1926, Nos. 1991-1994: 1261-1320.).
- Heikkinen, J. E. P., Elsakov, V. & Martikainen, P. J. (2002) Carbon dioxide and methane dynamics and annual carbon balance in tundra wetland in NE Europe, Russia. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **16**(4): 1115.
- Hendriks, D. M. D., van Huissteden, J., Dolman, A. J. & van der Molen, M. K. (2007) The full greenhouse gas balance of an abandoned peat meadow. *Biogeosciences* **4**: 411-424.
- Herbst, M., Friborg, T., Schelde, K., Jensen, R., Ringgaard, R., Vasquez, V., Thomsen, A. & Soegaard, H. (2013) Climate and site management as driving factors for the atmospheric greenhouse gas exchange of a restored wetland. *Biogeosciences* **10**(1): 39-52.
- Hooijer, A., Page, S., Jauhiainen, J., Lee, W., Lu, X., Idris, A. & Anshari, G. (2012) Subsidence and carbon loss in drained tropical peatlands. *Biogeosciences* **9**(3): 1053-1071.
- Höll, B. S., Fiedler, S., Jungkunst, H. F., Kalbitz, K., Freibauer, A., Drösler, M. & Stahr, K. (2009) Characteristics of dissolved organic matter following 20 years of peatland restoration. *Science of The Total Environment* **408**(1): 78-83.
- Inubushi, K., Hadi, A., Okazaki, M. & Yonebayashi, K. (1998) Effect of converting wetland forest to sage palm plantations on methane gas flux and organic carbon dynamics in tropical peat soil. *Hydrological Processes* **12**(13-14): 2073-2080.
- Jacobs, C. M. J., Jacobs, A. F. G., Bosveld, F. C., Hendriks, D. M. D., Hensen, A., Kroon, P. S., Moors, E., Nol, I., Schrier-Uijl, A. & Veenendaal, E. M. (2007) Variability of annual CO<sub>2</sub> exchange from Dutch grasslands. *Biogeosciences* **4**: 803-816.
- Jager, D. F., Wilmking, M. & Kukkonen, J. V. K. (2009) The influence of summer seasonal extremes on dissolved organic carbon export from a boreal peatland catchment: Evidence from one dry and one wet growing season. *Sci. Total Environ.* **407**: 1373-1382.
- Jauhiainen, J., Heikkinen, J., Martikainen, P. J. & Vasander, H. (2001) CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes in pristine peat swamp forest and peatland converted to agriculture in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *International Peat Journal* **11**: 43-49.
- Jauhiainen, J., Limin, S., Silvennoinen, H. & Vasander, H. (2008) Carbon dioxide and methane fluxes in drained tropical peat before and after hydrological restoration. *Ecology* **89**(12): 3503-3514.
- Jauhiainen, J., Takahashi, H., Heikkinen, J. E. P., Martikainen, P. J. & Vasander, H. (2005) Carbon fluxes from a tropical peat swamp forest floor. *Global Change Biology* **11**(10): 1788-1797.
- Jauhiainen, J., Vasander, H., Jaya, A., Inoue, T., Heikkinen, J. & Martikainen, P. (2004) Carbon balance in managed tropical peat in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. In: *Wise use of peatlands: proceedings of the 12th International Peat Congress: Tampere, Finland, 6-11 June 2004*, ed. J. Päivänen, pp. 653-659.
- Joosten, H. (2009) The Global Peatland CO<sub>2</sub> Picture - Peatland status and drainage-related emissions in all countries of the world. In: Wetlands International and University of Greifswald University.
- Jungkunst, H. & Fiedler, S. (2007) Latitudinal differentiated water table control of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide fluxes from hydromorphic soils: feedbacks to climate change. *Global Change Biology* **13**(12): 2668-2683.

- Juottonen, H., Hynninen, A., Nieminen, M., Tuomivirta, T., Tuittila, E.-S., Nousiainen, H., Kell, D. K., Yrjälä, K., Tervahauta, A. & Fritze, H. (2012) Methane-cycling microbial communities and methane emission in natural and restored peatlands. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **78**(17): 6386-6389.
- Juutinen, S., Välimäki, M., Kuutti, V., Laine, A. M., Virtanen, T., Seppä, H., Weckström, J. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2013) Short-term and long-term carbon dynamics in a northern peatland-stream-lake continuum: A catchment approach. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* **118**: 171-183.
- Kivimäki, S. K., Yli-Petäys, M. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2008) Carbon sink function of sedge and *Sphagnum* patches in a restored cut-away peatland: increased functional diversity leads to higher production. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **45**: 921-929.
- Koehler, A.-K., Murphy, K., Kiely, G. & Sottocornola, M. (2009) Seasonal variation of DOC concentration and annual loss of DOC from an Atlantic blanket bog in South Western Ireland. *Biogeochemistry* **95**: 231-242.
- Koehler, A.-K., Sottocornola, M. & Kiely, G. (2011) How strong is the current carbon sequestration of an Atlantic blanket bog? *Global Change Biology* **17**: 309-319.
- Kolka, R. K., Grigal, D. F., Verry, E. S. & Nater, E. A. (1999) Mercury and organic carbon relationships in streams draining forested upland peatland watersheds. *J. Environmental Quality* **28**: 766-775.
- Komulainen, V.-M., Nykänen, H., Martikainen, P. J. & Laine, J. (1998) Short-term effect of restoration on vegetation change and methane emissions from peatlands drained for forestry in southern Finland. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research-Revue Canadienne De Recherche Forestiere* **28**(3): 402-411.
- Komulainen, V.-M., Tuittila, E.-V., Vasander, H. & Laine, J. (1999) Restoration of drained peatlands in southern Finland: initial effects on vegetation change and CO<sub>2</sub> balance. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **36**: 634-648.
- Konnerup, D., Sorrell, B. & Brix, H. (2011) Do tropical wetland plants possess convective gas flow mechanisms? *New Phytologist* **190**(2): 379-386.
- Koprivnjak, J.-F. & Moore, T. R. (1992) Sources, sinks and fluxes of dissolved organic carbon in subarctic fen catchments. *Arctic and Alpine Research* **24**: 204-210.
- Kortelainen, P., Mattsson, T., Finér, L., Ahtainen, M., Saukkonen, S. & Sallantausta, T. (2006) Controls on the export of C, N, P and Fe from undisturbed boreal catchments, Finland. *Aquat. Sci.* **68**: 453-468.
- Kurbatova, J., Li, C., Tataronov, F., Varlagin, A., Shalukhina, N. & Olchev, A. (2009) Modeling of the carbon dioxide fluxes in European Russia peat bogs. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **4**: 045022.
- Lafleur, P. M., Roulet, N. T. & Admiral, S. W. (2001) Annual cycle of CO<sub>2</sub> exchange at a bog peatland. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **106**(D3): 3071 - 3081.
- Laine, A., Byrne, K., Kiely, G. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2007) Patterns in vegetation and CO<sub>2</sub> dynamics along a water level gradient in a lowland blanket bog. *Ecosystems* **10**(6): 890-905.
- Laine, J., Minkkinen, K., Sinisalo, J., Savolainen, I. & Martikainen, P. J. (1997) Greenhouse impact of a mire after drainage for forestry. In: *Northern Forested Wetlands, Ecology and Management*, eds. C. C. Trettin, M. F. Jurgensen, D. F. Grigal, M. R. Gale & J. J.K., pp. 437-447. Baco Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
- Laine, J., Silvola, J., Tolonen, K., Alm, J., Nykänen, H., Vasander, H., Sallantausta, T., Savolainen, I., Sinisalo, J. & Martikainen, P. (1996) Effect of water-level drawdown on global climatic warming: Northern peatlands. *Ambio* **25**(3): 179-184.
- Li, T., Huang, Y., Zhang, W. & Song, C. (2009) CH<sub>4</sub>MODwetland: A biogeophysical model for simulating methane emissions from natural wetlands. *Ecological Modelling* **221**(4): 666-680.
- Limpens, J., Berendse, F., Blodau, C., Canadell, J., Freeman, C., Holden, J., Roulet, N., Rydin, H. & Schaepman-Strub, G. (2008) Peatlands and the carbon cycle: from local processes to global implications - a synthesis. *Biogeosciences* **5**(5): 1475-1491.
- Lund, M., Lindroth, A., Christensen, T. R. & Strom, L. (2007) Annual CO<sub>2</sub> balance of a temperate bog. *Tellus B* **59**(5): 804-811.
- Lähteenoja, O., Reátegui, Y. R., Räsänen, M., Torres, D. D. C., Oinonen, M. & Page, S. (2011) The large Amazonian peatland carbon sink in the subsiding Pastaza-Marañón foreland basin, Peru. *Global Change Biology* **18**(1): 164-178.
- Lähteenoja, O., Ruokolainen, K., Schulman, L. & Oinonen, M. (2009) Amazonian peatlands: an ignored C sink and potential source. *Global Change Biology* **15**(9): 2311-2320.

- Maanavilja, L., Riutta, T., Aurela, M., Pulkkinen, M., Laurila, T. & Tuittila, E. (2011) Spatial variation in CO<sub>2</sub> exchange at a northern aapa mire. *Biogeochemistry* **104**(1-3): 325-345.
- Maanavilja, L., Urbanová, Z., Picek, T., Bárta, J., Laiho, R. & Tuittila, E.-S. Effect of long-term drainage and hydrological restoration on peat biogeochemistry in spruce swamp forests. *Submitted to Soil Biology and Biochemistry in July 2012*.
- Marinier, M., Glatzel, S. & Moore, T. (2004) The role of cotton-grass (*Eriophorum vaginatum*) in the exchange of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> at two restored peatlands, eastern Canada. *Ecoscience* **11**(2): 141-149.
- Melling, L., Goh, K. J., Klöni, A. & Hatano, R. (2012) Is water table the most important factor influencing soil C flux in tropical peatlands? In: *Proceedings of the 14th International Peat Congress. Extended Abstract No.330*, p. 6.
- Melling, L., Hatano, R. & Goh, K. (2005) Methane fluxes from three ecosystems in tropical peatland of Sarawak, Malaysia. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* **37**(8): 1445-1453.
- Meng, L., Hess, P. G. M., Mahowald, N. M., Yavitt, J. B., Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Lawrence, D. M., Swenson, S. C., Jauhainen, J. & Fuka, D. R. (2012) Sensitivity of wetland methane emissions to model assumptions: application and model testing against site observations. *Biogeosciences* **9**(7): 2793-2819.
- Moore, S., Evans, C. D., Page, S. E., Garnett, M. G., Jones, T. G., Freeman, C., A., H., Wiltshire, A., Limin, S. & Gauci, V. (2013) Deep instability of deforested tropical peatlands revealed by fluvial organic carbon fluxes. *Nature* **493**: 660-664.
- Moore, T. R. (2003) Dissolved organic carbon in a northern boreal landscape. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **17**: 1109, doi: 1110.1029/2003GB002050.
- Moore, T. R., Matos, L. & Roulet, N. T. (2003) Dynamics and chemistry of dissolved organic carbon in Precambrian Shield catchments and an impounded wetland. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **60**: 612-623.
- Nagata, O., Takakai, F. & Hatano, R. (2005) Effect of sasa invasion on global warming potential in sphagnum dominated poor fen in Bibai, Japan. *Phyton, Annales Rei Botanicae, Horn* **45**(4): 299-307.
- Nagata, O., Yazaki, T. & Yanai, Y. (2010) Nitrous oxide emissions from drained and mineral soil-dressed peatland in central Hokkaido, Japan. *Journal of Agricultural Meteorology* **66**: 23-30.
- Nellemann, C. & Corcoran, E. (eds.) (2010) Dead planet, living planet: biodiversity and ecosystem restoration for sustainable development. *A Rapid Response Assessment. United Nations Environment Programme, GRID-Arendal. Birkeland Trykkeri AS, Norway*: 112 pp.
- Nilsson, M., Sagerfors, J., Buffam, I., Laudon, H., Eriksson, T., Grelle, A., Klemetsson, L., Weslien, P. E. R. & Lindroth, A. (2008) Contemporary carbon accumulation in a boreal oligotrophic minerogenic mire – a significant sink after accounting for all C-fluxes. *Global Change Biology* **14**(10): 2317-2332.
- Nykänen, H., Alm, J., Lang, K., Silvola, J. & Martikainen, P. J. (1995) Emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CO<sub>2</sub> from a virgin fen and a fen drained for grassland in Finland. *Journal of Biogeography* **22**(2/3): 351-357.
- Nykänen, H., Heikkinen, J. E. P., Pirinen, L., Tiilikainen, K. & Martikainen, P. J. (2003) Annual CO<sub>2</sub> exchange and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes on a subarctic palsa mire during climatically different years. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **17**(1): 1018, doi:1010.1029/2002GB001861.
- O'Brien, H. E., Labadz, J. C. & Butcher, D. P. (2008) The role of blanket peat moorland management in the generation and amelioration of discolouration of surface water supplies. In: Nottingham Trent University.
- Page, S. E., Rieley, J. O. & Banks, C. J. (2011) Global and regional importance of the tropical peatland carbon pool. *Global Change Biology* **17**(2): 798-818.
- Pangala, S. R., Moore, S., Hornibrook, E. R. C. & Gauci, V. (2012) Trees are major conduits for methane egress from tropical forested wetlands. *New Phytologist* **197**(2): 524-531.
- Petrone, R. M., Waddington, J. M. & Price, J. S. (2003) Ecosystem-scale flux of CO<sub>2</sub> from a restored vacuum harvested peatland. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **11**: 419-432.
- Rantakari, M., Mattsson, T., Kortelainen, P., Piirainen, S., Finér, L. & Ahtiainen, M. (2010) Organic and inorganic carbon concentrations and fluxes from managed and unmanaged boreal first-order catchments. *Sci. Total Environ.* **408**: 1649-1658.
- Reddy, K. R. & DeLaune, R. D. (2008) *Biogeochemistry of Wetlands, Science and Applications*. Boca Raton, London, New York: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis group. 744 p.

- Riutta, T., Laine, J., Aurela, M., Rinne, J., Vesala, T., Laurila, T., Haapanala, S., Pihlatie, M. & Tuittila, E. S. (2007) Spatial variation in plant community functions regulates carbon gas dynamics in a boreal fen ecosystem. *Tellus* **59B**: 838-852.
- Roehm, C. L. & Roulet, N. T. (2003) Seasonal contribution of CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in the annual C budget of a northern bog. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **17**(1): 1029.
- Roulet, N. T., Lafleur, P. M., Richard, P. J. H., Moore, T., Humphreys, E. R. & Bubier, J. (2007) Contemporary carbon balance and late Holocene carbon accumulation in a northern peatland. *Global Change Biology* **13**: 397-411, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01292.
- Rusch, H. & Rennenberg, H. (1998) Black alder (*Alnus Glutinosa* (L.) Gaertn.) trees mediate methane and nitrous oxide emission from the soil to the atmosphere. *Plant and Soil* **201**(1): 1-7.
- Rydin, H. & Jeglum, J. K. (2006) *The biology of peatlands*. Oxford University Press. 360 p.
- Saarnio, S., Morero, M., Shurpali, N., Tuittila, E., Makila, M. & Alm, J. (2007) Annual CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes of pristine boreal mires as a background for the lifecycle analyses of peat energy. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**(2): 101-113.
- Sagerfors, J., Lindroth, A., Grelle, A., Klemetsson, L., Weslien, P. & Nilsson, M. (2008) Annual CO<sub>2</sub> exchange between a nutrient-poor, minerotrophic, boreal mire and the atmosphere. *J. Geophys. Res.* **113**(G1): G01001.
- Samaritani, E., Siegenthaler, A., Yli-Petäys, M., Buttler, A., Christin, P.-A. & Mitchell, E. A. D. (2011) Seasonal net ecosystem carbon exchange of a regenerating cutaway bog: How long does it take to restore the C sequestration function. *Restoration Ecology* **19**: 480-489.
- Schimel, J. P. (1995) Plant - transport and methane production as controls on methane flux from arctic wet meadow tundra. *Biogeochemistry* **28**(3): 183-200.
- Schulze, E. D., Prokushkin, A., Arneth, A., Knorre, N. & Vaganov, E. A. (2002) Net ecosystem productivity and peat accumulation in a Siberian Aapa mire. *Tellus* **54B**: 531-536.
- Scottish Executive. (2007) Ecosse - Estimating Carbon in Organic Soils, Sequestration and emissions. Scottish Executive, Edinburgh. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2007/03/16170508> [febr. 2008]. 177 p.
- Sebach, D. I., Harriss, R. C. & Bartlett, K. B. (1985) Methane emissions to the atmosphere through aquatic plants. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **14**(1): 40-46.
- Shannon, R. D. & White, J. R. (1994) A three-year study of controls on methane emissions from two Michigan peatlands. *Biogeochemistry* **27**(1): 35-60.
- Shannon, R. D., White, J. R., Lawson, J. E. & Gilmour, B. S. (1996) Methane efflux from emergent vegetation in peatlands. *Journal of Ecology* **84**(2): 239-246.
- Shurpali, N. J., Verma, S. B., Kim, J. & Arkebauer, T. J. (1995) Carbon dioxide exchange in a peatland ecosystem. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **100**(D7): 14,319-14,326.
- Soegaard, H. & Nordstroem, C. (1999) Carbon dioxide exchange in a high-arctic fen estimated by eddy covariance measurements and modelling. *Global Change Biology* **5**(5): 547-562.
- Soini, P., Riutta, T., Yli-Petäys, M. & Vasander, H. (2010) Comparison of vegetation and CO<sub>2</sub> dynamics between a restored cut-way peatland and a pristine fen: evaluation of the restoration success. *Restoration Ecology* **18**(6): 894-903.
- Sommer, M., Fiedler, S., Glatzel, S. & Kleber, M. (2003) First estimates of regional (Allgäu, Germany) and global CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from wet colluvial margins of closed depressions in glacial drift areas. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **103**(1): 251-257.
- Strack, M., Kellner, E. & Waddington, J. M. (2005) Dynamics of biogenic gas bubbles in peat and their effects on peatland biogeochemistry. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **19**(GB1003).
- Strack, M., Waddington, J. M., Bourbonniere, R. A., Buckton, L., Shaw, K., Whittington, P. & Price, J. S. (2008) Effect of water table drawdown on peatland dissolved organic carbon export and dynamics. *Hydrol. Process.* **22**: 3373-3385.
- Strack, M., Waddington, J. M., Rochefort, L. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2006) Response of vegetation and net ecosystem carbon dioxide exchange at different peatland microforms following water table drawdown. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences* **111**(G02006).
- Strack, M. & Zuback, Y. C. A. (2013) Annual carbon balance of a peatland 10 yr following restoration. *Biogeosciences* **10**(5): 2885-2896.

- Suyker, A. E., Verma, S. B. & Arkebauer, T. J. (1997) Season-long measurement of carbon dioxide exchange in a boreal fen. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **102**(D24): 29,021 - 029,028.
- Tauchnitz, N., Brumme, R., Bernsdorf, S. & Meissner, R. (2008) Nitrous oxide and methane fluxes of a pristine slope mire in the German National Park Harz Mountains. *Plant and Soil* **303**(1-2): 131-138.
- Tuittila, E.-S., Komulainen, V.-M., Vasander, H. & Laine, J. (1999) Restored cut-away peatland as a sink for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. *Oecologia* **120**: 563 - 574.
- Tuittila, E.-S., Komulainen, V.-M., Vasander, H., Nykänen, H., Martikainen, P. J. & Laine, J. (2000) Methane dynamics of a restored cut-away peatland. *Global Change Biology* **6**(5): 569-581.
- Turner, E. K., Worrall, F. & Burt, T. P. (2013) The effect of drain blocking on the dissolved organic carbon (DOC) budget of an upland peat catchment in the UK. *Journal of Hydrology* **479**: 169-179.
- Urban, N. R., Bayley, S. E. & Eisenreich, S. J. (1989) Export of dissolved organic carbon and acidity from peatlands. *Water Resour. Res.* **25**: 1619-1628.
- Urbanová, Z. (2012) Vegetation and carbon gas dynamics under affected hydrological regime in central European peatlands. *Plant Ecology and Diversity* (URL: <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tped>).
- Urbanová, Z., Pícek, T., Hájek, T., Buřková, I. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2012) Impact of drainage and restoration on vegetation and carbon gas dynamics in Central European peatlands. *Plant Ecology and Diversity* (In press).
- van Huissteden, J., van den Bos, R. & Alvarez, I. (2006) Modelling the effect of water-table management on CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from peat soils. *Netherlands Journal of Geosciences-Geologie En Mijnbouw* **85**(1): 3-18.
- Verma, S. B., Ullman, F. G., Billesbach, D., Clement, R. J., Kim, J. & Verry, E. S. (1992) Eddy-correlation measurements of methane flux in a northern peatland ecosystem. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **58**(3): 289-304 (cited in: Bartlett K.B. & Harris R.C. 1993. Review and assessment of Methane Emissions from Wetlands. Chemosphere. Vol.1926, Nos. 1991-1994: 1261-1320.).
- Verville, J. H., Hobbie, S. E., Chapin, F. S. & Hooper, D. U. (1998) Response of tundra CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> flux to manipulation of temperature and vegetation. *Biogeochemistry* **41**(3): 215-235.
- Von Arnold, K. (2004) Forests and greenhouse gases - fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O from drained forests on organic soils. *Linköping Studies in Arts and Science* no **302**: 48.
- Waddington, J. & Day, S. (2007) Methane emissions from a peatland following restoration. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences* **112**: G03018, doi:03010.01029/02007JG000400.
- Waddington, J. M. & Price, J. S. (2000) Effect of peatland drainage, harvesting and restoration on atmospheric water and carbon exchange. *Physical Geography* **21**(5): 433-451.
- Waddington, J. M. & Roulet, N. T. (2000) Carbon balance of a boreal patterned peatland. *Global Change Biology* **6**(1): 87- 97.
- Waddington, J. M., Strack, M. & Greenwood, M. J. (2010) Toward restoring the net carbon sink function of degraded peatlands: Short-term response in CO<sub>2</sub> exchange to ecosystem-scale restoration. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **115**: G01008, doi:01010.01029/02009JG001090.
- Waddington, J. M., Toth, K. & Bourbonniere, R. (2008) Dissolved organic carbon export from a cutover and restored peatland. *Hydrological Processes* **22**(13): 2215-2224.
- Wallage, Z. E., Holden, J. & McDonald, A. T. (2006) Drain blocking: An effective treatment for reducing dissolved organic carbon loss and water discolouration in a drained peatland. *Science of the Total Environment* **367**(2-3): 811-821.
- Walter, B. P., Heimann, M. & Matthews, E. (2001) Modeling modern methane emissions from natural wetlands 1. Model description and results. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* **106**(D24): 34189-34206.
- Watanabe, A., Purwanto, B. H., Ando, H., Kakuda, K.-i. & Jong, F.-S. (2009) Methane and CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from an Indonesian peatland used for sago palm (*Metroxylon sagu* Rottb.) cultivation: Effects of fertilizer and groundwater level management. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **134**(1-2): 14-18.
- Whiting, G. J. & Chanton, J. P. (2001) Greenhouse carbon balance of wetlands: methane emission versus carbon sequestration. *Tellus* **53B**: 521-528.
- Wickland, K. (2001) Carbon gas exchange at a southern Rocky Mountain wetland, 1996-1998. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **15**(2): 321-335.



- Wild, U., Kamp, T., Lenz, A., Heinz, S. & Pfadenhaeur, J. (2001) Cultivation of *Typha* spp. in constructed wetlands for peatland restoration. *Ecological Engineering* **17**(1): 49-54.
- Wilson, D., Alm, J., Laine, J., Byrne, K., Farrell, E. & Tuittila, E. (2009) Rewetting of Cutaway Peatlands: Are We Re-Creating Hot Spots of Methane Emissions? *Restoration Ecology* **17**(6): 796-806.
- Wilson, D., Farrell, C. A., Muller, C., Hepp, S. & Renou-Wilson, F. (2013) Rewetted industrial cutaway peatlands in western Ireland: a prime location for climate change mitigation? *Mires and Peat* **11**(1): 1-22.
- Wilson, D., Tuittila, E.-S., Alm, J., Laine, J., Farrell, E. P. & Byrne, K. A. (2007) Carbon dioxide dynamics of a restored maritime peatland. *Ecoscience* **14**(1): 71-80.
- Wilson, J. O., Crill, P. M., Bartlett, K. B., Sebacher, D. I., Harriss, R. C. & Sass, R. L. (1989) Seasonal variation of methane emissions from a temperate swamp. *Biogeochemistry* **8**(1): 55-71. (cited in: Bartlett K.B. & Harris R.C. 1993. Review and assessment of Methane Emissions from Wetlands. Chemosphere. Vol.1926, Nos. 1991-1994: 1261-1320.).
- Yavitt, J. B. & Knapp, A. K. (1998) Aspects of methane flow from sediment through emergent cattail (*Typha latifolia*) plants. *New Phytologist* **139**(3): 495-503.
- Yli-Petäys, M., Laine, J., Vasander, H. & Tuittila, E.-S. (2007) Carbon gas exchange of a re-vegetated cut-away peatland five decades after abandonment. *Boreal Environment Research* **12**: 177-190.
- Yule, C. M. & Gomez, L. N. (2009) Leaf litter decomposition in a tropical peat swamp forest in Peninsular Malaysia. *Wetlands Ecol. Manage.* **17**: 231–241.
- Zulkifli, Y. (2002) Hydrological attributes of a disturbed peat swamp forest. In: *Prevention and control of fire in peatlands. Proceedings of workshop on prevention and control of fire in peatlands, 19–21 March 2002*, eds. F. Parish, E. Padmanabhan, C. L. Lee & H. C. Thang, pp. 51–55. Kuala Lumpur. Global Environment Centre & Forestry Department Peninsular Malaysia. Cetaktama, Kuala Lumpur.

# **CHAPTER 4**

---

## **COASTAL WETLANDS**

### **Coordinating Lead Authors**

Hilary Kennedy (UK), Daniel M. Alongi (Australia) and Ansarul Karim (Bangladesh)

### **Lead Authors**

Guangcheng Chen (China), Gail L. Chmura (Canada), Stephen Crooks (USA), James G. Kairo (Kenya), Baowen Liao (China) and Guanghui Lin (China)

### **Contributing Author**

Tiffany G. Troxler (IPCC TFI TSU)

### **Review Editors**

Nuria Marba Bordalba (Spain) and Georgi Karl Hiebaum (Bulgaria)

## Contents

4	Coastal Wetlands .....	6
4.1	Introduction .....	6
4.2	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals .....	11
4.2.1	Forest management practices in mangroves .....	11
4.2.1.1	Biomass .....	12
4.2.1.2	Dead organic matter .....	16
4.2.1.3	Soil carbon .....	18
4.2.2	Extraction .....	18
4.2.2.1	Biomass .....	19
4.2.2.2	Dead organic matter .....	23
4.2.2.3	Soil carbon .....	24
4.2.3	Rewetting, revegetation and creation of mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows .....	26
4.2.3.1	Biomass .....	26
4.2.3.2	Dead organic matter .....	27
4.2.3.3	Soil carbon .....	27
4.2.4	Drainage in mangroves and tidal marshes .....	29
4.2.4.1	Biomass .....	30
4.2.4.2	Dead organic matter .....	30
4.2.4.3	Soil carbon .....	30
4.3	Non-CO <sub>2</sub> emissions .....	32
4.3.1	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted soils and created mangroves and tidal marshes .....	32
4.3.1.1	Choice of method .....	33
4.3.1.2	Choice of emission factors .....	33
4.3.1.3	Choice of activity data .....	34
4.3.1.4	Uncertainty assessment .....	34
4.3.2	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions during aquaculture use in mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows .....	34
4.3.2.1	Choice of method .....	35
4.3.2.2	Choice of emission factors .....	35
4.3.2.3	Choice of activity data .....	36
4.3.2.4	Uncertainty assessment .....	36
4.4	Completeness, time series consistency, and Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) .....	36
4.4.1	Completeness .....	36
4.4.2	Time series consistency .....	36
4.4.3	Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) .....	36
Annex 4A.1	Salinity-based definitions .....	37
Annex 4A.2	Estimation of above-ground mangrove biomass: higher tier methodology .....	38
Annex 4A.3	Wood density of mangrove species .....	39

Annex 4A.4 Percent refractory carbon.....	40
Annex 4A.5 Derivation of N <sub>2</sub> O emission factor for aquaculture .....	41
Appendix 4a.1 Future methodological development for estimating carbon export.....	42
References .....	43

## Equations

Equation 4.1	Estimation of BCEF using BEF and wood densities .....	12
Equation 4.2	Tier 1 estimation of initial change in carbon stocks with extraction (all C pools).....	18
Equation 4.3	Initial change in carbon stocks with excavation (all C pools) .....	18
Equation 4.4	Tier 1 estimation of initial change in biomass carbon stocks due to extraction activities .	20
Equation 4.5	Tier 1 estimation of initial change in dead organic matter carbon stocks due to extraction activities.....	23
Equation 4.6	Tier 1 estimation of initial change in soil carbon stocks due to extraction activities .....	24
Equation 4.7	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from rewetting, revegetation and creation of coastal wetlands .....	28
Equation 4.8	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions on drained organic and mineral soils.....	30
Equation 4.9	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted soils and created tidal marshes and mangroves.....	33
Equation 4.10	Direct N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from Aquaculture use .....	35

## Figures

Figure 4.1	Decision tree to indicate relevant section for Tier 1 estimation of GHG emissions and removals due to specific management activities in coastal wetlands.....	9
------------	---	---

## Tables

Table 4.1	Specific management activities in coastal wetlands .....	6
Table 4.2	Carbon fraction of above-ground biomass (tonnes C (tonnes d.m.) <sup>-1</sup> ) in mangroves.....	13
Table 4.3	Above-ground biomass in mangroves (tonnes d.m. ha <sup>-1</sup> ).....	14
Table 4.4	Above-ground biomass growth in mangroves (tonnes d.m. ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ).....	14
Table 4.5	Ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass (R) in mangroves .....	14
Table 4.6	Average density (D; tonnes m <sup>-3</sup> ) of mangrove wood .....	15
Table 4.7	Tier 1 default values for litter and dead wood carbon stocks in mangroves.....	17
Table 4.8	Summary of Tier 1 estimation of initial changes in carbon pools for extraction activities.....	19
Table 4.9	Ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass (R) for tidal marshes.....	21
Table 4.10	Ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass (R) for seagrass meadows .....	21

Table 4.11	Soil carbon stocks for mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows for extraction activities.....	26
Table 4.12	Annual emission factors associated with rewetting ( $EF_{RE}$ ) on aggregated organic and mineral soils (tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) at initiation of vegetation reestablishment.....	29
Table 4.13	Annual emission factors associated with drainage ( $EF_{DR}$ ) on aggregated organic and mineral soils (tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) .....	31
Table 4.14	Emission factors for CH <sub>4</sub> ( $EF_{REWET}$ ) for Tier 1 estimation of rewetted land previously vegetated by tidal marshes and mangroves .....	34
Table 4.15	Emission factor ( $EF_F$ ) for N <sub>2</sub> O emission from aquaculture use in mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows .....	35

## Boxes

Box 4.1	The following examples illustrate different management practices which may result in a change of a land-use category depending on how countries define mangroves and other coastal wetlands .....	8
---------	---	---

## 4 COASTAL WETLANDS

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides guidance on estimating and reporting anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and removals from managed coastal wetlands. Coastal wetlands hold large reservoirs of carbon (C) in biomass and especially soil [global stocks: mangroves, ~8 Pg C (Donato *et al.*, 2011); tidal marshes, ~0.8 Pg C (midrange; Pendleton *et al.*, 2012); and seagrass meadows, 4.2 – 8.4 Pg C (Fourqurean *et al.*, 2012)]. Soil carbon originates largely *in situ*, from root biomass and litter, and can result in a significant pool in coastal wetlands, especially when compared with terrestrial forests (Pidgeon, 2009).

Coastal wetlands generally consist of organic and mineral soils that are covered or saturated, for all or part of the year, by tidal freshwater, brackish or saline water (Annex 4A.1) and are vegetated by vascular plants. The boundary of coastal wetlands may extend to the landward extent of tidal inundation and may extend seaward to the maximum depth of vascular plant vegetation. Countries need to develop a nationally appropriate definition of coastal wetland taking into account national circumstances and capabilities. This chapter refers specifically to tidal freshwater<sup>1</sup> and salt marshes, seagrass meadows, and mangroves. For non-tidal inland mineral wetland soils, refer to Chapter 5, this supplement.

**TABLE 4.1**  
**SPECIFIC MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN COASTAL WETLANDS**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Subactivity</i>	<i>Vegetation types affected</i>
<b>Activities relevant to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals</b>		
<b>Forest management practices in mangroves</b>	Planting, thinning, harvest, wood removal, fuelwood removal, charcoal production <sup>1</sup>	Mangrove <sup>2</sup>
<b>Extraction</b>	Excavation to enable port, harbour and marina construction and filling or dredging to facilitate raising the elevation of land	Mangrove, Tidal marsh, Seagrass meadow <sup>4</sup>
	Aquaculture (construction)	Mangrove, Tidal marsh
	Salt production (construction)	Mangrove, Tidal marsh
<b>Drainage</b>	Agriculture, forestry, mosquito control	Mangrove, Tidal marsh
<b>Rewetting, revegetation and creation<sup>3</sup></b>	Conversion from drained to saturated soils by restoring hydrology and reestablishment of vegetation	Mangrove, Tidal marsh
	Reestablishment of vegetation on undrained soils	Seagrass meadow <sup>4</sup>
<b>Activities relevant to non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions</b>		
<b>Aquaculture (use)</b>	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from aquaculture use	Mangrove, Tidal marsh, Seagrass meadow
<b>Rewetted soils</b>	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from change to natural vegetation following modifications to restore hydrology	Mangrove, Tidal marsh

<sup>1</sup>Including conversion to Forest Land or conversion from Forest Land to other land uses.

<sup>2</sup>It is *good practice* to report mangroves in the appropriate national land-use category according to the national forest definition and to consider when forest management practices may occur on mangroves classified under land-use categories other than Forest Land (similar types of examples in inventory reporting include wood harvest from orchards or other perennial Cropland or harvest of trees from Wetlands).

<sup>3</sup>The term revegetation is used to refer to practices within the framework of UNFCCC reporting.

<sup>4</sup>Countries need to report on emissions from extraction and revegetation only if necessary data are available.

<sup>1</sup>At the present time, insufficient data are available to provide generic default data for C pools in tidal freshwater swamps.

It is *good practice* that inventory compilers determine a country-specific definition of coastal wetlands, recognizing national circumstances. Having applied the country-specific definition, the specific management activities (Table 4.1) need to be identified and emissions and removals reported using the methodologies provided in this chapter. When identifying the nature and location of these activities, inventory compilers need only report GHG emissions or removals for activities where the anthropogenic contribution dominates over natural emissions and removals. Management activities resulting in extraction of soils, such as construction of aquaculture ponds, can result in large carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions in mangroves and tidal marshes. Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions can be significant from aquaculture activities. Rewetting increases methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions from drained freshwater tidal systems and increases carbon accumulation in mangrove biomass, dead wood and soils.

Coastal wetlands can potentially occur in any land-use category defined in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and the management activity may or may not result in a land-use change (see Box 4.1). Regardless of whether a land-use change occurs, it is *good practice* to quantify and report significant emissions and removals (Table 4.1) resulting from management activities on coastal wetlands in line with the country-specific definition. To cover all potential reporting options, new Wetland subcategories *Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands* and *Land Converted to Other Wetlands* are included. Coastal wetlands can also occur on areas that are not part of the total land area of the country. Emissions and removals from these areas should be reported separately under the relevant land-use category, however the associated land areas should be excluded from the total area of the land-use category (refer to Chapter 7, this supplement). In this way, countries need not be concerned with areas of coastal wetland, with small impacts on carbon stock changes and emissions of non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases, which are not included in the total land area.

Readers are referred to Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for many of the basic equations to estimate GHG emissions, and new guidance is provided in this chapter, as necessary. The decision tree (Figure 4.1) guides the inventory compiler to the appropriate estimation methodology for each of the specific management activities covered in this chapter.

## COVERAGE OF THIS CHAPTER

This Chapter updates guidance contained in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* to:

- provide default data for estimation of carbon stock changes in mangrove living biomass and dead wood pools for coastal wetlands at Tier 1.

This Chapter gives new:

- guidance for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from organic and mineral soils for the management activities of extraction (including construction of aquaculture and salt production ponds), drainage and rewetting, revegetation and creation;
- default data for estimation of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals for soils in mangrove, tidal marsh and seagrass meadows;
- guidance for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions during aquaculture use;
- guidance for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for rewetting, revegetation and creation of mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows.

The Appendix to this Chapter provides the basis for future methodological development to address:

- Anthropogenic emissions and removals associated with dissolved or particulate organic carbon (DOC, POC) loss during drainage as affected by tidal exchange.

For constructed wetlands that occur in coastal zones that are modified to receive and treat wastewater, refer to Chapter 6 (this supplement). Chapter 6 also covers semi-natural treatment wetlands, which are natural wetlands where wastewater has been directed for treatment but the wetland is otherwise unmodified.

While countries will follow their own national definitions of coastal wetlands, some general features that may help in consistent identification can be found throughout this guidance. It is *good practice* to maintain consistent identification of lands for the purpose of reporting.



**Box 4.1****THE FOLLOWING EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATE DIFFERENT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WHICH MAY RESULT IN A CHANGE OF A LAND-USE CATEGORY DEPENDING ON HOW COUNTRIES DEFINE MANGROVES AND OTHER COASTAL WETLANDS**

For Land remaining in a Land-use category (i.e. no change in land-use category), when:

Seagrass meadows or tidal marshes classified as Wetlands remain reported as Wetlands following introduction of aquaculture activity.

Mangroves classified as Forest Land according to the national forest definition undergo selective harvesting or biomass clearing remain reported as Forest Land unless they undergo a land-use change.

Mangroves, which do not meet all thresholds of a country's definition of forest, but are coastal wetlands with trees are classified as Wetlands, and when subject to selective harvesting or biomass clearing remain reported as Wetlands.

Conversely, management activities may result in a change in reporting category, for example, when:

Seagrass meadows are initially classified as Wetlands, but are considered a Settlement following introduction of aquaculture activity.

Tidal marshes are classified as Wetlands and are drained for agriculture and subsequently classified as a Cropland or Grassland.


Mangroves are classified as Forest Land and undergo clearing, or drainage and converted to another land-use category.

**MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN COASTAL WETLANDS**

Coastal wetlands that have been modified by anthropogenic activities are often reduced in area. Globally about 35% of the area of mangroves has disappeared since 1980, with a current global areal rate of loss of between 0.7 and 3% yr<sup>-1</sup> (Pendelton *et al.*, 2012). The management activities that have led to the majority of mangrove loss include forestry activities (26%) and aquaculture, comprising the construction (and extraction of soil) for shrimp ponds (38%) and fish farms (14%) (Vaiela *et al.*, 2009). Other management activities may lead to the removal of mangrove biomass without necessarily resulting in mangrove clearance i.e. harvesting for fuelwood, charcoal and construction. The current global areal rate of loss of tidal marsh is estimated to be between 1 and 2% yr<sup>-1</sup> (Pendelton *et al.*, 2012). Draining for agriculture, diking to isolate marsh from tides, filling (after extraction) with sediment, and the extraction of soil during the construction of ponds for salt production are common management activities affecting tidal marshes. Seagrass meadows are experiencing a global areal rate of loss currently of between 0.4 and 2.5% yr<sup>-1</sup> (Pendelton *et al.*, 2012). Globally, the main reasons for seagrass loss are management activities such as dredging, leading to the excavation of soil to raise the elevation of land in low lying areas and contribute to new land areas for settlement and aquaculture.

Revegetation efforts with mangroves, tidal marsh plants and seagrass, have been made worldwide to compensate or mitigate for coastal wetland loss resulting from management activities (e.g. Bosire *et al.*, 2008; Orth *et al.*, 2011). Recovery of vegetation that characterised the coastal zone generally requires reestablishment of the pre-existing environmental setting, such as rewetting (restored hydrology), to maintain saturated soils and facilitate plant growth. Management activities do not always affect all vegetation types (i.e. mangroves, tidal marsh plants and seagrasses) or occur in all countries and not all coastal wetlands will be managed. To identify areas affected refer to respective sections on Activity Data and throughout this supplement.

**Figure 4.1** Decision tree to indicate relevant section for Tier 1 estimation of GHG emissions and removals due to specific management activities in coastal wetlands<sup>2</sup>.



<sup>2</sup> For extraction activities, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals are estimated for the initial change in carbon stocks that occur during the year the extraction activities take place. Once the activity/activities is/are completed, these lands are continually tracked but CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals are reported as zero at Tier 1. Forest management practices in mangroves, drainage and rewetting are reported based on the area of land where it occurs, lands are tracked and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals subsequently are reported in the annual inventory.

The following sections provide some general information on the specified management activities in coastal wetlands that result in large anthropogenic emissions and removals.

### **Forest management practices in mangroves**

Removal of wood occurs throughout the tropics where mangrove forests are harvested for fuelwood, charcoal, and construction (Ellison and Farnsworth, 1996; Walters *et al.*, 2008). The wood removal can range from extensive forest clearing to more moderate, selective harvesting of individual trees, or to minimally invasive activities such as bark removal. Natural disturbances are another form of biomass carbon stock loss. There may also be conversion to forest land where mangrove replanting can take place on rewetted, or already saturated, soils.

### **Extraction**

Extraction collectively refers to:

- (A) Excavation of saturated soils leading to unsaturated (drained) soils and removal of biomass and dead organic matter. Activities that lead to the excavation of soil often lead to loss of coastal wetlands. The excavated or dredged soil is also commonly used to help develop coastal infrastructure where there is a need to raise the elevation of land in low lying areas and/or contribute to new land areas for settlement.
- (B) Excavation during the “construction” phase of aquaculture and salt production ponds in mangroves and tidal marshes followed by the “use” of these facilities.

Aquaculture and salt production are common activities in the coastal zone and similarly require excavation of soil and removal of biomass and dead organic matter for construction. There is a range of aquaculture practices, but the most important are fish farming and production from shrimp ponds (World Bank, 2006). Salt production, from the evaporation of seawater, is also a widespread activity with sites along tropical and subtropical coasts worldwide, some of which have been producing salt for centuries (Oren, 2009; Thiery and Puente, 2002). In both activities, ponds are constructed in mangroves and tidal marshes by clearing vegetation, levelling the soil and subsequently excavating the surface soils to build berms where water is held. Depending on the type of aquaculture (intensive, extensive etc.) and the species stocked in the ponds (shrimp, fish) the soils can be excavated to make ponds of 0.5 m to 2.5 m depth (Cruz, 1997; Kungvankij *et al.*, 1986; Wang, 1990; Robertson and Phillips, 1995). In a similar manner the depth of salt production ponds can vary between depths of about 0.5 to 2.5 m (e.g. Ortiz-Milan, 2006; Madkour and Gaballah, 2012).

Construction is only the first phase in aquaculture and salt production. The second phase, termed “use” is when fish ponds, cages or pens are stocked and fish production occurs. In seagrass meadows, aquaculture is maintained by housing fish in floating cages or pens that are anchored to the sediment (Alongi *et al.*, 2009) and these settings are considered during the use phase. N<sub>2</sub>O is emitted from aquaculture systems primarily as a by-product of the conversion of ammonia (contained in fish urea) to nitrate through nitrification and nitrate to N<sub>2</sub> gas through denitrification. The N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are related to the fish production (Hu *et al.*, 2012). When use of the aquaculture systems has been stopped, often due to disease or declining water clarity (Stevenson *et al.*, 1999), the systems transition to a final phase i.e. “discontinued”. All three phases (construction, use and discontinued) of aquaculture and salt production are considered together with the other extraction activities, because the activity data are linked. However, only construction is addressed at Tier 1 for CO<sub>2</sub>, with higher tiers addressing use and discontinued phases. For non-CO<sub>2</sub>, only the use phase is considered at Tier 1.

### **Rewetting, revegetation and creation**

Rewetting is a pre-requisite for vegetation reestablishment and/or creation of conditions conducive to purposeful planting of vegetation that is characteristic of coastal wetlands. This activity is also used to describe the management activities designed to reestablish vegetation on undrained soils in seagrass meadows. Once the natural vegetation is established, soil carbon accumulation is initiated at rates commensurate to those found in natural settings (Craft *et al.*, 2002, 2003; Osland *et al.*, 2012).

Rewetting in mangroves and tidal marshes occurs where hydrologic modifications reverse drainage or remove impoundments or other obstructions to hydrologic flow (e.g. levee breach). Also included in this activity are mangroves and tidal marshes that have been created, typically by raising soil elevation or removing the upper layer of upland soil or dredge spoil, and grading the site until the appropriate tidal elevation is reached to facilitate reestablishment of the original vegetation. Revegetation can occur by natural recolonisation, direct seeding and purposeful planting. Alternatively, created wetlands with mangroves can be found where high riverine sediment loads lead to rapid sediment accumulation, so that previously sub-aqueous soils can be elevated above tidal influence. This naturally created land can be reseeded or purposefully vegetated.

The rewetting of tidal marshes and mangroves through reconnection of hydrology may lead to CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Harris, 2010), particularly at low salinities, with an inverse relationship between CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and salinity (Purvaja and Ramesh, 2001; Poffenbarger *et al.*, 2011).

In coastal wetlands where seagrass loss has occurred due to anthropogenic activities, soils remain saturated. Initiatives to allow revegetation can include natural or purposeful dispersal of seed or planting of seagrass modules (Orth *et al.*, 2011). These same techniques can also be used to create (rather than re-establish) seagrass meadows (Jones *et al.*, 2012).

### Drainage

Mangroves and tidal marshes have been diked and drained to create pastures, croplands and settlements since before the 11th century (Gedan *et al.*, 2009). The practice continues today on many coastlines. On some diked coasts, groundwater of reclaimed former wetlands is pumped out to maintain the water table at the required level below a dry soil surface, while on other coasts drainage is achieved through a system of ditches and tidal gates. Due to the substantial carbon reservoirs of coastal wetlands, drainage can lead to large CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

## 4.2 CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS

This section provides the methodology to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from human activities in coastal wetlands comprising forest management practices in mangroves, extraction, drainage and rewetting. The methodological guidance provided here is consistent with methods for biomass and dead organic matter in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and are in large part based on that methodological guidance: (1) for forest management practices in mangroves, methods for biomass and dead organic matter are in large part based on Chapter 4 of Volume 4; (2) for extraction activities, the methodological guidance is generally consistent with guidance for peat extraction Chapter 7 of Volume 4; and (3) for rewetting and drainage activities, updated methodological guidance found in other chapters of this supplement is consistent with the methodologies presented here. Activities covered by this chapter are described in Table 4.1. Separate guidance is provided on estimation of changes in carbon stock from the five carbon pools.

Depending on circumstances, practices and definitions, specific coastal wetland management activities may or may not involve a change in land-use category. The guidance in this chapter needs to be applied regardless of the reporting categories. In particular, no recommendation is provided in relation to transition periods between land-use categories; countries can apply the existing transition period of appropriate land-use categories.

Consistent with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, the Tier 1 default approach assumes that the change in biomass and dead organic matter carbon stocks are zero on all lands except on Forest Land or on Cropland, Grassland and Wetlands with perennial woody biomass. On Forest Land and on Cropland, Grassland, or Wetlands with woody biomass, the woody biomass and woody dead organic matter pools are potentially significant and need to be estimated in a manner consistent with the guidance provided in Chapters 2 (generic methods), 4 (Forest Land), 5 (Cropland), 6 (Grassland) and 7 (Wetlands) in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Guidance provided here refers to Equations 2.7, 2.8 and the subsequent equations in Chapter 2 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* which split the carbon stock changes in the biomass pool or  $\Delta C_B$  into the various possible gains and losses.

If specific management activities in coastal wetlands (Table 4.1) are accompanied by a change in land use that involves Forest Land or Cropland, Grassland or Wetlands with perennial woody biomass, changes in carbon stocks in biomass, dead wood and litter pools are equal to the difference in carbon stocks in the old and current land-use categories (see Section 2.3.1.2, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). These changes in carbon stock occur only in the year of the conversion (extraction activities), or are uniformly distributed over the length of the transition period (e.g. planting, harvesting). In soils the change in carbon stocks for extraction activities occurs in the year of conversion, while for drainage, emissions persist as long as the soil remains drained or as long as organic matter remains, following the methodological guidance in this chapter.

### 4.2.1 Forest management practices in mangroves

This section deals with CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals associated with forest management practices in mangroves. It is *good practice* to follow a country's national definition of forest, but also to apply the appropriate guidance when mangrove wetlands have trees, but that do not necessarily satisfy all thresholds of the national definition of forest. Depending on how the land is classified, forest management practices in mangroves may or may not lead to a change in land-use category (examples provided in Box 4.1). For estimation methodologies refer to the generic guidance provided in Chapter 2 of Volume 4 and more specific guidance in the relevant chapters of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for reporting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals for above-ground biomass, below-ground biomass and dead organic matter (litter and dead wood).

### 4.2.1.1 BIOMASS

Biomass can be stored in mangroves that contain perennial woody vegetation. The default methodology for estimating carbon stock changes in woody biomass is provided in Section 2.2.1, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The change in biomass is only estimated for perennial woody vegetation of mangroves. Changes in mangrove biomass may be estimated from either: 1) annual rates of biomass gain and loss (Equation 2.7, Chapter 2) or 2) changes in carbon stocks at two points in time (Equation 2.8, Chapter 2). The first approach (Gain-Loss method) can be used for Tier 1 estimation (with refinements at higher tiers) whereas the second approach can be used for Tier 2 or 3 estimations. It is *good practice* for countries to strive to improve inventory and reporting approaches by advancing to the highest possible tier given national circumstances. For coastal wetlands with non-woody vegetation (i.e. seagrass meadows and many tidal marshes), increase in biomass stocks in a single year is assumed equal to biomass losses from mortality in that same year leading to no net change.

### CHOICE OF METHOD

#### Tier 1

If the land (1) satisfies a country's definition of forest or (2) is a mangrove wetland with trees, that nonetheless do not meet the national definition of forest, and is managed for forest activities where no land-use change has occurred, guidance is provided in "Section 2.3.1.1 Land Remaining in a Land-Use Category" and in the specific guidance in Volume 4, of the *IPCC 2006 Guidelines*. Guidance is applied using the default data provided in this chapter (Table 4.2 – 4.6) and specific guidance below. Examples may include Forest Land to Forest Land, Wetlands to Wetlands or Other Wetlands to Other Wetlands.

If the land (1) satisfies a country's definition of forest or (2) is a mangrove wetland with trees, and is managed for forest activities where land-use change has occurred or trees have been cleared, guidance is provided in "Section 2.3.1.2 Land Converted to a Another Land-Use Category" and in the specific guidance in the relevant chapters of Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Guidance is applied using the default data provided in this chapter (Table 4.2 – 4.6) and specific guidance below.

When either the biomass stock or its change in a category (or sub-category) is significant or a *key category*, it is *good practice* to select a higher tier for estimation. The choice of Tier 2 or 3 methods depends on the types and accuracy of data and models available, level of spatial disaggregation of activity data and national circumstances.

If using activity data collected via Approach 1 (see Chapter 3 of Volume 4 in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), and it is not possible to use supplementary data to identify land converted from and to the respective land category, the inventory compiler needs to estimate carbon stocks in biomass following Section 2.3.1.1 and specific relevant guidance as indicated above.

Because a biomass conversion and expansion factor (BCEF) is not available for mangroves, when above-ground biomass is estimated from merchantable growing stock, for conversion of net annual increment, or for conversion of woody and fuelwood removal volume to above-ground biomass removal, BCEF is derived from wood density (Table 4.6) and a default value of BEF (Table 3A.1.10- Annex 3A.10 of the *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-use Change, and Forestry*). This formulation follows Equation 4.1 and is described in Box 4.2 of Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

<p><b>EQUATION 4.1</b></p> <p><b>ESTIMATION OF BCEF USING BEF AND WOOD DENSITIES</b></p> $\text{BCEF} = \text{BEF} \cdot \text{D}$ <p>(Section 2.3.1.1, Chapter 2 of the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>)</p>
---

Where:

BCEF = biomass conversion and expansion factor for conversion of growing stock, net annual increment or wood removals into above-ground biomass, above-ground biomass growth or biomass removals; tonnes d.m. m<sup>-3</sup>

BEF = biomass expansion factor to expand the dry weight of the merchantable volume of growing stock, net annual increment or wood removals to account for non-merchantable components; dimensionless

D = wood density; tonnes d.m. m<sup>-3</sup>

#### Tier 2

As in Tier 1, the Gain-Loss method can be applied using country-specific data. In addition, the Stock-Difference method can also be applied using country-specific emission factors. If using the Stock-Difference method, country-specific BEF or BCEF data or species specific wood density values (provided in Annex 4A.3) could be applied. For Tier 2, countries may also modify the assumption that immediately following conversion to another

land-use category, or after mangrove trees are cleared, biomass is zero. Refer to the relevant sections in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for further guidance on Tier 2 methodologies for forest management practices in mangroves.

### Tier 3

Tier 3 approach for biomass carbon stock change estimation allows for a variety of methods including process-based models that simulate the dynamics of biomass carbon stock changes. Country-defined methodology can be based on estimates of above-ground biomass through use of allometric equations (Annex 4A.2) or include detailed inventories based on permanent sample plots. Tier 3 could also involve substantial national data on disaggregation by vegetation type, ecological zone and salinity. Tier 3 approaches can use growth curves stratified by species, ecological zones, site productivity and management intensity. If developing alternative methods, these need to be clearly documented. Refer to the relevant sections in Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for further guidance on Tier 3 methodologies for forest management practices in mangroves. Spaceborne optical and radar data can be used for mapping changes in the extent of mangroves and transitions to and from other land covers. Such techniques currently cannot routinely provide estimates of a sufficient level of accuracy, although this may become more feasible in the future (refer to this section, “Choice of Activity Data”).

## CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

### Tier 1

For countries using the Gain-Loss method as a Tier 1 approach, the estimation of the annual carbon gains in living biomass requires the following: carbon fraction of above-ground biomass, average above-ground biomass, mean annual above-ground biomass growth, ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass and average wood density. The default values for these parameters are provided in Tables 4.2-4.6, respectively. It is *good practice* to apply annual growth rates that lead neither to over- nor underestimates. Losses due to wood removals, fuelwood removals and disturbances are also needed (refer to Choice of Activity Data for Tier 1 and uncertainty analysis in this section).

### Tier 2

National data could include country specific values of any parameter used in the Tier 1 method or values that permit biomass carbon stock changes using the Stock-Difference method. Refer also to the relevant sections of Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for further guidance.

### Tier 3

Tier 3 methods may employ the use of data that are of higher order spatial disaggregation and that depend on variation in salinity or further disaggregation of regional differences within a country. Forest growth rates of specific age ranges could be applied. Refer also to the relevant sections of Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for further guidance.

TABLE 4.2 CARBON FRACTION OF ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (TONNES C (TONNES D.M.) <sup>-1</sup> ) IN MANGROVES <sup>1</sup>			
Component	%C	95% CI <sup>3</sup>	Range
Leaves + wood <sup>2</sup>	45.1 (n = 47)	42.9, 47.1	42.2-50.2
<sup>1</sup> This Table provides supplementary values to those presented in Table 4.3, Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .			
<sup>2</sup> Sources: Spain and Holt, 1980; Gong and Ong, 1990; Twilley <i>et al.</i> , 1992; Bouillon <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Saenger, 2002; Alongi <i>et al.</i> , 2003, 2004; Kristensen <i>et al.</i> , 2008			
<sup>3</sup> 95% CI of the geometric mean			

**TABLE 4.3**  
**ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS IN MANGROVES (TONNES D.M. HA<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>1</sup>**

Domain	Region	Above-ground biomass	95% CI <sup>5</sup>	Range	n
Tropical	Tropical Wet	192 <sup>2</sup>	187, 204	8.7-384	49
	Tropical Dry	92 <sup>3</sup>	88, 97	3.2-201	13
Subtropical		75 <sup>4</sup>	66, 84	3.9-129	10

<sup>1</sup>This Table provides supplementary values to those presented in Table 4.7-4.9, Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<sup>2</sup>Sources: Golley *et al.*, 1975; Christensen, 1978; Ong *et al.*, 1982; Putz and Chan, 1986; Tamai *et al.*, 1986; Komiyama *et al.*, 1987; 1988, 2000, 2008; Lin *et al.*, 1990; Mall *et al.*, 1991; Amarasinghe and Balasubramaniam, 1992; Kusmana *et al.*, 1992; Slim *et al.*, 1996; Fromard *et al.*, 1998; Norhayati and Latiff, 2001; Pongparn, 2003; Sherman *et al.*, 2003; Juliana and Nizam, 2004; Kirui *et al.*, 2006; Kairo *et al.*, 2008; Fatoyinbo *et al.*, 2008; Camacho *et al.*, 2011; Kauffman *et al.*, 2011; Thant and Kanzaki, 2011

<sup>3</sup>Sources: Golley *et al.*, 1962; Briggs, 1977; Suzuki and Tagawa, 1983; Steinke *et al.*, 1995; Alongi *et al.*, 2003; Medeiros and Sampoia, 2008; Khan *et al.*, 2009

<sup>4</sup>Sources: Lugo and Snedaker, 1974; Woodroffe, 1984; Lee, 1990; Mackey, 1993; Tam *et al.*, 1995; Saintilan, 1997; Ross *et al.*, 2001; Coronado-Molina *et al.*, 2004; Simard *et al.*, 2006; Fatoyinbo *et al.*, 2008; Komiyama *et al.*, 2008; Abohassan *et al.*, 2012

<sup>5</sup>95% CI of the geometric mean

**TABLE 4.4**  
**ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS GROWTH IN MANGROVES (TONNES D.M. HA<sup>-1</sup> YR<sup>-1</sup>)<sup>1</sup>**

Domain	Region	Above-ground biomass growth <sup>2,3</sup>	95% CI <sup>4</sup>	Range	n
Tropical	Tropical Wet	9.9	9.4, 10.4	0.1-27.4	23
	Tropical Dry	3.3	3.1, 3.5	0.1-7.5	6
Subtropical		18.1	17.1, 19.1	5.3-29.1	4

<sup>1</sup>This Table provides supplementary values to those presented in Table 4.10, Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<sup>2</sup>Sources: Ajonina 2008; Kairo *et al.*, 2008; Alongi, 2010

<sup>3</sup>Biomass growth rates are from forests of varying age and such default values should only pertain to forests until the carbon biomass stock (Table 4.3) is reached.

<sup>4</sup>95% CI of the geometric mean

**TABLE 4.5**  
**RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) IN MANGROVES<sup>1</sup>**

Domain	Region	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.) <sup>-1</sup> ]	95% CI <sup>5</sup>	Range	n
Tropical	Tropical Wet	0.49 <sup>2</sup>	0.47, 0.51	0.04-1.1	18
	Tropical Dry	0.29 <sup>3</sup>	0.28, 0.30	0.09-0.79	9
Subtropical		0.96 <sup>4</sup>	0.91, 1.0	0.22-0.27	18

<sup>1</sup>This Table provides supplementary values to those presented in Table 4.4, Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<sup>2</sup>Sources: Golley *et al.*, 1975; Tamai *et al.*, 1986; Komiyama *et al.*, 1987, 1988; Gong and Ong, 1990; Lin *et al.*, 1990; Pongparn, 2003

<sup>3</sup>Sources: Golley *et al.*, 1962; Alongi *et al.*, 2003; Hoque *et al.*, 2010

<sup>4</sup>Sources: Briggs, 1977; Lin, 1989; Tam *et al.*, 1995; Saintilan, 1997

<sup>5</sup>95% CI of the geometric mean

**TABLE 4.6**  
**AVERAGE DENSITY (D; TONNES M<sup>-3</sup>) OF MANGROVE WOOD<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>D</b>	<b>95% CI<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>n</b>
<b>Wood</b>	0.71	0.64, 0.74	0.41-0.87	85

<sup>1</sup>Sources: Global Wood Density Database <http://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.234/1?show=full>; Saenger, 2002; Komiyama *et al.*, 2005; Donato *et al.*, 2012

<sup>2</sup>95% CI of the geometric mean

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

All tiers require information on areas of forest management practices in mangroves. Information on mangrove forest types as well as soil types can be obtained from national wetland and soil type maps (if available) or the International Soil Reference and Information Centre ([www.isric.org](http://www.isric.org)). Mangrove distributions for most countries can be obtained from the RAMSAR web site ([www.ramsar.org](http://www.ramsar.org)). When information is gathered from multiple sources, it is *good practice* to conduct crosschecks to ensure complete and consistent representation and avoid omissions and double-counting.

### Tier 1

For Tier 1, these data can be obtained from one of the following sources<sup>3</sup>:

FAOSTAT <http://faostat.fao.org/>

Global Mangrove Database & Information System: <http://www.glomis.com/>

The UNESCO Mangrove Programme: <http://www.unesco.org/csi/intro/mangrove.htm>

Mangrove and the Ramsar Convention: [http://www.ramsar.org/types\\_mangroves.htm](http://www.ramsar.org/types_mangroves.htm)

USGS Global Mangrove Project <http://lca.usgs.gov/lca/globalmangrove/index.php>

Mangrove.org: <http://mangrove.org/>

Mangrove Action Project: <http://www.mangroveactionproject.org/>

FAO Mangrove Management: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/mangrove/en/>

USGS National Wetlands Research Center: <http://www.nwrc.usgs.gov/index.html>

World Atlas of Mangrove: <http://data.unep-wcmc.org/datasets/22>

World Distribution of Coral Reefs and Mangroves: <http://www.unep-wcmc.org>

For Tier 1 estimation, FAO data sources can be used to estimate wood removal and fuelwood removal. Further sources of activity data can be found in the relevant sections of Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Additional resources can be found in IPCC (2010).

Global mangrove cover has been mapped by the United States Geological Service (USGS) for three epochs “1975” (1973-1983), “1990” (1989 – 1993), and “2000” (1997 -2000) and is available for download at <http://edcintl.cr.usgs.gov/ip/mangrove/download.php>. Global distribution of Mangroves (V3.0, 1997) has been compiled by UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in collaboration with the International Society for Mangrove Ecosystems (ISME).

The Kyoto & Carbon Initiative of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA) Global Mangrove Watch project has used Synthetic Aperture Radar mosaics to create maps of global mangrove extent for the years 1995 and 2007-2010 (JAXA 2010a) and maps of annual changes in mangrove areas between the years 1995-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. (<http://www.eorc.jaxa.jp/ALOS/en/kyoto/mangrovewatch.htm>).

Resources providing recent trends in coastal wetland area can help countries understand circumstances of those trends and what management activities contribute to them (FAO, 2007; Green and Short, 2003; <http://archive.org/stream/worldatlasofseag03gree#page/n5/mode/2up>; JAXA, 2010b; Sifleet *et al.*, 2011; <http://nicholasinstitute.duke.edu/publications?topics=34>; Fatoyinbo and Simard, 2013).

Sources providing international data can be verified, validated and updated data with national sources.

<sup>3</sup>If these links do not work, either paste into your browser or do a web search for the resources or institution.



## Tiers 2 and 3

At Tiers 2 and 3, country-specific activity data is applied, and at Tier 3, at the resolution required for Tier 3 methods. At higher tiers, these data may be obtained from local, state or regional government department websites as many countries and regional government authorities report this information. Countries also have their own remote sensing systems which can be used for land change mapping (Nascimto *et al.*, 2013). Wood density values (Annex 4A.3) of specific species need to be applied at Tiers 2 and 3. Areas of extensive harvesting of mangroves may be assessed with aerial imagery. When the ALOS-2 satellite is operational, generation of annual radar mosaics and mangrove extent and change maps is planned (<http://www.eorc.jaxa.jp/ALOS/en/kyoto/mangrovewatch.htm>).

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

The major sources of uncertainty for all wetland types, especially mangroves, are dominant species-specific differences in carbon content and differences due to forest age, species composition, intertidal location, soil fertility and community structure. The confidence intervals presented in Tables 4.2 - 4.6, range from about 24% to 200%. To reduce uncertainty, countries are encouraged to develop country- or region-specific BEFs and BCEF values. In case country- or region-specific values are unavailable, it is *good practice* to check the sources of default parameters and their correspondence with species present, as well as with the conditions in country.

The causes of variation of annual increment of mangrove growth include climate, site growth conditions, and soil fertility. Artificially regenerated and managed stands are less variable than natural forests. One of the ways to improve accuracy of estimates of these wetlands includes the application of country-specific or regional estimates of growth stratified by the dominant species present. If the default values of growth increments are used, the uncertainty of the estimates need to be clearly indicated and documented.

For mangroves, data on commercial fellings are relatively accurate, although they may be incomplete or biased due to illegal fellings and under-reported due to tax regulations. Traditional wood that is gathered and used directly, without being sold, is not likely to be included in any statistics. Countries must carefully consider these issues. The amount of wood removed from forests after storms and pest outbreaks varies both in time and volume. No default data can be provided on these types of losses. The uncertainties associated with these losses can be estimated from the amount of damaged wood directly withdrawn from the forest or using data on damaged wood subsequently used for commercial and other purposes. If fuelwood gathering is treated separately from fellings, the relevant uncertainties might be high, due to the level of uncertainty associated with traditional gathering.

### 4.2.1.2 DEAD ORGANIC MATTER

The guidance for changes in the carbon pools in dead organic matter (DOM; dead wood and litter) in mangroves provided in the *2006 IPCC Guideline* remains unchanged. Dead roots  $\leq 2$  cm diameter are included in the soil pool and not considered within the dead organic matter pool. This fraction of dead roots turns over rapidly (Alongi, 2009) with the assumption of approximating steady state. Dead organic matter C stocks can vary depending on tidal inundation and frequency, as well as soil oxidation and vegetation cover. Fine litter can be exported with tidal activity (Alongi, 2009) while a larger fraction of senesced woody biomass is buried or decomposed *in-situ*. In wetlands, decomposition of DOM, especially wood, is slow (Robertson and Daniel, 1989) and accumulates as soil organic matter. Careful consideration of pools is needed in estimating inputs, outputs or changes of dead organic matter carbon stocks to avoid double-counting. Consistent with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, it is *good practice* to consider dead organic matter carbon stock changes when management activities in coastal wetlands result in changes in mangrove cover due to human-induced impacts.

## CHOICE OF METHOD

### Tier 1

If the land (1) satisfies a country's definition of forest or (2) is a mangrove wetland with trees, that nonetheless does not meet the national definition of forest, and is managed for forest activities, where no land-use change has occurred, guidance is provided in "Section 2.3.1.1 Land Remaining in a Land-Use Category" and in the specific guidance in Volume 4, of the *IPCC 2006 Guidelines* and applied using the default data provided in this chapter (Table 4.7) and specific guidance below. Examples may include Forest land to Forest land, Wetlands to Wetlands or Other Wetlands to Other Wetlands.

If the land (1) satisfies a country's definition of forest or (2) is a mangrove wetland with trees, and is managed for forest activities where land-use change has occurred or trees have been cleared, guidance is provided in "Section 2.3.1.2 Land Converted to a Another Land-Use Category" and in the specific guidance in the relevant chapters of Volume 4 of the *IPCC 2006 Guidelines* and applied using the default data provided in this chapter (Table 4.7) and specific guidance below.

## Tier 2

Estimation methodologies for Tier 2 can follow Tier 1 methods, but apply country-specific data. The Stock-Difference method (Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*) could also be applied if countries have sample plot data from forest inventories for two points in time. Literature data or carbon databases may provide more feasible and cost-effective data to apply this method.

## Tier 3

Loss estimates of dead wood and litter due to tidal movement (export) can also be considered (Appendix 4a.1). Tier 3 methods may further employ stratification by ecological zone or disturbance regime to reduce uncertainties. It is *good practice* to sum changes in both dead wood and litter to report changes in total dead organic matter. Additional Tier 3 guidance is provided in Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

## CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

### Tier 1

Default values are provided in Table 4.7 of this supplement for use in Tier 1 assessment of emissions and removals.

### Tier 2

Tier 2 methods using country-specific data can be used if such country-specific data can be acquired at reasonable cost.

### Tier 3

Tier 3 emission factors include model output and validation and disaggregated data sources. Field measurements can be developed and used to inform and validate model output at Tier 3. For mangroves, Tier 3 methodologies can employ empirical relationships to provide estimates of canopy litter fall and census of downed wood lying on the forest floor.

TABLE 4.7 TIER 1 DEFAULT VALUES FOR LITTER AND DEAD WOOD CARBON STOCKS IN MANGROVES			
Domain	Ecosystem type	Litter C stocks of mature stands (tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> ) with 95% CI <sup>1</sup>	Dead wood C stocks of mature stands (tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> ) with 95% CI <sup>1</sup>
Tropical/Subtropical	mangroves	0.7 (0-1.3)	10.7 (6.5-14.8)
Litter: Utrera-Lopez and Moreno-Casasola, 2008; Liao <i>et al.</i> , 1990; Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Richards <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Ramose-Silva <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Twilley <i>et al.</i> , 1986 Dead Wood: Kauffman <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Donato <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Allen <i>et al.</i> , 2000; Steinke <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Robertson <i>et al.</i> , 1989; Tam <i>et al.</i> , 1995; Krauss <i>et al.</i> , 2005 <sup>1</sup> 95% CI of the geometric mean			

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

### Tier 1

Carbon stock changes in dead organic matter are generally not reported at Tier 1 when management activities in coastal wetlands do not result in changes in mangrove cover due to human-induced impacts (following guidance in Section 4.2.2.3 of Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), and thus no activity data are required. If a land-use change has occurred resulting from an increase in woody biomass stock, it is *good practice* to report the change in dead organic matter carbon stock. For a Tier 1 method, the annual rate of conversion to Forest Land or other land-use categories with woody mangrove biomass is required, following Section 4.3.2.3 of Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Activity data should be consistent with those used for estimating changes in carbon stock.

### Tier 2 and Tier 3

Inventories using higher tiers will require more comprehensive information on the establishment of new forests, using climate, for example, as a disaggregating factor and at higher spatial and temporal resolution. Additional resources can be found in IPCC (2010).

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

The uncertainty assessment given in section 4.2.2.5 in Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* identifies sources of uncertainty in estimates of carbon stock changes in the dead organic matter pool of

mangroves. Other sources of uncertainty include output of dead organic matter due to decomposition or tidal export.

### 4.2.1.3 SOIL CARBON

The Tier 1 default assumption is that soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals are zero (EF=0) for forest management practices in mangroves. This assumption can be modified at higher tiers. At higher tiers, it is recommended to consider CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from soils due to forest clearing in carbon stock estimations (Alongi *et al.*, 1998). It should also be considered that at Tier 1, rewetting (section 4.2.3) and drainage activities (section 4.2.4) can occur as a result of forest management practices. In this case, follow the guidance for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from soil carbon stock changes (Sections 4.2.3.3 and 4.2.4.3, respectively).

## 4.2.2 Extraction

Extraction refers collectively to the following activities: (A) excavation (associated with dredging used to provide soil for raising the elevation of land, or excavation to enable port, harbour and marina construction and filling), (B) construction of aquaculture ponds and (C) construction of salt production ponds (where soil is excavated to build berms where water is held in ponds). Each of these extraction activities is associated with the removal of biomass, dead organic matter and soil, which results in significant emissions when their removal is from saturated (water-logged) to unsaturated (aerobic) conditions (World Bank, 2006). The Tier 1 methodology assumes that the biomass, dead organic matter and soil are all removed and disposed of under aerobic conditions where all carbon in these pools is emitted as CO<sub>2</sub> during the year of the extraction with no subsequent changes. Tier 1 guidance is given here for reporting the initial changes in carbon (Table 4.1). Regardless of whether the extraction activities result in a change in land-use category, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals associated with extraction are the same, following Equation 4.2 below. This approach follows the methodology applied for peat extraction in Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

**EQUATION 4.2**  
**TIER 1 ESTIMATION OF INITIAL CHANGE IN CARBON STOCKS WITH EXTRACTION**  
**(ALL C POOLS)**

$$\Delta C_{EXT} = \Delta C_{excav} + \Delta C_{aq-constr} + \Delta C_{sp-constr}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{EXT}$  = Changes in carbon stocks from all extraction activities; tonnes C

$\Delta C_{excav}$  = Initial change in biomass, dead organic matter and soil carbon stocks from extraction due to excavation; tonnes C

$\Delta C_{aq-constr}$  = Initial change in biomass, dead organic matter and soil carbon stocks from extraction during construction of aquaculture ponds; tonnes C

$\Delta C_{sp-constr}$  = Initial change in biomass, dead organic matter and soil carbon stocks from extraction during construction of salt production ponds; tonnes C

Equation 4.2 is applied to the total area of coastal wetland where extraction activities take place. The terms  $\Delta C_{excav}$ ,  $\Delta C_{aq-constr}$ , and  $\Delta C_{sp-constr}$  are estimated as  $\Delta C_{CONVERSION}$  (Equations 4.4 - 4.6) for initial change in carbon stocks of each of the C pools for each of the respective activities comprising extraction. Equation 4.3 is applied for each of the extraction activities (and A-C as described above) to estimate the initial change in stocks of each of the C pools.

**EQUATION 4.3**  
**INITIAL CHANGE IN CARBON STOCKS WITH EXCAVATION (ALL C POOLS)**

$$\Delta C_{excav} = \Delta C_{excav-AB} + \Delta C_{excav-BB} + \Delta C_{excav-DOM} + \Delta C_{excav-SO}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{excav}$  = Initial change in biomass, dead organic matter and soil carbon stocks with excavation; tonnes C

$\Delta C_{excav-AB}$  = Initial change in above-ground biomass carbon stock changes with excavation; tonnes C

$\Delta C_{excav-BB}$  = Initial change in below-ground biomass carbon stock changes with excavation; tonnes C

$\Delta C_{excav-DOM}$  = Initial change in dead organic matter carbon stock changes with excavation; tonnes C

$\Delta C_{\text{excav-SO}}$  = Initial change in soil carbon stock changes with excavation as annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals; tonnes C

At Tier 1,

$$\Delta C_{\text{excav-AB}} + \Delta C_{\text{excav-BB}} = \Delta C_{\text{B-CONVERSION}} \text{ (Equation 4.4, Section 4.2.2.1)}$$

$$\Delta C_{\text{excav-DOM}} = \Delta C_{\text{DOM-CONVERSION}} \text{ (Equation 4.5, Section 4.2.2.2)}$$

$$\Delta C_{\text{excav-SO}} = \Delta C_{\text{SO-CONVERSION}} \text{ (Equation 4.6, Section 4.2.2.3)}$$

Equation 4.3 provides the formulation to estimate the initial change in carbon stock in each C pool for the specific extraction activity, excavation. To estimate the initial changes in initial carbon stock change for these pools for construction of aquaculture and salt production ponds, replace  $\Delta C_{\text{excav}}$  with  $\Delta C_{\text{aq-constr}}$  and  $\Delta C_{\text{sp-constr}}$  in Equation 4.3 respectively.

The Tier 1 methodology assumes that the biomass, dead organic matter and soil are all removed and disposed of under aerobic conditions where all carbon in these pools is emitted as CO<sub>2</sub> during the year of extraction (consistent with the assumption applied for peat extraction in Section 7.2.1.1, Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines) and that no subsequent changes occur.

Table 4.8 summarises the Tier level guidance provided for extraction activities, which deals with excavation in general and excavation during the construction phase of aquaculture and salt production, in particular. Estimates are not made at Tier 1 for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals while (1) fish ponds are stocked and salt production is occurring (use phase of aquaculture and salt production) or (2) when the activity has ceased (discontinued phase), although they are considered together with other extraction activities because the activity data are linked.

TABLE 4.8 SUMMARY OF TIER 1 ESTIMATION OF INITIAL CHANGES IN CARBON POOLS FOR EXTRACTION ACTIVITIES						
			C pools			
			Mangrove biomass, dead wood and litter <sup>1</sup>	Soils		
				Mangrove and Tidal Marsh		Seagrass Meadow
				Organic	Mineral	Mineral <sup>2</sup>
Extraction activities	Excavation		Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1
	Aquaculture and Salt Production	Construction	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	NA <sup>3</sup>
		Use	No guidance <sup>4</sup>			
		Discontinued	No guidance <sup>4</sup>			

<sup>1</sup>Removal of biomass resulting from extraction activities is estimated at Tier 1 level in mangroves only.

<sup>2</sup>Tier 1 assumption is that all seagrass soils are mineral.

<sup>3</sup>Extraction activity of aquaculture pond construction, is not applicable for seagrass meadows.

<sup>4</sup>No suitable Tier 1 methodologies are available for C pools during these phases/activities.

### 4.2.2.1 BIOMASS

This section addresses estimation of changes in living (above and below-ground) biomass pools associated with extraction activities comprising excavation, and construction of aquaculture and salt production ponds in coastal wetlands. For extraction in coastal wetlands with tidal marshes and seagrass meadows, changes in biomass carbon stocks are reported at only Tier 2 or higher estimations. It is *good practice* to report the conversion of above-ground and below-ground biomass that occurs with extraction of mangroves.

### CHOICE OF METHOD

Following Box 4.1 extraction may or may not result in a change in land-use category, however the same methodologies apply for mangrove wetlands with forest regardless of how the land is classified.

#### Tier 1

Changes in carbon stock of living biomass during extraction are associated with clearing and removal of vegetation. The area applied is that of a certain year in which the conversion occurs. Regardless of the land-use category, the loss in biomass associated with extraction activities is estimated as  $\Delta C_{\text{conversion}}$  following the

methodology for peat extraction (Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), modified here as Equation 4.4.

**EQUATION 4.4**  
**TIER 1 ESTIMATION OF INITIAL CHANGE IN BIOMASS CARBON STOCKS DUE TO EXTRACTION**  
**ACTIVITIES**

$$\Delta C_{B-CONVERSION} = \sum_{v,c} \{B_{AFTER} \cdot (1+R) - B_{BEFORE} \cdot (1+R)\} \cdot CF \cdot A_{CONVERTEDv,c}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{B-CONVERSION}$  = Changes in biomass carbon stock from conversion due to extraction activities; tonnes C

$B_{AFTER}$  = Carbon stock in above-ground biomass per unit of area immediately after the conversion by vegetation type (v) and climate (c); tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup>; default value = 0

$B_{BEFORE}$  = Carbon stock in above-ground biomass per unit of area immediately before the conversion; tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup>

R = ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass by vegetation type (v) and climate (c); tonnes d.m. below-ground biomass (tonnes d.m. above ground biomass)<sup>-1</sup>

CF = carbon fraction of dry matter; tonnes C (tonnes d.m.)<sup>-1</sup>

$A_{CONVERTED}$  = Area of conversion by vegetation type (v) and climate (c); ha

The Tier 1 methodology assumes that the biomass is removed and disposed of under aerobic conditions where all carbon is emitted as CO<sub>2</sub> during the year of the extraction and that no subsequent changes occur. At Tier 1, initial change in carbon stocks of biomass  $\{B_{AFTER} \cdot (1+R) - B_{BEFORE} \cdot (1+R)\}$  is assumed to be zero for coastal wetlands without perennial biomass or trees. For mangrove wetlands with perennial biomass or trees, the stock after the conversion ( $B_{AFTER}$ ) at Tier 1 is taken to be zero.

## Tier 2

At Tier 2, changes of carbon stock in living above-ground biomass of tidal marsh and seagrass meadow vegetation can be estimated and reported for the specified activities employing the equation for  $\Delta C_{B-CONVERSION}$ , using country-specific emission factors and default values for R given in Tables 4.9 and 4.10, in conjunction with country-specific data on above-ground biomass. At Tier 2, the Gain-Loss or Stock-Difference methods can be applied to estimate biomass carbon stock changes of mangrove in lands where extraction activities (aquaculture and salt production) are discontinued (i.e. regrowth). Tier 2 approaches could also include evaluation of the assumption of instantaneous oxidation of the converted biomass pool.

## Tier 3

In Tier 3, estimation could include methods to incorporate data on the fraction of biomass carbon stock that is retained under saturated conditions to improve estimation of proportion of carbon that is oxidized.

## CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

### Tier 1

Default data for Tier 1 method is provided for mangroves in Tables 4.2-4.6, Section 4.2.1, including above-ground biomass carbon stock, carbon fraction and below-ground to above-ground ratio, for the different climate domains and regions, where applicable.

### Tier 2

Under Tier 2, countries apply country-specific data to estimate changes in carbon stock in above-ground biomass. The conversion of above-ground and below-ground biomass that occurs with extraction activities in tidal marsh and seagrass meadows may be estimated using Tables 4.9 and 4.10 for tidal marshes and seagrass meadows respectively. These data are to be used in conjunction with the carbon fraction of dry matter alongside country-specific data on above-ground biomass carbon stock.

### Tier 3

Field measurements can be developed and used to inform and validate model output at Tier 3. It is expected that data improvements for excavation activities such as ground-truth estimates of overall area impacted, the depth at which removal of biomass has occurred, or the fraction of biomass removal, could be used to develop and verify models.

**TABLE 4.9**  
**RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) FOR TIDAL MARSHES**

Domain	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.) <sup>-1</sup> ]	95% CI <sup>5</sup>	Range	n
Mediterranean	3.63 <sup>1</sup>	3.56, 3.70	1.09-7.15	5
Subtropical	3.65 <sup>2</sup>	3.56, 3.74	2.23-9.41	5
Temperate freshwater tidal	1.15 <sup>3</sup>	1.12, 1.18	0.36-3.85	7
Temperate	2.11 <sup>4</sup>	2.07, 2.15	0.33-10.15	17

<sup>1</sup>Sources: Scarton *et al.*, 2002; Neves *et al.*, 2007; Boyer *et al.*, 2000  
<sup>2</sup>Sources: Lichacz *et al.*, 1984; da Cunha Lana *et al.*, 1991  
<sup>3</sup>Sources: Birch and Cooley, 1982; Whigham *et al.*, 1978  
<sup>4</sup>Sources: Kistritz *et al.*, 1983; Hussey and Long, 1982; Smith *et al.*, 1979; Dunn, 1981; Connor and Chmura, 2000; Gross *et al.*, 1991; Whigham *et al.*, 1978; Elsey-Quirk *et al.*, 2011; Adams *et al.*, 2012  
<sup>5</sup>95% CI of the geometric mean

**TABLE 4.10**  
**RATIO OF BELOW-GROUND BIOMASS TO ABOVE-GROUND BIOMASS (R) FOR SEAGRASS MEADOWS**

Domain	R [tonne root d.m. (tonne shoot d.m.) <sup>-1</sup> ]	95% CI <sup>4</sup>	Range	n
Tropical	1.7 <sup>1</sup>	1.5, 1.9	0.05-25.62	396
Subtropical	2.4 <sup>2</sup>	2.3, 2.6	0.07-16.8	391
Temperate	1.3 <sup>3</sup>	1.1, 1.5	0.14-13.8	91

<sup>1</sup>Sources: Aioi and Pollard, 1993; Brouns, 1985; Brouns, 1987; Coles *et al.*, 1993; Daby, 2003; Devereux *et al.*, 2011; Fourqurean *et al.*, 2012; Halun *et al.*, 2002; Holmer *et al.*, 2001; Ismail, 1993; Lee, 1997; Lindeboom and Sandee, 1989; McKenzie, 1994; Mellors *et al.*, 2002; Moriarty *et al.*, 1990; Nienhuis *et al.*, 1989; Ogden and Ogden, 1982; Paynter *et al.*, 2001; Poovachiranon and Chansang, 1994; Povidisa *et al.*, 2009; Rasheed, 1999; Udy *et al.*, 1999; van Lent *et al.*, 1991; van Tussenbroek, 1998; Vermaat *et al.*, 1993; Vermaat *et al.*, 1995; Williams, 1987  
<sup>2</sup>Sources: Aioi, 1980; Aioi *et al.*, 1981; Asmus *et al.*, 2000; Bandeira, 2002; Boon, 1986; Brun *et al.*, 2009; Collier *et al.*, 2009; de Boer, 2000; Devereux *et al.*, 2011; Dixon and Leverone, 1995; Dos Santos *et al.*, 2012; Dunton, 1996; Fourqurean *et al.*, 2012; Hackney, 2003; Herbert and Fourqurean, 2008; Herbert and Fourqurean, 2009; Holmer and Kendrick, 2012; Jensen and Bell, 2001; Kim *et al.*, 2012; Kirkman and Reid, 1979; Kowalski *et al.*, 2009; Larkum *et al.*, 1984; Lee *et al.*, 2005; Lee *et al.*, 2005b; Lipkin, 1979; Longstaff *et al.*, 1999; Masini *et al.*, 2001; McGlathery *et al.*, 2012; McMahan, 1968; Meling-Lopez and Ibarra-Obando, 1999; Mukai *et al.*, 1979; Paling and McComb, 2000; Park *et al.*, 2011; Powell, 1989; Preen, 1995; Schwarz *et al.*, 2006; Stevensen, 1988; Townsend and Fonseca, 1998; Udy and Dennison, 1997; van Houte-Howes *et al.*, 2004; van Lent *et al.*, 1991; van Tussenbroek, 1998; Walker, 1985; West and Larkum, 1979; Yarbrow and Carlson, 2008  
<sup>3</sup>Sources: Agostini *et al.*, 2003; Cebrian *et al.*, 2000; Fourqurean *et al.*, 2012; Hebert *et al.*, 2007; Holmer and Kendrick, 2012; Larned, 2003; Lebreton *et al.*, 2009; Lillebo *et al.*, 2006; Marba and Duarte, 2001; McRoy, 1974; Olesen and Sand-Jensen, 1994; Rismondo *et al.*, 1997; Sand-Jensen and Borum, 1983; Terrados *et al.*, 2006  
<sup>4</sup>95% CI of the geometric mean

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

**Extraction:** Submissions of licenses for prospecting and exploitation and associated environmental impact assessments (EIAs) can be used to obtain areas under extraction activities. Relevant regulation for extraction can be found at international and national levels. International regulation is covered by the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) 1982 ([www.un.org/Depts/los/index.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/index.htm)). Contracting Parties are under the obligation to publish/communicate reports on monitoring and assessment of potential harmful effects of extraction. The OSPAR Convention 1992 ([www.ospar.org](http://www.ospar.org)) provides guidance for programmes and measures for the control of the human activities in the North-East Atlantic region. The “Agreement on Sand and Gravel Extraction” provides that authorisation for extraction of marine soils from any ecologically sensitive site should be granted after consideration of an EIA. The Helsinki Convention 1992 ([www.helcom.fi](http://www.helcom.fi)) covers the Baltic Sea Area and requires EIAs to be carried out as part of the extraction process and that “monitoring data” and “results of EIA’s.....be made available for scientific evaluation”. The Barcelona Convention 1995

([www.unepmap.org](http://www.unepmap.org)), covers the regulatory framework for the Mediterranean. The ICES Convention 1964 ([www.ices.dk](http://www.ices.dk)) provides data handling services to OSPAT and Helsinki Commissions. An overview of the regulation of marine aggregate operations in some European Union Member States is reported in Radzevicius et al. (2010) and includes relevant EC Directives and national legislation/regulation. Other such sources of activity data include, for example, statistics on sand and gravel extraction for the OSPAR maritime area (e.g. [www.ospar.org/documents/dbase/publications/p0043](http://www.ospar.org/documents/dbase/publications/p0043)) as well as information on sand and gravel activities and related statistics for North Sea Continental Shelves and UK waters (<http://www.sandandgravel.com/>).

If time series data back to 1990 are unavailable, it is suggested that surrogate data be used, derived from statistical reports/databases containing information on temporal changes in proxy factors such as human population density, port or marina development, port revenue, shipping tonnage, and commodity exports. Such data can be obtained from the internet e.g. for the Asia-Pacific region from the UN ESCAP Commission (<http://www.unescap.org/stat/>) and for the Baltic from <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/themes>. Data on shipping indices can be obtained from [http://www.worldshipping.org/about-the-industry/global\\_trade/trade-statistics](http://www.worldshipping.org/about-the-industry/global_trade/trade-statistics). Such data for most countries can also be obtained from <http://datacatalog.worldbank.org>.

**Aquaculture and salt production:** Annual data (1950 – present) providing statistics on aquaculture production is collated by the FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department. Additional data on type aquaculture (e.g. freshwater or brackish) and area under aquaculture production is summarised in country profiles enabling stratification of aquaculture into those occurring in coastal wetlands (<http://www.fao.org/fishery/countryprofiles/search/en>). As local regulations typically apply for developing new aquaculture activities (i.e. licensing, permitting), regulations also typically apply to report such activities to the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Affairs (or country equivalent). For example an aquaculture farm needs to get a license (or permission) to operate. Depending on the country, it is given by the regional (e.g. in Spain it is the autonomic, e.g. Balearic- government, who approves it) or local (e.g. at Bolinao, The Philippines) and maybe in others the national government. For example, in Indonesia local government must be consulted on land-use change including aquaculture pond construction and are obliged to report activities to the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Affairs.

Similar project information for salt production activities can be obtained from the Salt Institute at [www.saltinstitute.org](http://www.saltinstitute.org).

Literature sources can also provide national area change statistics from aerial photographs of ponds or structures used for aquaculture and salt production.

A map of available tidal marsh distribution (with area data) is in production by the World Conservation and Monitoring Center (WCMC; <http://data.unep-wcmc.org/>) currently holding layers for Europe, the United States, Australia and China. It is the intent to expand mapping of tidal marsh to global coverage.

A map of global distribution of seagrasses (V2.0, 2005) is also available at the WCMC (<http://data.unep-wcmc.org/>) and prepared in collaboration with Dr. Frederick T. Short. Other regional and national maps are also available (e.g. [http://www.ospar.org/documents/dbase/publications/p00426\\_zostera\\_beds](http://www.ospar.org/documents/dbase/publications/p00426_zostera_beds)). A tabulated list of web sites for existing seagrass monitoring programmes is given in Borum *et al.*, (2000; [http://www.seagrasses.org/handbook/european\\_seagrasses\\_high.pdf](http://www.seagrasses.org/handbook/european_seagrasses_high.pdf)).

These data sources, and those provided in Section 4.2.1.1, can be used in conjunction with activity data described above to improve estimations of areas of mangroves, tidal marsh and seagrass meadow undergoing extraction activities.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

For uncertainty assessment for mangroves, see Section 4.2.1 (this chapter). The uncertainties involved in extraction in mangroves also follow those outlined in Section 4.3.1.5 of Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Variability in tidal marsh biomass will be due to differences in dominant species and competition between species, as well as salinity of flood waters, frequency of tidal flooding and climate. For example, the high biomass in mediterranean climates is due to the frequent dominance of perennial shrubs. For all vegetation there can be considerable interannual variability in production of biomass and seasonal variability in standing biomass that contributes to uncertainty in ratios of below-ground to above-ground biomass. Most empirical data are available from temperate regions and North America and there are limited data available for tidal freshwater and boreal and subtropical tidal marshes. The average ratio of below-ground to above-ground biomass for seagrass is variable depending on the dominant species, and fertility of the soil. The data are mainly derived from observations along the coasts of North America, Western Europe and Australia. Data were scarce from South America and Africa.

### 4.2.2.2 DEAD ORGANIC MATTER

Previously saturated dead organic matter (DOM), which is exposed to aerobic conditions, can contribute to large sources of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from extraction activities. Consistent with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for Forest Land, in coastal wetlands, it is *good practice* to consider dead organic matter carbon stock changes when extraction activities result in changes in mangrove cover due to these human-induced impacts.

#### CHOICE OF METHOD

##### Tier 1

During extraction activities, existing dead organic matter pools may be reduced to zero as vegetation is cleared and removed while at the same time no new carbon enters the dead organic matter pool. At Tier 1, changes in carbon stock in dead organic matter in tidal marshes and seagrass meadows are assumed to be zero. It is noted, however, that extraction activities that result in vegetation or soil disturbance in tidal marsh with perennial woody biomass may have significant impacts on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals. It is *good practice* for country-specific methods to be developed to cover these cases, if feasible. Regardless of the land-use category, the loss in dead organic matter associated with extraction activities is estimated as  $\Delta C_{\text{conversion}}$  following the methodology applied for peat extraction (Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), modified here as Equation 4.5:

**EQUATION 4.5**  
**TIER 1 ESTIMATION OF INITIAL CHANGE IN DEAD ORGANIC MATTER CARBON STOCKS DUE TO EXTRACTION ACTIVITIES**

$$\Delta C_{\text{DOM-CONVERSION}} = \sum_v (\text{DOM}_{\text{AFTER}} - \text{DOM}_{\text{BEFORE}})_v \cdot A_{\text{CONVERTED}v}$$

Where:

$\Delta C_{\text{DOM-CONVERSION}}$  = Initial changes in dead organic matter carbon stock from conversion due to extraction activities by vegetation type (v); tonnes C

$\text{DOM}_{\text{AFTER}}$  = Carbon stock in dead organic matter per unit of area immediately after the conversion by vegetation type (v); tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup>; default value = 0

$\text{DOM}_{\text{BEFORE}}$  = Carbon stock in dead organic matter per unit of area immediately before the conversion by vegetation type (v); tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup>

$A_{\text{CONVERTED}}$  = Area of conversion by vegetation type (v); ha

The Tier 1 methodology assumes that the dead organic matter is removed and disposed of under aerobic conditions where all carbon is emitted as CO<sub>2</sub> during the year of the extraction and that no subsequent changes occur. The choice of method follows that in Section 4.2.2.

##### Tiers 2 and 3

The choice of method follows that in Section 4.2.2. For these management activities that impact dead organic matter pools in tidal marshes with perennial or woody biomass, Tier 2 and higher estimation methods are recommended.

#### CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

##### Tier 1

Default values of dead organic matter carbon stock (for dead wood and litter) for mangroves are provided in Table 4.7 of this supplement for use in Tier 1 estimations. In tidal marsh and seagrass meadows the Tier 1 assumption is that carbon stocks in the dead organic matter pools resulting from extraction activities are zero.

##### Tier 2

At Tier 2, the assumption that all dead organic matter lost in the year of conversion is oxidized can be reassessed. Tier 2 assumption of zero for dead organic matter pools in tidal marsh can also be assessed. It is *good practice* for countries, in such cases, to use national estimates for dead organic matter carbon stocks for mangroves and tidal marshes with perennial biomass, if such country-specific data can be acquired at reasonable cost.

##### Tier 3

Tier 3 emission factors include model output and validation and disaggregated data sources.



## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Choice of activity data follows from guidance provided in Section 4.2.2.1. The area in which the extraction activities occur will be the same area applied for each carbon pool, especially forest biomass.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

The discussion on uncertainty outlined in Section 4.3.2.5 of Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* is also relevant for extraction of mangroves.

### 4.2.2.3 SOIL CARBON

Extraction activities that occur within coastal wetlands can influence organic and mineral stocks of carbon in soils and both soil types are covered at Tier 1 (Table 4.11). During extraction activities, the stock of soil carbon that is removed depends on the soil type (i.e. carbon stock is higher in organic soils). For Tier 1 estimation, in the absence of soil map data or other resources to differentiate soil type, the following assumptions can be applied.

- i. Assume that soils in which seagrass grow are mineral.
- ii. Assume all soils, regardless of dominant vegetation in or at the mouth of estuaries or adjacent to any river characterised by a large and/or mountainous catchment and high flow, are mineral. For all other mangroves and tidal marshes the soils are organic. See Durr *et al.* (2011) for additional national level guidance.
- iii. If soils cannot be disaggregated into organic and mineral, use the aggregated default data given in Table 4.11.

## CHOICE OF METHOD - ORGANIC AND MINERAL SOILS

### Tier 1

Regardless of the land-use category, the loss in soil carbon associated with extraction activities is estimated as  $\Delta C_{\text{conversion}}$  following the methodology applied for peat extraction (Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), modified here as Equation 4.6.

**EQUATION 4.6**

**TIER 1 ESTIMATION OF INITIAL CHANGE IN SOIL CARBON STOCKS  
DUE TO EXTRACTION ACTIVITIES**

$$\Delta C_{\text{SO-CONVERSION}} = \sum_{v,s} (SO_{\text{AFTER}} - SO_{\text{BEFORE}})_{v,s} \cdot A_{\text{CONVERTED } v,s}$$

Where,

$\Delta C_{\text{SO-CONVERSION}}$  = Initial changes in soil carbon stock from conversion due to extraction activities by vegetation type (v) and soil type (s); tonnes C

$SO_{\text{AFTER}}$  = Soil carbon stock per unit of area, immediately after the conversion, by vegetation type (v) and soil type (s); tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>; default value = 0

$SO_{\text{BEFORE}}$  = Soil carbon stock per unit of area, immediately before the conversion, by vegetation type (v) and soil type (s); tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>

$A_{\text{CONVERTED}}$  = Area of conversion by vegetation type (v) and soil type (s); ha

At Tier 1, soil extraction depth to 1 m approximates the mid-range of the extraction depth for construction of aquaculture and salt production ponds (see extraction activities in section 4.1). Countries may modify the assumption of 1 m extraction depth at higher tiers.

The Tier 1 methodology assumes that the soil is removed and disposed of under aerobic conditions where the carbon stock is emitted as CO<sub>2</sub> (oxidised) during the year of the extraction. The carbon stock is taken as all soil carbon except any refractory (unoxidisable) carbon. In mangrove soils, 4% of the carbon stock is refractory (Annex 4A.4) and this is taken to be representative of the refractory carbon in tidal marshes and seagrass meadows as well. Therefore, after the initial conversion of the soil pool in the year in which the activity occurs, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reported as zero. It is *good practice* to track these lands to consider management activities that may occur on those lands in the future and for higher tier estimations. The choice of method follows that in Section 4.2.2. For Tier 1, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are reported as the conversion in soil carbon where this activity occurs; the type of vegetation and the available activity data to distinguish between organic and mineral soils determines which data are applied from Table 4.11.

## Tier 2

At Tier 2, methodology can be applied to disaggregate by vegetation type and soil type. For the specific extraction activity, countries may use national data to determine their particular extraction processes and the volume of soil removed, if sufficient data are available. Because tidal marshes can occur in a range of climates, disaggregating by climate may also be applied to improve estimates if those country-specific data are available. Tier 2 may also refine the estimate for the soil carbon stock that is excavated to construct the aquaculture or salt production ponds by including country-specific information on the depth excavated during the construction phase.

## Tier 3

Tier 3 methods can employ models to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions based on the effect of temperature and salinity on soil oxidation both seasonally and with climate and vegetation type. At Tier 3, it is *good practice* for countries to validate models with field measurements. Tier 3 methods may also include site-specific measurements of, for example, carbon content, bulk density, clay content, salinity, redox potential, etc., to determine the underlying processes of emissions.

## CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS - ORGANIC AND MINERAL SOILS

### Tier 1

Default Tier 1 soil carbon stocks (to 1 m depth) for mangrove, tidal marsh and seagrass meadows for the calculation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are given in Table 4.11. These values are to be used in conjunction with Equation 4.6 to estimate emissions. If soil type is not known, a generic default value for aggregated organic and mineral soils can be applied (Table 4.11).

### Tier 2

Tier 2 includes the use of country-specific emission factors that can be applied to disaggregate by soil type and vegetation type to improve on Tier 1 estimates. Country-specific data may include excavation depth to improve on the default estimation of soil extracted.

### Tier 3

A Tier 3 approach could use models that take into account the time-dependent nature of the CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes over a range of timescales. For example, during the construction phase, a pulse of CO<sub>2</sub> efflux from soil directly after mangrove clearing and prior to excavation, followed by a logarithmic decline in CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes over time, has been shown to occur (Lovelock *et al.*, 2011). For fish and shrimp ponds, the actual area excavated and the depth to which soil is excavated, could be taken into account as this varies with aquaculture and salt production practices.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Choice of activity data follows from guidance above provided in Section 4.2.2.1 as the area in which the extraction activities occur will be the same area applied for each C pool.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Variability in soil carbon stocks will derive from a number of sources. The soil stock represents global averages and may therefore under or over-estimate emissions and removals when applied to specific countries. Deriving country-specific carbon stocks can reduce uncertainties using Tier 2 methodology. There may also be significant within country differences due to: (1) the dominant species present in mangroves, tidal marshes or seagrass meadows, (2) climatic conditions and (3) general environmental setting in which the vegetation is found, all of which may influence the carbon stock. When deriving global emission factors, uncertainties can also be introduced by areas where there is greater prevalence of data from specific regions of the globe. The change in carbon stock on extraction is dependent on the value assigned to the percent refractory organic carbon. The value applied is taken from soil in mangroves and may not be fully representative of the value for tidal marshes and seagrass meadows.

TABLE 4.11

SOIL CARBON STOCKS FOR MANGROVES, TIDAL MARSHES AND SEAGRASS MEADOWS FOR EXTRACTION ACTIVITIES

ORGANIC SOILS (TONNES C HA <sup>-1</sup> )				
Vegetation type	SO <sub>BEFORE</sub>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	range	n
Mangrove	471 <sup>2</sup>	436, 510	216-935	43
Tidal marsh	340 <sup>3</sup>	315, 366	221-579	35
Seagrass meadow	NA <sup>4</sup>			
MINERAL SOILS (TONNES C HA <sup>-1</sup> )				
Vegetation type	SO <sub>BEFORE</sub>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	range	n
Mangrove	286 <sup>5</sup>	247, 330	55-1376	77
Tidal marsh	226 <sup>6</sup>	202, 252	15.6-623	82
Seagrass meadow <sup>7</sup>	108 <sup>8</sup>	84, 139	9.1-829	89
AGGREGATED ORGANIC AND MINERAL SOILS (TONNES C HA <sup>-1</sup> )				
Vegetation type	SO <sub>BEFORE</sub>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	range	n
Mangrove	386	351, 424	55-1376	119
Tidal marsh	255	254, 297	15.6-623	117

<sup>1</sup>95% CI of the geometric mean

<sup>2</sup>Sources: Adame *et al.*, 2012; Breithaupt *et al.*, 2012; Chmura *et al.*, 2003; Donato *et al.*, 2011; Kauffman *et al.*, 2011; Osborne *et al.*, 2011; Vegas-Vilarrúbia *et al.*, 2010

<sup>3</sup>Sources: Anisfeld *et al.*, 1999; Callaway *et al.*, 1996; Callaway *et al.*, 2012; Chmura and Hung, 2004; Craft *et al.*, 1988; Craft, 2007; Hussein *et al.*, 2004; Kearney and Stevenson, 1991; Orson *et al.*, 1998; Markewich *et al.*, 1998; McCaffrey and Thomson, 1980

<sup>4</sup>Seagrass meadows are assumed to be on mineral soils.

<sup>5</sup>Sources: Donato *et al.*, 2011; Chmura *et al.*, 2003; Breithaupt *et al.*, 2012; Fujimoto *et al.*, 1999; Adame *et al.*, 2012; Perry and Mendelssohn, 2009; Ren *et al.*, 2010; Kauffman *et al.*, 2011; Ray *et al.*, 2011; Zhang *et al.*, 2012; Khan *et al.*, 2007; Matsui, 1998

<sup>6</sup>Sources: Cahoon *et al.*, 1996; Callaway *et al.*, 2012; Chmura and Hung, 2004; Connor *et al.*, 2001; Craft *et al.*, 1988; Craft, 2007; Hatton, 1981; Kearney and Stevenson, 1991; Livesley and Andrusiak, 2012; Loomis and Craft, 2010; Morris and Jensen, 2003; Oenema and DeLaune, 1988; Patrick and DeLaune, 1990; Roman *et al.*, 1997; Yu and Chmura, 2009

<sup>7</sup>For extraction only

<sup>8</sup>Source: Fourqurean *et al.*, 2012

### 4.2.3 Rewetting, revegetation<sup>4</sup> and creation of mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows

This section addresses the carbon stock changes and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals for the rewetting, revegetation and creation activities relating to mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows.

The rewetting and revegetation activity refers collectively to the following (1) rewetting, which saturates the soil of drained sites previously colonised by mangrove and tidal marshes and is a prerequisite for, and thus facilitates, reestablishment of the original vegetation by natural recolonisation, direct seeding and/or purposeful planting, (2) raising or lowering the soil elevation to facilitate reestablishment of the original vegetation by natural recolonisation, direct seeding and/or purposeful planting, (3) creation of coastal wetlands where it may be difficult to identify where they previously occurred and are in proximity to the coastal margin, and (4) reestablishment of seagrass on undrained soils by natural recolonisation, direct seeding and/or purposeful planting.

#### 4.2.3.1 BIOMASS

The initiation of soil carbon accumulation is only possible with the presence of vegetation, which is introduced by purposeful seeding/planting or natural recolonisation. For mangroves, methodological guidance for estimating

<sup>4</sup> The term revegetation is used to refer to practices within the framework of UNFCCC reporting.

carbon stock changes in the biomass pool, including choice of method and choice of emission and removal factors, follows Section 4.2.1.1 of this Chapter. For tidal marshes and seagrass meadows, changes in biomass carbon stocks, are reported only for Tier 2 or higher estimations. Guidance for estimating biomass carbon stock changes for tidal marshes and seagrass meadows follow those presented in Volume 4, Section 6.2.1.1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Grassland Remaining Grassland) for Gain-Loss and Stock-Difference methods. These are used with country-specific data on above-ground biomass stocks and ratios of below-ground to above-ground biomass provided in Tables 4.9 and 4.10. Refer to Volume 4, Section 6.2.1.4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for calculation steps useful in applying these methods.

### 4.2.3.2 DEAD ORGANIC MATTER

For mangroves, methodological guidance for estimating carbon stock changes in the dead organic matter pool, including choice of method and choice of emission and removal factors, follows Section 4.2.1.2 of this Chapter. For tidal marshes and seagrass meadows, changes in biomass carbon stocks, are reported only for Tier 2 or higher estimations. Guidance for estimating dead organic matter carbon stock changes for tidal marshes and seagrass meadows follows that presented in Volume 4, Section 6.2.2.1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Grassland Remaining Grassland) for Gain-Loss and Stock-Difference methods. These are used with country-specific data. Refer to Volume 4, Section 6.2.2.4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for calculation steps useful in applying these methods.

### 4.2.3.3 SOIL CARBON

The guidance provided in this section on soils differs from that in Chapter 3 (this supplement) because, on coastal wetland soils, revegetation leads to the accumulation of soil organic carbon when vegetation is reestablished and a CO<sub>2</sub> sink is then developed. The CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor is approximated as zero when resaturated soils are devoid of vegetation. This is consistent with the default EFs for rewetted soils for temperate and tropical regions (but not the boreal region) presented in Chapter 3 of this supplement. Based on information for natural fluxes from rewetted organic soils, it is consistent with data illustrating that rewetting effectively stops soil organic matter oxidation but does not necessarily reestablish the soil carbon sink function.

Guidance for inventories of rewetting and revegetation activities of coastal wetlands follows the assumptions at Tier 1 level of estimation that:

- i. upon rewetting and revegetation of previously drained soil, creation of a mangrove or tidal marsh or on reestablishment of a seagrass meadow, soil carbon accumulation is initiated when natural vegetation becomes established and
- ii. the rate of soil carbon accumulation is instantaneously equivalent to that in natural settings.

Craft *et al.* (2003) found that (a) soil carbon accumulation, developed almost instantaneously with the establishment of vegetation along a chronosequence of 1- to 28-yr old constructed marshes and (b) a similar soil carbon accumulation rate over 10 years in a natural and created marsh (Craft *et al.*, 2002) and over 20 years in a created mangrove (Osland *et al.*, 2012). Given this equivalence, estimates of soil carbon accumulation rates in mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows (Chmura *et al.*, 2003; Breithaupt *et al.*, 2012; Duarte *et al.*, 2013) make it possible to quantify carbon gains at sites characterised by rewetting and revegetation activities. A transition time for soil carbon stocks to become equivalent to those in natural/undrained settings with vegetation (Table 4.11) will exceed the default land-use transition time of the typically used land-use category conversions (i.e. 20 years). Instead it is suggested to apply the EF for soil carbon accumulation as long as the soil remains rewetted and vegetated, until such time as stocks are equivalent to soil carbon stocks in natural/undrained settings with vegetation (Table 4.11) or there is a change in management practice.

### CHOICE OF METHOD

Changes in soil carbon resulting from rewetting, revegetation and creation activities for mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows are estimated because they represent potentially large carbon removals from the atmosphere.

#### Tier 1

At Tier 1, the default method, EF<sub>RE</sub> values are to be used in conjunction with Equation 4.7 to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

**EQUATION 4.7****CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS FROM REWETTING, REVEGETATION AND CREATION OF COASTAL WETLANDS**

$$\text{CO}_{2\text{SO-RE}} = \sum_{v,s,c} (A_{\text{RE}} \cdot \text{EF}_{\text{RE}})_{v,s,c}$$

Where:

$\text{CO}_{2\text{SO-RE}}$  = CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with rewetting, revegetation and creation activities by vegetation type (v), soil type (s) and climate (c); tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

$A_{\text{RE}}$  = Area of soil that has been influenced by rewetting, revegetation and creation activities by vegetation type (v), soil type (s) and climate (c); ha

$\text{EF}_{\text{RE}}$  = CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from aggregated mineral and organic soils that have been influenced by rewetting and revegetation activities by vegetation type (v), soil type (s) and climate (c); tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$\text{EF}_{\text{RE}} = 0$  for rewetted and naturally saturated soils where no vegetation has been re-established or where re-establishment is expected to occur by recolonization.

At Tier 1,  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}}$  is applied (Table 4.12) when vegetation has been established through replanting or reseeded. If, however, re-establishment of vegetation is expected to occur by recolonization,  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}} = 0$  is applied at Tier 1. It is *good practice* to document the basis on which the  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}}$  is applied. When vegetation has been established the  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}}$  is disaggregated with respect to vegetation type. Organic and mineral soils are not differentiated at Tier 1 within any particular vegetation type, as the organic carbon inputs mainly derive from the production of above-ground and below-ground biomass under similar conditions of soil saturation. Land area estimates should be based on land classification within the new land-use category (if applicable) to apply Tier 1  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}}$ .

**Tier 2**

Under the Tier 2 method, country-specific carbon accumulation rates could be disaggregated with respect to area of organic and mineral soils. Where such country-specific data can be acquired and used to improve estimations, disaggregation by climate zone could also be applied.

**Tier 3**

Under the Tier 3 method, the land use prior to rewetting, its climate and vegetation type could be taken into account. A comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub> gas emission factors, based on field measurements of, for example, carbon content, bulk density, clay content, salinity, redox potential, etc., could be employed at Tier 3. A Tier 3 approach could also use empirical measurements and models that take into account the time-dependent nature of the CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes over a range of timescales (Morris *et al.*, 2012), location relative to the low to high intertidal zone (Alongi, 2010) or other dynamics (Craft, 2007).

**CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS****Tier 1**

The choice of EFs at Tier 1 is applied based on the coastal wetland vegetation type being established through the rewetting, revegetation or creation activity. It is assumed that within each vegetation type, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are the same regardless of how the suitable conditions for revegetation are facilitated. If vegetation is reestablished through direct reseeded or purposeful planting, apply  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}}$  in Table 4.12. If the rewetting, revegetation or creation activity is associated with recolonization (no direct replanting or reseeded), apply  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}} = 0$ . It is *good practice* to evaluate and document these activities (See Choice of Activity Data below) and modify what EF is applied, as appropriate. If the rewetting and revegetation activity results in patches of biomass (if coverage data are available),  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}} > 0$  should only be applied when the mangrove, tidal marsh plant or seagrass canopy covers at least 10% of the overall area. This consideration follows the definition of forest (Table 4.2, Chapter 4, Volume 4, 2006 IPCC Guidelines).

**Tier 2**

In a Tier 2 approach, country-specific emission factors for rewetting, revegetation or creation activities could be applied. The assumption of  $\text{EF}_{\text{RE}} = 0$  in areas where vegetation had not been established could also be reassessed. Country-specific emission factors could be applied based on disaggregation of organic and mineral soils and climate.

**Tier 3**

In a Tier 3 approach, field measurement of soil organic carbon content and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from areas where rewetting and revegetation activities occur could be used to develop an empirical relationship (for example, a simple regression equation) that can be used across other sites where rewetting and revegetation activities occur within a particular area or country. Country-specific values can be developed to model possible time-dependent changes in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Soil carbon accumulation rates will likely change, as vegetation grows and biomass

matures. Increased inundation and soil saturation, as a result of intertidal location in tidal marshes and mangroves, will accelerate development of soil characteristics of revegetated soils. Thus, rates of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in these tidal wetlands will vary in relation to a combination of these factors and consideration of them would result in more accurate estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

TABLE 4.12 ANNUAL EMISSION FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH REWETTING (EF <sub>RE</sub> ) ON AGGREGATED ORGANIC AND MINERAL SOILS (TONNES C HA <sup>-1</sup> YR <sup>-1</sup> ) AT INITIATION OF VEGETATION REESTABLISHMENT				
Ecosystem	EF <sub>REWET</sub> <sup>1</sup>	95% CI <sup>5</sup>	range	n
Mangrove	-1.62 <sup>2</sup>	1.3, 2.0	0.10-10.2	69
Tidal marsh	-0.91 <sup>3</sup>	0.7, 1.1	0.05-4.65	66
Seagrass meadow	-0.43 <sup>4</sup>	0.2, 0.7	0.09-1.12	6
<sup>1</sup> Negative values indicate removal (i.e. accumulation) of C <sup>2</sup> Sources: Breithaupt <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Chmura <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Fujimoto <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Ren <i>et al.</i> , 2010 <sup>3</sup> Sources: Anisfeld <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Cahoon <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Callaway <i>et al.</i> , 1996; Callaway <i>et al.</i> , 1997; Callaway <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Callaway <i>et al.</i> , 1999; Callaway <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Chmura and Hung, 2003; Hatton, 1981; Craft, 2007; Kearney and Stevenson, 1991; Markewich <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Oenema and DeLaune, 1988; Orson <i>et al.</i> , 1998; Patrick and DeLaune, 1990; Roman <i>et al.</i> , 1997 <sup>4</sup> Sources: Mateo and Romero, 1997; Serrano <i>et al.</i> , 2012 <sup>5</sup> 95% CI of the geometric mean				

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

Historical photos and coastal wetland maps, if available at the appropriate spatial resolution, may be used to estimate the pre-restored wetland area. Information on regional wetland restoration and creation projects worldwide can be obtained from the Global Gateway to Geographic Information Systems of the FAO ([www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)) as well as from the websites, [www.wetlands.org](http://www.wetlands.org) and [www.globalrestorationnetwork.org](http://www.globalrestorationnetwork.org). Within a given country, government agencies responsible for issuance of permits for restoration/creation/alteration of wetland are to be consulted for information of area data on the wetlands being considered. In addition, many countries may have a process for reporting rewetting and revegetation activities as permission is often required. For example, in Australia, the Environmental Protection Agency in Western Australia approves revegetation projects as part of their Ministerial Conditions. The Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities also directs the Federal Minister to approve or reject revegetation programs. The establishment of vegetation and/or change in areal extent can be reviewed on a five year period and assessed for accurate implementation of the appropriate soil EF. If data are lacking, expert judgement about success rates of projects implemented under similar conditions could be used for initial assessments (examples are size of project, vegetation type, tidal range, proximity to coast, climate). In general, for rewetting activities that include purposeful planting or direct reseedling, an EF<sub>RE</sub> (using Table 4.12) is appropriate for Tier 1 estimation. Information on which the choice in EF is based should be documented.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Uncertainties in estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from rewetting, revegetation and creation of mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows largely lie in the underlying assumptions and area to which the EFs are applied. The values for EF<sub>REWET</sub> in Table 4.12 represent global averages and have large uncertainties due to variability in soil carbon accumulation rate with 1) depth of the intertidal zone, 2) the dominant species type, its morphology and rate of growth, and 3) climate. The underlying assumption of EF<sub>RE</sub>=0 for rewetted/saturated soils where vegetation has not been re-established may introduce uncertainty into estimates. Also, the assumption of complete areas with or without vegetation cover could introduce under- or overestimates.

### 4.2.4 Drainage in mangroves and tidal marshes

This section addresses the changes in carbon stock and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals for drainage in mangroves and tidal marshes. Drainage may be accompanied by land clearing, also resulting in changes in biomass and dead organic matter pools. If burning accompanies drainage, it is *good practice* to report emissions from changes in those C pools. For methods to estimate changes in carbon stock in biomass, and for default data, refer to Section 4.2.1 of this report for guidance on mangroves and Section 4.2.2 for guidance on tidal marshes. It is important to retain information about drained coastal wetlands so that guidance in this supplement can be applied if a reversal of drainage conditions occurs.

Drainage causes soils to dry and ordinarily increases rates of organic matter decomposition, resulting in loss of soil carbon via CO<sub>2</sub> release (Armentano and Menges, 1986). This response varies with climate (Pozo and Colino, 1992) and locally with soil salinity and texture, and the quantity of labile organic matter available (Setia *et al.*, 2011). Activities associated with extensive lowering of the water table are often linked to the construction of drainage channels leading to CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes due to oxidation of DOC and POC in the water carried by drainage channels. However, there is currently not enough information to provide emission factors for DOC and POC export (see Appendix 4a.1, “Future methodological development for estimating carbon export”).

#### 4.2.4.1 BIOMASS

Methodological guidance for estimating carbon stock changes in the biomass pool, including choice of method and choice of emission and removal factors, follows Section 4.2.3.1 of this chapter. For tidal marshes, increase in biomass stocks in a single year is assumed equal to biomass losses from mortality in that same year at Tier 1.

#### 4.2.4.2 DEAD ORGANIC MATTER

Methodological guidance for estimating carbon stock changes in the dead organic matter pool, including choice of method and choice of emission and removal factors, follows Section 4.2.3.2 of this chapter. For tidal marshes, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from change in biomass and dead organic matter pools are reported as zero at Tier 1.

#### 4.2.4.3 SOIL CARBON

Annual carbon losses from drained mineral and organic soils are applied similarly for mangroves and tidal marshes (but not applicable to seagrass meadows) at Tier 1 level of estimation (Table 4.13). Data on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drainage in mangroves is limited, however, the CO<sub>2</sub> emission rate from drainage in tidal marshes was considered to provide an appropriate Tier 1 default emission factor. This value is also consistent with drained forest default EF presented in Chapter 2 of this supplement.

### CHOICE OF METHOD

#### Tier 1

Guidance for inventories on drainage in coastal wetlands follows the assumptions at Tier 1 level of estimation that:

- i. emissions persist as long as the soil remains drained or as long as it takes for soil carbon stocks equivalent to those in natural/undrained settings with vegetation (Table 4.11) to be oxidised and
- ii. the drainage condition is characterized by full drainage (i.e. the water table has been changed to 1 m below the soil surface for organic and mineral soils), consistent with the Tier 1 approach in Chapter 2 of this supplement.

Emissions from drained coastal wetland soils are estimated at Tier 1 for mangrove forests and tidal marshes using Equation 4.8.

<p><b>EQUATION 4.8</b></p> <p><b>CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS ON DRAINED ORGANIC AND MINERAL SOILS</b></p> $CO_{2-SO-DR} = (A_{DR} \cdot EF_{DR})$
--

Where:

CO<sub>2-SO-DR</sub> = CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from aggregated organic and mineral soil carbon associated with drainage; tonnes C yr<sup>-1</sup>

A<sub>DR</sub> = land area under drainage; ha

EF<sub>DR</sub> = CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from organic or mineral soil carbon associated with drainage; tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

As described above, the Tier 1 emission factor is applied until the soil carbon stock (Table 4.11) is depleted and determines the time frame for emissions due to drainage regardless of whether a land-use change occurs. Once depleted, guidance from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines applies.

#### Tier 2

The Tier 2 estimation method is the same as the Tier 1 method, but national data can be used to additionally disaggregate by vegetation, soil type and regional climatic factors, if such data are available at reasonable cost.

### Tier 3

Tier 3 methods could take account of differences in the management of the drained wetland. Empirical measurements of gas flux based on site-specific measurements of, for example, carbon content, bulk density, clay content, salinity, redox potential, etc., to determine the underlying processes of emissions could be included. Site differences in frequency of drainage activity could also be considered at Tier 3 methods. Other factors that could be used to apply disaggregated data include salinity and tidal export of DOC and POC (Appendix 4a.1).

## CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

### Tier 1

At Tier 1, a generic default emission factor is applied for drainage, regardless of vegetation or soil type (Table 4.13). That is, the same EF is applied regardless of the management activity involving soil drainage.

<b>TABLE 4.13</b> <b>ANNUAL EMISSION FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DRAINAGE (EF<sub>DR</sub>) ON AGGREGATED ORGANIC AND MINERAL SOILS</b> <b>(TONNES C HA<sup>-1</sup> YR<sup>-1</sup>)</b>				
<b>Ecosystem</b>	<b>EF<sub>DR</sub></b>	<b>95% CI<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>N</b>
Tidal marshes and mangroves	7.9 <sup>1</sup>	5.2, 11.8	1.2-43.9	22
<sup>1</sup> Sources: Camporese <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Deverel and Leighton, 2010; Hatala <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Howe <i>et al.</i> , 2009; Rojstaczer and Deverel, 1993 <sup>2</sup> 95% CI of the geometric mean				

### Tier 2

Tier 2 emission factors apply country-specific data disaggregated by soil type, vegetation type, and climate, where feasible. Data to address any change in emissions since initiation of drainage could additionally be implemented.

### Tier 3

In a Tier 3 approach, field measurements of soil organic carbon content and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the drained site would be useful to develop an empirical relationship (for example, a simple regression equation of soil carbon content versus rate of carbon removal) that can be used across other drained sites within a particular area or country. Country-specific values can thus be developed to model possible time-dependent changes in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions such as changes in relation to timing and rate of soil drainage, depth of drainage and additional national information about mean annual water table and land-use type or intensity. A comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics of CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors, based on field measurements of, for example, carbon content, bulk density, clay content, salinity, redox potential, etc., could be employed at Tier 3.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

### Tier 1

The Tier 1 approach requires area data of drained land for each land-use category that have been identified in coastal wetlands. Classification systems for activity data that form the basis for a Tier 1 inventory are provided in the respective chapters of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. For coastal wetlands, the predominant land-use category conversion is to Cropland and Grassland.

### Tier 2 and 3

Activity data for higher tier estimates are generally derived following the methods presented in Chapter 3 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. To disaggregate by soil type and vegetation type, several institutions, including ISRIC and FAO have country-specific and global maps that include organic soils (<http://www.fao.org/geonetwork/srv/en/main.home> or <http://www.isric.org/>). A global consortium has been formed to make a new digital soil map of the world at fine resolution (<http://www.globalsoilmap.net/>).

Drainage is assumed to result in persistent emissions from soils as long as the management system remains in place. Activity data may be spatially explicit and could be disaggregated by type of management, if appropriate emissions factors are available.

The combination of land-use databases and soil maps or spatially-explicit data allow delineation of combinations of land-use categories, climate domains, and management systems and their changes over time on organic soils.

Information sources about drainage with adequate disaggregation may include that listed below.



- National land-use statistics. Land-use maps and soil maps, maps of water and nature conservation zones with restrictions for water management, wetlands.
- National water management statistics. In most countries, the agricultural land base including croplands is usually surveyed regularly, providing data on distribution of different land-uses and other aspects of management, often at sub-national, regional level. These statistics may originate, in part, from remote sensing methods, from which additional information about wetness or periods with seasonal flooding could be extracted.
- Inventory data from a statistically based, plot-sampling system of water table wells, ditches and surface waters on organic soils. Water table is monitored at specific permanent sample plots either continuously or on plots that are revisited on a regular basis. It has to be documented that the water data represent the water table in the organic soil and for what land-use and drainage stratum and that the data cover a representative period, which represents a multi-year mean annual water table.
- Water management plans and documentation from water management installations.
- Drainage maps.

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Three broad sources of uncertainty exist in estimating emissions and removals from drainage: 1) uncertainties in land-use and environmental data; 2) uncertainties in the emission/removal factors for Tier 1 or 2 approaches; and 3) model structure/parameter error for Tier 3 model-based approaches, or measurement error/sampling variability associated with Tier 3 measurement-based inventories. In general, precision of an inventory is increased and confidence ranges are smaller with more sampling to estimate values for these categories, while accuracy is more likely to be increased through implementation of higher Tier methods that incorporate country-specific information.

For Tier 1, the default uncertainty level of emissions/removal factors is the 95% confidence interval in Table 4.13. Countries developing specific emission factors for their inventories at higher tiers should assess the uncertainty of these factors.

If using aggregate land-use area statistics for activity data (e.g. FAO data), the inventory agency may have to apply a default level of uncertainty for the land area estimates, for example. It is *good practice* for the inventory compiler to derive uncertainties from country-specific activity data instead of using a default level of uncertainty. Uncertainties in activity data may be reduced through a better national system, such as developing or extending a ground-based survey with additional sample locations and/or incorporating remote sensing to provide additional coverage. Uncertainties in activity data and emission/removal factors need to be combined using an appropriate method, such as simple error propagation equations. Details are given in Chapter 3, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and in Chapter 5 of the *GPG-LULUCF*.

## 4.3 NON-CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS

This section provides methods for estimating the emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted mangroves and tidal marshes and N<sub>2</sub>O from aquaculture use.

### 4.3.1 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted soils and created mangroves and tidal marshes

Rewetting of drained soils, through reconnection of hydrology, shifts microbial decomposition from aerobic to anaerobic conditions, increasing the potential for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Harris *et al.*, 2010). In environments where low salinity also occurs (especially <5 ppt), microbial decomposition of organic matter may result in production of CH<sub>4</sub>. However, in soils saturated with seawater, microbial reduction of sulfate to sulfide will generally occur before methanogens produce CH<sub>4</sub> regardless of the organic matter content. A strong inverse relationship between CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and salinity of mangrove soils exists (Purvaja and Ramesh, 2001). A review by Poffenbarger *et al.* (2011) showed that CH<sub>4</sub> emissions decrease as salinity in tidal marshes increases.

Guidance for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions associated with rewetting land previously characterised by mangrove and tidal marsh vegetation differs from that for estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in that, at Tier 1 level of estimation, the EF remains the same for CH<sub>4</sub>, regardless of extant vegetation.

### 4.3.1.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

#### TIER 1

In the case of rewetting of lands that had been previously in an agricultural (or any other drained) land-use category, the Tier 1 method estimates CH<sub>4</sub> emissions without considering the land-use prior to rewetting.

<p><b>EQUATION 4.9</b></p> <p><b>CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM REWETTED SOILS AND CREATED TIDAL MARSHES AND MANGROVES</b></p> $\text{CH}_{4\text{-SO-REWET}} = \sum_v (\text{A}_{\text{REWET}} \cdot \text{EF}_{\text{REWET}})_v$
---

Where:

$\text{CH}_{4\text{-SO-REWET}}$  = CH<sub>4</sub> emissions associated with rewetted and created coastal wetlands by vegetation type (v); kg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>

$\text{A}_{\text{REWET}}$  = Area of soil that has been rewetted (including tidal marsh or mangrove wetland creation), by vegetation type (v); ha

$\text{EF}_{\text{REWET}}$  = CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from mineral and organic soils that have been rewetted by vegetation type (v); kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

#### TIER 2

At Tier 2, country-specific data can be applied. Improved estimates can be produced if country-specific data could include more disaggregation by salinity and vegetation type.

#### TIER 3

At Tier 3, country-specific values can be used and developed to model possible time-dependent changes in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Tier 3 methods may also consider vegetation composition and density, as plants can act as a conduit for gas exchange between the soil and atmosphere (e.g. Burdick, 1989; Purvaja and Ramesh, 2001; Kristensen *et al.*, 2008).

### 4.3.1.2 CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

#### TIER 1

Tier 1 CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors are found in Table 4.14 and should be used in conjunction with Equation 4.9 to estimate emissions taking into account vegetation type (and associated salinity level). The choice of emission factor at Tier 1 is differentiated between rewetting by freshwater and brackish water (<18ppt) and saline water (>18ppt, Annex 4A.1). Rates of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions approximate 0 in saline water marshes and mangroves but are greater than zero in freshwater tidal and brackish marshes and mangroves (Table 4.14). For rewetting that results in salinities >18 ppt, the Tier 1 assumption is to apply an annual CH<sub>4</sub> emission rate = 0. Within each vegetation type, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are the same regardless of the management activity involving rewetting at Tier 1.

#### TIER 2

In a Tier 2 approach, country-specific CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are encouraged to be used and will provide better estimates based on the salinity of water used to rewet the mangrove or tidal marsh, particularly to determine CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from tidal brackish marshes.

#### TIER 3

In a Tier 3 approach, field measurements of soil salinity and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from the rewetted site could be used to develop an empirical relationship (for example, a simple regression equation of salinity versus rate of methane emission) and applied across other rewetted sites within a particular area or country. Country-specific values can thus be developed to model possible time-dependent changes in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions such as changes in relation to frequency of tidal inundation, frequency of the rewetting activity and elevation from the water's edge. Such considerations would result in more accurate estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions.

TABLE 4.14 EMISSION FACTORS FOR CH <sub>4</sub> (EF <sub>REWET</sub> ) FOR TIER 1 ESTIMATION OF REWETTED LAND PREVIOUSLY VEGETATED BY TIDAL MARSHES AND MANGROVES				
Vegetation Type	Salinity (ppt)	EF <sub>REWET</sub> (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> y <sup>-1</sup> )	95% CI <sup>4</sup>	Range
Tidal freshwater and brackish marsh and mangrove <sup>1</sup>	<18	193.7 <sup>2</sup>	99.8, 358	10.95-5392
Tidal saline water marsh and mangrove <sup>1</sup>	>18	0 <sup>3</sup>		0-40
<sup>1</sup> See Annex 4A.1 for salinity-based definitions <sup>2</sup> Sources: Keller <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Ma <i>et al.</i> , 2012; Poffenbarger <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Sotomayor <i>et al.</i> , 1994; Tong <i>et al.</i> , 2010 <sup>3</sup> Marshes and mangroves with salinities >1 ppt approximate an order of magnitude lower rates than from tidal freshwater and brackish marsh (as defined here, salinity <18ppt), so a Tier 1 assumption is to apply 0. <sup>4</sup> 95% CI of the geometric mean				

### 4.3.1.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

To estimate emissions using CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors refer, in part, to the guidance for rewetting in Section 4.2.3 above. The EF should be applied to the specific type of vegetation that will be reestablished, which is associated with salinity. When salinity data are not available the type and location of rewetting may be used as a proxy for salinity. For example, breaching of sea walls and rewetting in an estuarine setting will result in rewetting with saline waters. If rewetting occurs with freshwater, a salinity of <18ppt is likely. When applying guidance for tidal freshwater marsh, it is *good practice* to determine the inland boundary for rewetting of tidal freshwater wetlands as based on national circumstances, and to consistently apply these conditions to identifying these rewetted lands. If more information is available on salinity concentrations associated with the area being rewetted, better estimates of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions can be determined. Information used for these assessments should be documented.

### 4.3.1.4 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

There have been few empirical measurements of emissions disaggregated by factors such as temperature, tidal frequency or duration of inundation, which introduce uncertainty in global default emission factors. However, higher tier approaches can take these factors into account to improve estimations. Few reports are available to give specifics of the types of rewetting activities that may vary geographically. Because activity data may be limited in terms of delineating salinity boundaries to apply more constrained CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors, aggregation of data to produce Tier 1 emission factors was based upon expert knowledge. There is also uncertainty in the time, depth of soil affected, and the contribution of vegetation to rate of CH<sub>4</sub> loss.

## 4.3.2 N<sub>2</sub>O emissions during aquaculture use in mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows

The most significant activity contributing to N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed coastal wetlands is aquaculture. One-third of global anthropogenic N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are from aquatic ecosystems, and nearly 6% of anthropogenic N<sub>2</sub>O–N emission is anticipated to result from aquaculture by 2030 at its current annual rate of growth (Hu *et al.*, 2012). Shrimp and fish cultivation increases nutrient loads in culture ponds. As opposed to indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions originating from activities on terrestrial lands or as wastewater treatment, coastal wetland aquaculture occurs as a direct source of N<sub>2</sub>O from coastal wetlands, including mangroves and tidal marshes from aquaculture pond use. In seagrass meadows, this direct N<sub>2</sub>O source arises from N added to fish cages (e.g. off-shore installations). While this differentiation should assure no double-counting, it is *good practice* to evaluate this assessment considering national circumstances. As such, this new activity fills a gap in the current reporting on direct and indirect sources of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. A country can exclude N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from estimation that occur during aquaculture activities where no mangroves, tidal marsh or seagrass meadows exist (i.e. outside of coastal wetland areas).

N<sub>2</sub>O is emitted as a by-product of the conversion of ammonia (contained in fish urea) to nitrate through nitrification and nitrate to N<sub>2</sub> gas through denitrification (Hu *et al.*, 2012; Annex 4A.5). N<sub>2</sub>O emissions can readily be estimated from fish production data.

### 4.3.2.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

#### TIER 1

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from aquaculture ponds can be estimated based on fish/shrimp production of the aquaculture activity. N<sub>2</sub>O emission estimation follows a modified form of Equation 11.1 from Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and is presented in Equation 4.10.

<b>EQUATION 4.10</b> <b>DIRECT N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM AQUACULTURE USE</b> $\text{N}_2\text{O-N}_{\text{AQ}} = F_{\text{F}} \cdot \text{EF}_{\text{F}} \text{ (based on fish production)}$
--

Where:

N<sub>2</sub>O-N<sub>AQ</sub> = annual direct N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions from aquaculture use; kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N yr<sup>-1</sup>

F<sub>F</sub> = annual fish production; kg fish yr<sup>-1</sup>

EF<sub>F</sub> = emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from fish produced; kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N (kg fish produced)<sup>-1</sup>

#### TIER 2

Tier 2 estimation methodology follows that of Tier 1 with the added information provided by country-specific data.

#### TIER 3

Tier 3 estimation methodology could include the consideration of fish/shrimp type, type of feed and stocking density, category of aquaculture (fish/shrimp species or feed stuff), aquaculture use intensity, and impact of environmental factors (e.g. climate zone, season, and salinity).

### 4.3.2.2 CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

#### TIER 1

Hu *et al.* (2012) used the relationship between in-coming nitrogen loads and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from wastewater plants to estimate that 1.8% of the N is emitted as N<sub>2</sub>O (0.00169 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N is emitted per kg fish produced). The EF<sub>F</sub> is applied during the 'in use' phase of aquaculture (Table 4.15). In the construction and discontinued phases, non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are assumed negligible with EF=0. At Tier 1, countries could consider applying this EF to other species groups under aquaculture production. Because the EF is developed for fish, wider application may introduce additional uncertainty.

#### TIERS 2 AND 3

Under the Tier 2 method, country specific emission factors for N<sub>2</sub>O are applied. At Tier 2, these country-specific emission factors could incorporate a different value for the proportion of N emitted as N<sub>2</sub>O. For Tier 3 emission factors, comprehensive understanding and representation of the dynamics based on direct field measurements or models is involved, which estimates emission factors considering the category of aquaculture (fish/shrimp species or feed stuff), aquaculture use intensity, and impact of environmental factors e.g. climate zone, season, and salinity.

TABLE 4.15 EMISSION FACTOR (EF <sub>F</sub> ) FOR N <sub>2</sub> O EMISSION FROM AQUACULTURE USE IN MANGROVES, TIDAL MARSHES AND SEAGRASS MEADOWS		
Default EF (kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N per kg fish produced)	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	Reference
0.00169 kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N per kg fish produced	0, 0.0038	Hu <i>et al.</i> , 2012
<sup>1</sup> 95% CI of the geometric mean. Note: Approach used by Hu <i>et al.</i> (2012) using N in feed to fish biomass: Hargreaves, 1998; Protein content of fish biomass: USDA nutrient database for Standard Reference Nutrient Data Laboratory; N content of protein: Nelson and Cox, 2013; N to N <sub>2</sub> O conversion: Hu <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Kong <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Kampschrew <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Ahn <i>et al.</i> , 2010 (refer to Annex 4A.5)		

### **4.3.2.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA**

Data for fish and shrimp production are needed. These data can be obtained from FAO (<http://www.fao.org/fishery/statistics/global-aquaculture-production/en>). For additional guidance, see Section 4.2.1.

### **4.3.2.4 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT**

Emission factors for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from aquaculture systems are based on protein content of fish, relationships between total nitrogen content and wet weight of fish and the percent of nitrogen load emitted as N<sub>2</sub>O. There are no such data for shrimp production so using fish data as a proxy adds a high level of uncertainty. The fish-related factors can vary greatly, and in part on environmental conditions, so high variation can occur among fish aquaculture systems. Decreased uncertainty can be achieved at Tier 2 and 3 to reflect variability in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions based on shrimp and fish species and type of food (pellets vs. trash fish). Uncertainties in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions associated with stocking of aquaculture facilities can be reduced greatly by better estimation of shrimp and fish production.

## **4.4 COMPLETENESS, TIME SERIES CONSISTENCY, AND QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL (QA/QC)**

### **4.4.1 Completeness**

General guidance on completeness is provided in Chapter 7 of this supplement.

### **4.4.2 Time series consistency**

It is *good practice* that countries clearly define coastal wetlands and use this definition consistently over time.

Consistent time series require that the same methodology is used for the entire time series. Whenever new methodologies are used previous estimates should be recalculated using the new methods for all years in the time series. It is also *good practice* to report why the new estimates are regarded as more accurate or less uncertain.

One potential problem in recalculating previous estimates is that certain data sets may not be available for the earlier years. There are several ways of overcoming this limitation and they are explained in detail in Chapter 5, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Time series consistency is discussed further in Chapter 7.6 of the *Wetlands Supplement* and Chapter 5 (Time series consistency and recalculations), Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

### **4.4.3 Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC)**

Quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) procedures should be developed and implemented as outlined in Chapter 7 of this supplement.

## Annex 4A.1 Salinity-based definitions

SALINITY-BASED DEFINITIONS	
Common description	Salinity (ppt) <sup>1</sup>
Tidal fresh water	<0.5
Brackish water	0.5 - 18
Saline water	>18
<sup>1</sup> ppt is parts per thousand (‰) and is roughly equivalent to grams of salt per litre of water	

## Annex 4A.2 Estimation of above-ground mangrove biomass: higher tier methodology

Because of field conditions and heavy weight of wood, an accurate survey of a mangrove forest is difficult and time-consuming. Allometric methods (Soares and Schaeffer-Novelli, 2005; Komiyama *et al.*, 2008) estimate the whole or partial weight of a tree from measurable tree dimensions, notably trunk diameter and height, using allometric relations developed from empirical measurement of weight of individual tree components (leaves, branches, stem). Use of allometric equations is favored because it is non-destructive and is therefore useful for estimating temporal changes in forest biomass by means of subsequent stem diameter measurements over subsequent years.

Up until recently, the major drawback of this method has been the site- and species-specific differences in allometric relations, necessitating the use of different allometric equations for different sites (e.g. Smith and Whelan, 2005) and, at a minimum, different species. However, a number of workers, using global datasets, have developed a common allometric equation applicable for all tropical tree species, with the most applicable equations for above-ground biomass being those developed for all tropical trees by Chave *et al.* (2005) and for all mangrove species by Komiyama *et al.* (2005):

$$W_{\text{top}} = 0.168p\text{DBH}^{2.47} \text{ (Chave } et al. 2005)$$

$$W_{\text{top}} = 0.251pD^{2.46} \text{ (Komiyama } et al. 2005)$$

where  $W_{\text{top}}$  = above-ground tree weight in kg dry weight,  $p$  = wood specific gravity,  $D$  = tree diameter, and  $\text{DBH}$  = diameter-at-breast height. The relative error of each equation varies among species, but is typically within the range of -10% to +10%. There are, of course, arguments to be made that empirical measurements should be made in all mangrove forests, considering the significant allometric differences between species and for the same species at different locations (Smith and Whelan, 2005; Soares and Schaeffer-Novelli, 2005). However, this idea is impractical for inventory compilers; a relative error of  $\pm 10\%$  is acceptable being within the range of error for allometric relations within a forest where biomass has been weighted.

Comparing the two equations, the Chave estimation gives lower above-ground weight estimates than that of the Komiyama equation. Presuming that a complete census of all trees, with species identified, and their diameter have been undertaken from replicate plots within a given forest, these numbers can then be used in either equation to derive individual tree weight.

## Annex 4A.3 Wood density of mangrove species

WOOD DENSITY OF MANGROVE SPECIES			
Species	n	Average density (tonnes m <sup>-3</sup> )	Standard error
<i>Bruguiera gymnorhiza</i>	8	0.81	0.07
<i>Xylocarpus granatum</i>	7	0.61	0.04
<i>Sonneratia apetala</i>	2	0.50	0.01
<i>Sonneratia alba</i>	6	0.47	0.12
<i>Rhizophora mucronata</i>	9	0.83	0.05
<i>Rhizophora mangle</i>	7	0.87	0.02
<i>Rhizophora apiculata</i>	4	0.87	0.06
<i>Laguncularia racemosa</i>	3	0.60	0.01
<i>Heritiera littoralis</i>	6	0.84	0.05
<i>Heritiera fomes</i>	3	0.86	0.14
<i>Excoecaria agallocha</i>	7	0.41	0.02
<i>Ceriops tagal</i>	7	0.85	0.04
<i>Ceriops decandra</i>	2	0.87	0.10
<i>Avicennia officinalis</i>	3	0.63	0.02
<i>Avicennia marina</i>	6	0.62	0.06
<i>Avicennia germinans</i>	5	0.72	0.04
<b>Average</b>		<b>0.71</b>	<b>0.02</b>
Source: Global Wood Density Database <a href="http://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.234/1?show=full">http://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.234/1?show=full</a> ; Saenger, 2002; Komiyama <i>et al.</i> , 2005; Donato <i>et al.</i> , 2012			



## Annex 4A.4 Percent refractory carbon

Percent refractory carbon in organic/mineral soils were estimated for mangrove soils based on either the amount of phenolic compounds/lignins in soils or % TOC in mangrove soils deeper than 1 m if there was no further decline in TOC concentration.

PERCENT REFRACTORY CARBON APPLIED TO ESTIMATE % C OXIDATION FOR MANGROVE SOILS (% BY SOIL DRY WEIGHT)	
Mean	3.98
Median	3.4
N	16
Source: Prasad and Ramanathan, 2009; Marchand <i>et al.</i> , 2003; Dittmar and Lara, 2001; Koch <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Ranjan <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Marchand <i>et al.</i> , 2005, which is similar to that in tidal marshes (Filip <i>et al.</i> , 1988; Alberts <i>et al.</i> , 1988; Reddy and DeLaune, 2008).	

## Annex 4A.5 Derivation of N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor for aquaculture

The emission factor of 0.00169 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N per kg fish produced in Table 4.15 is based on the following. Firstly, the protein content of fish is estimated from 80 values in various cultured fish species as  $17.72 \pm 2.97\%$  (USDA nutrient database for Standard Reference Nutrient Data Laboratory). Using the protein content of fish and the average N content of protein (16%; Nelson and Cox, 2013) implies an N content of  $2.84 \pm 1.33\%$  of fish biomass; i.e. one metric tonne of fish contains  $2.84 \times 10^4$  g N. Secondly, the % N in aquaculture fish feed that is incorporated into fish biomass averages  $23.22 \pm 5.88\%$  (Hargreaves, 1998). This value is based on results from four aquaculture production methods in which 18 individual estimates for the conversion of fish biomass to fish N were obtained from 11 different cultured fish species.

Following Hu *et al.* (2012; and references therein), it is assumed that all the feed is ingested by fish and the N input as ammonia to the aqueous phase to produce 1 metric tonne of fish is  $12.23 \times 10^4$  g -  $2.84 \times 10^4$  g =  $9.39 \pm 4.69 \times 10^4$  g. Given that on average, during N transformation in the aqueous phase,  $1.8 \pm 0.7\%$  of the N is converted to N<sub>2</sub>O (Kong *et al.*, 2013; Kampschreur *et al.*, 2008; Ahn *et al.*, 2010; Hu *et al.*, 2013), the amount of N emitted to the atmosphere as N<sub>2</sub>O-N is  $1.69 \times 10^3$  g. Thus the average N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor of an aquaculture system is 1.69 g N<sub>2</sub>O-N per kg fish or 0.00169 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N per kg fish produced. The uncertainty range is estimated using standard error propagation through the calculations indicated.

## Appendix 4a.1 Future methodological development for estimating carbon export

The amount of dissolved and particulate carbon potentially available for export is highly variable among coastal wetlands, depending on a large number of factors such as: net primary productivity, tidal range, the ratio of wetland to watershed area, lateral trapping of tidal water, the presence of high salinity plugs in the tropical dry season, total wetland area, frequency of storms, amount of precipitation, and volume of water exchange. Each ecosystem is unique; some wetlands export DOC but import POC, others import DOC and POC but export DIC, while other systems import or export all forms of dissolved and particulate C. The direction of net exchange also usually varies within the same estuary with change in season. Emerging evidence indicates that DIC (derived from CO<sub>2</sub> by heterotrophic organisms and/or carbonate dissolution) is exported from coastal wetlands by the physical processes of tidal drainage of soils and subsequent advection to adjacent waterways (Alongi, 2009; Perillo *et al.*, 2009). For instance, in mangroves, tidal export of respiratory-derived DIC may equate to as much as one-third of carbon fixed by the forests. However, available data are still too few to allow for generalization, and the scant data are highly variable with tidal amplitude being a major driver of soil DIC drainage.

Estimation of tidal exchange in a particular wetland is not a straightforward process. Many workers have provided rough estimates by multiplying carbon concentrations suspended in wetland creeks and waterways by the tidal range multiplied by the creek/waterway cross-sectional area. Estimates derived from such simple calculations are invalid and misleading for a number of reasons, including the inherent assumption that there are differences in carbon concentrations between ebb and flood tide stages and that the tidal prism is symmetrical. In fact, carbon concentrations in many wetland waters do not show significant differences between tides. Further, tides in most wetlands are characterized by a pronounced asymmetry between ebb and flood tides with the ebb most often being of shorter duration but with stronger current velocity than the flood tide. Also, tidal velocities vary across a waterway with faster surface current velocities mid-stream than those just above the creekbed or proximal to the wetland.

For these reasons, it is not possible to make simple generalizations regarding dissolved and particulate organic and inorganic total carbon export from mangroves, seagrasses or tidal marshes and, in fact, comparatively few such measurements have been made properly. The correct method would be to measure water volume and velocity over entire tidal cycles over several seasons in relation to position in the water-column to derive an overall annual estimate of average water flow by volume. This involves fairly complex instrument measurements and sophisticated mathematical modelling as well as extensive and expensive repetitive measurements of dissolved and particulate carbon concentrations. For mangroves, net exchange of carbon has been properly measured in only twelve systems (DIC has only been measured in four systems), with no clear exchange patterns among locations, although it does appear that most mangroves export POC as litter but with rates ranging widely from 0.1-27.7 mol C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (Alongi, 2009). This export equates globally to only about 10% of total carbon fixed by trees; respiration to the atmosphere is by far the largest loss of carbon to the atmosphere. Such appears to be the case for tidal marshes (Chmura *et al.*, 2003) and subtidal seagrass beds (Fourqurean *et al.*, 2012). Some recent syntheses and literature do hold promise for future development of model relationships that can be used for estimating carbon export (Adame and Lovelock 2011; Maher *et al.*, 2013).

## References

- Abohassan, R. A. A., Okia, C. A., Agea, J. G., Kimondo, J. M. & McDonald, M. M. (2012) Perennial biomass production in arid mangrove systems on the Red Sea coast of Saudi Arabia. *Environmental Research Journal* **6**(1): 22-31.
- Adame, M. C., and C.E. Lovelock (2011) Carbon and nutrient exchange of mangrove forests with the coastal ocean. *Hydrobiologia* **663**: 23-50.
- Adame, M. F., Reef, R., Herrera-Silveira, J. A. & Lovelock, C. E. (2012) Sensitivity of dissolved organic carbon exchange and sediment bacteria to water quality in mangrove forests. *Hydrobiologia* **691**(1): 239-253.
- Adams, C. A., Andrews, J. E. & Jickells, T. (2012) Nitrous oxide and methane fluxes vs. carbon, nitrogen and phosphorous burial in new intertidal and saltmarsh sediments. *Science of the Total Environment* **434**: 240-251.
- Agostini, S., Pergent, G. & Marchand, B. (2003) Growth and primary production of *Cymodocea nodosa* in a coastal lagoon. *Aquatic Botany* **76**(3): 185-193.
- Ahn, J. H., Kwan, T. & Chandran, K. (2011) Comparison of partial and full nitrification processes applied for treating high-strength nitrogen wastewaters: microbial ecology through nitrous oxide production. *Environmental Science & Technology* **45**: 2734-2740.
- Aioi, K. (1980) Seasonal change in the standing crop of eelgrass *Zostera marina* in Odawa Bay, Central Japan. *Aquatic Botany* **8**(4): 343-354.
- Aioi, K., Mukai, H., Koike, I., Ohtsu, M. & Hattori, A. (1981) Growth and organic production of eelgrass *Zostera-marina* in temperate waters of the Pacific coast of Japan. 2. Growth Analysis in Winter. *Aquatic Botany* **10**(2): 175-182.
- Aioi, K. & Pollard, P. C. (1993) Biomass, Leaf growth and loss rate of the seagrass *Syringodium isotifolium* on Dravuni Island, Fiji. *Aquatic Botany* **46**(3-4): 283-292.
- Ajonina, G. M. (2008) Inventory and modelling mangrove forest stand dynamics following different levels of wood exploitation pressures in the Douala-Edea Atlantic Coast of Cameroon, Central Africa, Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany, p. 232.
- Alberts, J. J., Filip, Z., Price, M. T., Williams, D. J. & Williams, M. C. (1988) Elemental composition, stable carbon isotope ratios and spectrophotometric properties of humic substances occurring in a salt-marsh estuary. *Organic Geochemistry* **12**(5): 455-467.
- Allen, J. A., Ewel, K. C., Keeland, B. D., Tara, T. & Smith, T. J. (2000) Downed wood in Micronesian mangrove forests. *Wetlands* **20**(1): 169-176.
- Alongi, D. M. (2010) *The Energetics of Mangrove Forests*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Science+Business Media B.V.
- Alongi, D. M., Clough, B. F., Dixon, P. & Tirendi, F. (2003) Nutrient partitioning and storage in arid-zone forests of the mangroves *Rhizophora stylosa* and *Avicennia marina*. *Trees-Structure and Function* **17**(1): 51-60.
- Alongi, D. M., McKinnon, A. D., Brinkman, R., Trott, L. A., Undu, M. C., Muawanah & Rachmansyah. (2009) The fate of organic matter derived from small-scale fish cage aquaculture in coastal waters of Sulawesi and Sumatra, Indonesia. *Aquaculture* **295**(1-2): 60-75.
- Amarasinghe, M. D. & Balasubramaniam, S. (1992) Net primary productivity of two mangrove forest stands on the Northwestern coast of Sri-Lanka. *Hydrobiologia* **247**(1-3): 37-47.
- Anisfeld, S. C., Tobin, M. & Benoit, G. (1999) Sedimentation rates in flow-restricted and restored salt marshes in Long Island Sound. *Estuaries* **22**(2A): 231-244.
- Armentano, T. V. a. M., E.S. (1986) Patterns of change in the carbon balance of organic soil wetlands of the temperate zone. *Journal of Ecology* **74**: 755-774.
- Asmus, R. M., Sprung, M. & Asmus, H. (2000) Nutrient fluxes in intertidal communities of a South European lagoon (Ria Formosa) - similarities and differences with a northern Wadden Sea bay (Sylt-Romo Bay). *Hydrobiologia* **436**(1-3): 217-235.
- Bandeira, S. O. (2002) Leaf production rates of *Thalassodendron ciliatum* from rocky and sandy habitats. *Aquatic Botany* **72**(1): 13-24.

- Bank, W. (2006) Aquaculture: Changing the Face of the Waters Meeting the Promise and Challenge of Sustainable Aquaculture.
- Birch, J. B. & Cooley, J. L. (1982) Production and standing crop patterns of giant cutgrass *Zizaniopsis miliacea* in a freshwater tidal marsh. *Oecologia* **52**(2): 230-235.
- Blackburn, T. H., Lund, B. A. & Krom, M. D. (1988) C-mineralization and N-mineralization in the sediments of earthen marine fishponds. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **44**(3): 221-227.
- Boon, P. I. (1986) Nitrogen pools in seagrass beds of *Cymodocea serrulata* and *Zostera capricorni* of Moreton Bay, Australia. *Aquatic Botany* **25**(1): 1-19.
- Borum, J., Duarte, C. M., Krause-Jensen, D. & Greve, T. M. (2004) European seagrasses: an introduction to monitoring and management. In: The M&MS project.
- Bouillon, S., Borges, A. V., Castaneda-Moya, E., Diele, K., Dittmar, T., Duke, N. C., Kristensen, E., Lee, S. Y., Marchand, C., Middelburg, J. J., Rivera-Monroy, V. H., Smith, T. J. & Twilley, R. R. (2008) Mangrove production and carbon sinks: A revision of global budget estimates. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **22**(2).
- Boyer, K. E., Callaway, J. C. & Zedler, J. B. (2000) Evaluating the progress of restored cordgrass *Spartina foliosa* marshes: Below-ground biomass and tissue nitrogen. *Estuaries* **23**(5): 711-721.
- Breithaupt, J. L., Smoak, J. M., Smith, T. J., Sanders, C. J. & Hoare, A. (2012) Organic carbon burial rates in mangrove sediments: Strengthening the global budget. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **26**.
- Briggs, S. V. (1977) Estimates of biomass in a temperate mangrove community. *Australian Journal of Ecology* **2**(3): 369-373.
- Brouns, J. (1985) A comparison of the annual production and biomass in three monospecific stands of the seagrass *Thalassia hemprichii* (Ehrenb) Aschers. *Aquatic Botany* **23**(2): 149-175.
- Brouns, J. (1987) Aspects of production and biomass of four seagrass species *Cymodoceoideae* from Papua New Guinea. *Aquatic Botany* **27**(4): 333-362.
- Brouns, J. & Heijs, F. M. L. (1986) Production and biomass of the seagrass *Enhalus acoroides* (L.f.) Royle and its epiphytes. *Aquatic Botany* **25**(1): 21-45.
- Brun, F. G., van Zetten, E., Cacabelos, E. & Bouma, T. J. (2009) Role of two contrasting ecosystem engineers *Zostera noltii* and *Cymodocea nodosa* on the food intake rate of *Cerastoderma edule*. *Helgoland Marine Research* **63**(1): 19-25.
- Cahoon, D. R., Lynch, J. C. & Knaus, R. M. (1996) Improved cryogenic coring device for sampling wetland soils. *Journal of Sedimentary Research* **66**(5): 1025-1027.
- Callaway, J. C., R.D. DeLaune, and W.H. Patrick. (1997) Sediment accretion rates from four coastal wetlands along the Gulf of Mexico. *Journal of Coastal Research* **13**: 181-191.
- Callaway, J. C., Borgnis, E. L., Turner, R. E. & Milan, C. S. (2012) Carbon sequestration and sediment accretion in San Francisco Bay tidal wetlands. *Estuaries and Coasts* **35**(5): 1163-1181.
- Callaway, J. C., DeLaune, R. D. & Patrick, W. H. (1996) Chernobyl Cs-137 used to determine sediment accretion rates at selected northern European coastal wetlands. *Limnology and Oceanography* **41**(3): 444-450.
- Calleja, M. L., Barron, C., Hale, J. A., Frazer, T. K. & Duarte, C. M. (2006) Light regulation of benthic sulfate reduction rates mediated by seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* metabolism. *Estuaries and Coasts* **29**(6B): 1255-1264.
- Camacho, L. D., Gevaña, D. T., Carandang, A. P., Camacho, S. C., Combalicer, E. A., Rebugio, L. L. & Youn, Y.-C. (2011) Tree biomass and carbon stock of a community-managed mangrove forest in Bohol, Philippines. *Forest Science and Technology* **7**(4): 161-167.
- Camporese, M., Putti, M., Salandin, P. & Teatini, P. (2008) Spatial variability of CO<sub>2</sub> efflux in a drained cropped peatland south of Venice, Italy. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences* **113**(G4).
- Cebrian, J., Pedersen, M. F., Kroeger, K. D. & Valiela, I. (2000) Fate of production of the seagrass *Cymodocea nodosa* in different stages of meadow formation. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **204**: 119-130.
- Chave, J., Andalo, C., Brown, S., Cairns, M. A., Chambers, J. Q., Eamus, D., Folster, H., Fromard, F., Higuchi, N., Kira, T., Lescure, J. P., Nelson, B. W., Ogawa, H., Puig, H., Riera, B. & Yamakura, T. (2005) Tree allometry and improved estimation of carbon stocks and balance in tropical forests. *Oecologia* **145**(1): 87-99.
- Chen, G. C., Ye, Y. & Lu, C. Y. (2008) Seasonal variability of leaf litter removal by crabs in a *Kandelia candel* mangrove forest in Jiulong Jiang Estuary, China. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* **79**(4): 701-706.

- Chmura, G. L., Anisfeld, S. C., Cahoon, D. R. & Lynch, J. C. (2003) Global carbon sequestration in tidal, saline wetland soils. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **17**(4).
- Chmura, G. L. & Hung, G. A. (2004) Controls on salt marsh accretion: A test in salt marshes of Eastern Canada. *Estuaries* **27**(1): 70-81.
- Christensen, B. (1978) Biomass and primary production of *Rhizophora apiculata* Bl. in a mangrove in southern Thailand. *Aquatic Botany* **4**(1): 43-52.
- Coles, R. G., Long, W. J. L., Watson, R. A. & Derbyshire, K. J. (1993) Distribution of Seagrasses, and Their Fish and Penaeid Prawn Communities, in Cairns Harbour, a Tropical Estuary, Northern Queensland, Australia. *Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* **44**(1): 193-210.
- Collier, C. J., Lavery, P. S., Ralph, P. J. & Masini, R. J. (2009) Shade-induced response and recovery of the seagrass *Posidonia sinuosa*. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **370**(1-2): 89-103.
- Connor, R. & Chmura, G. L. (2000) Dynamics of above- and below-ground organic matter in a high latitude macrotidal saltmarsh. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **204**: 101-110.
- Connor, R. F., Chmura, G. L. & Beecher, C. B. (2001) Carbon accumulation in Bay of Fundy salt marshes: Implications for restoration of reclaimed marshes. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **15**(4): 943-954.
- Coronado-Molina, C., Day, J., Reyes, E. & Perez, B. (2004) Standing crop and aboveground biomass partitioning of a dwarf mangrove forest in Taylor River Slough, Florida. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **12**(3): 157-164.
- Craft, C., J. Reader, J.N. Sacco, S.W. Broome. (1999) Twenty-five years of ecosystem development of constructed *Spartina alterniflora* (Loisel) marshes. *Ecological Applications* **13**: 1417-1423.
- Craft, C., S. Broome, and C. Campbell. (2002) Fifteen years of vegetation and soil development after brackish-water marsh creation. *Restoration Ecology* (10): 248-258.
- Craft, C. (2007) Freshwater input structures soil properties, vertical accretion, and nutrient accumulation of Georgia and U.S. tidal marshes. *Limnology and Oceanography* **52**(3): 1220-1230.
- Craft, C., Megonigal, P., Broome, S., Stevenson, J., Freese, R., Cornell, J., Zheng, L. & Sacco, J. (2003) The pace of ecosystem development of constructed *Spartina alterniflora* marshes. *Ecological Applications* **13**(5): 1417-1432.
- Craft, C. B., Broome, S. W. & Seneca, E. D. (1988) Nitrogen, phosphorus and organic carbon pools in natural and transplanted marsh soils. *Estuaries* **11**(4): 272-280.
- Cruz, P. S. (1997) *Aquaculture feed and fertilizer resource atlas of the Philippines*. FAO.
- da Cunha Lana, P., Guiss, C. & Disaro, S. T. (1991) Seasonal variation of biomass and production dynamics for above- and below-ground components of a *Spartina alterniflora* marsh in the euhaline sector of Paranaguá Bay (SE Brazil). *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* **32**: 231-241.
- Daby, D. (2003) Effects of seagrass bed removal for tourism purposes in a Mauritian bay. *Environmental Pollution* **125**(3): 313-324.
- de Boer, W. F. (2000) Biomass dynamics of seagrasses and the role of mangrove and seagrass vegetation as different nutrient sources for an intertidal ecosystem. *Aquatic Botany* **66**(3): 225-239.
- Deverel, S. J. & Leighton, D. A. (2010) Historic, recent, and future subsidence, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, California, USA. *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science* **8**(2): 1-23.
- Devereux, R., Yates, D. F., Aukamp, J., Quarles, R. L., Jordan, S. J., Stanley, R. S. & Eldridge, P. M. (2011) Interactions of *Thalassia testudinum* and sediment biogeochemistry in Santa Rosa Sound, NW Florida. *Marine Biology Research* **7**(4): 317-331.
- Dittmar, T. & Lara, R. J. (2001) Molecular evidence for lignin degradation in sulfate-reducing mangrove sediments (Amazonia, Brazil). *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta* **65**(9): 1417-1428.
- Dixon, L. K. & Leverone, J. R. (1995) Light requirements of *Thalassia testudinum* in Tampa Bay, Florida: final report.
- Donato, D. C., Kauffman, J. B., Mackenzie, R. A., Ainsworth, A. & Pfleeger, A. Z. (2012) Whole-island carbon stocks in the tropical Pacific: Implications for mangrove conservation and upland restoration. *Journal of Environmental Management* **97**: 89-96.
- Donato, D. C., Kauffman, J. B., Murdiyarso, D., Kurnianto, S., Stidham, M. & Kanninen, M. (2011) Mangroves among the most carbon-rich forests in the tropics. *Nature Geoscience* **4**(5): 293-297.

- Dos Santos, V. M., Matheson, F. E., Pilditch, C. A. & Elger, A. (2012) Is black swan grazing a threat to seagrass? Indications from an observational study in New Zealand. *Aquatic Botany* **100**: 41-50.
- Duarte, C. M., Kennedy, H., Marbà, N. & Hendriks, I. (2013) Assessing the capacity of seagrass meadows for carbon burial: current limitations and future strategies. *Ocean and Coastal Management* **83**: 32-38.
- Dunn, R. (1981) The effects of temperature on the photosynthesis, growth and productivity of *Spartina townsendii* (*sensu lato*) in controlled and natural environments. In: University of Essex.
- Dunton, K. H. (1996) Photosynthetic production and biomass of the subtropical seagrass *Halodule wrightii* along an estuarine gradient. *Estuaries* **19**(2B): 436-447.
- Dürr, H. H., Laruelle, G. G., van Kempen, C. M., Slomp, C. P., Meybeck, M. & Middelkoop, H. (2011) World-wide typology of near-shore coastal systems: defining the estuarine filter of river inputs to the oceans. *Estuaries and Coasts* **34**(3): 441-458.
- Ellison, A. M., Bertness, M. D. & Miller, T. (1986) Seasonal patterns in the below-ground biomass of *Spartina alterniflora* (Gramineae) across a tidal gradient. *American Journal of Botany* **73**(11): 1548-1554.
- Ellison, A. M. & Farnsworth, E. J. (1996) Anthropogenic disturbance of Caribbean mangrove ecosystems: Past impacts, present trends, and future predictions. *Biotropica* **28**(4): 549-565.
- Elsey-Quirk, T., Seliskar, D. M., Sommerfield, C. K. & Gallagher, J. L. (2011) Salt Marsh Carbon Pool Distribution in a Mid-Atlantic Lagoon, USA: Sea Level Rise Implications. *Wetlands* **31**(1): 87-99.
- FAO. (2003) Status and trends in mangrove area extent worldwide. In: Paris: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
- FAO. (2007) The State of the World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2006. In: Rome: FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
- FAO. (2007) The world's mangroves 1980-2005: a thematic study prepared in the framework of the Global Forest Resources Assessment 2005. In: Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
- Fatoyinbo, T. E. & Simard, M. (2013) Height and biomass of mangroves in Africa from ICESat/GLAS and SRTM. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* **34**(2): 668-681.
- Fatoyinbo, T. E., Simard, M., Washington-Allen, R. A. & Shugart, H. H. (2008) Landscape-scale extent, height, biomass, and carbon estimation of Mozambique's mangrove forests with Landsat ETM+ and Shuttle Radar Topography Mission elevation data. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Biogeosciences* **113**(G2).
- Filip, Z., Alberts, J. J., Cheshire, M. V., Goodman, B. A. & Bacon, J. R. (1988) Comparison of salt marsh humic acid with humic-like substances from the indigenous plant species *Spartina alterniflora* (Loisel). *Science of the Total Environment* **71**(2): 157-172.
- Fourqurean, J. W., Duarte, C. M., Kennedy, H., Marbà, N., Holmer, M., Mateo, M. A., Apostolaki, E. T., Kendrick, G. A., Krause-Jensen, D., McGlathery, K. J. & Serrano, O. (2012) Seagrass ecosystems as a globally significant carbon stock. *Nature Geoscience* **5**(7): 505-509.
- Fourqurean, J. W., Moore, T. O., Fry, B. & Hollibaugh, J. T. (1997) Spatial and temporal variation in C:N:P ratios, delta N-15 and delta C-13 of eelgrass *Zostera marina* as indicators of ecosystem processes, Tomales Bay, California, USA. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **157**: 147-157.
- Fromard, F., Puig, H., Mougin, E., Marty, G., Betoulle, J. L. & Cadamuro, L. (1998) Structure, aboveground biomass and dynamics of mangrove ecosystems: new data from French Guiana. *Oecologia* **115**(1-2): 39-53.
- Fujimoto, K., Imaya, A., Tabuchi, R., Kuramoto, S., Utsugi, H. & Murofushi, T. (1999) Below-ground carbon storage of Micronesian mangrove forests. *Ecological Research* **14**(4): 409-413.
- Gedan, K. B., Silliman, B. R. & Bertness, M. D. (2009) Centuries of human-driven change in salt marsh ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science* **1**: 117-141.
- Golley, F. B., McGuinnis, K., Clements, R. G., Child, G. I. & Duever, M. J. (1975) *Mineral cycling in a tropical moist ecosystem*. Athens, GA, USA: University of Georgia Press.
- Golley, F. B., Odum, H. T. & Wilson, R. F. (1962) *The structure and metabolism of a Puerto Rican red mangrove forest ecosystem*. Athens, GA, USA: University of Georgia Press.
- Gong, W. K. & Ong, J. E. (1990) Plant biomass and nutrient flux in a managed mangrove forest in Malaysia. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* **31**(5): 519-530.
- Gross, M. F., Hardisky, M. A., Wolf, P. L. & Klemas, V. (1991) Relationship between aboveground and below-ground biomass of *Spartina alterniflora* (smooth cordgrass). *Estuaries* **14**(2): 180-191.

- Hackney, J. W. (2003) Morphometric variability and allometric relationships in the seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* in Florida Bay. In: University of North Carolina.
- Halun, Z., Terrados, J., Borum, J., Kamp-Nielsen, L., Duarte, C. M. & Fortes, M. D. (2002) Experimental evaluation of the effects of siltation-derived changes in sediment conditions on the Philippine seagrass *Cymodocea rotundata*. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **279**(1-2): 73-87.
- Hargreaves, J. A. (1998) Nitrogen biogeochemistry of aquaculture ponds. *Aquaculture* **166**: 181-212.
- Harris, R. J., Milbrandt, E. C., Everham, E. M. & Bovard, B. D. (2010) The Effects of Reduced Tidal Flushing on Mangrove Structure and Function Across a Disturbance Gradient. *Estuaries and Coasts* **33**(5): 1176-1185.
- Hatala, J. A., Detto, M., Sonnentag, O., Deverel, S. J., Verfaillie, J. & Baldocchi, D. D. (2012) Greenhouse gas (CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O) fluxes from drained and flooded agricultural peatlands in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **150**: 1-18.
- Hatton, R. S., Delaune, R. D. & Patrick, W. H. (1983) Sedimentation, accretion, and subsidence in marshes of Barataria Basin, Louisiana. *Limnology and Oceanography* **28**(3): 494-502.
- Hebert, A. B., Morse, J. W. & Eldridge, P. M. (2007) Small-scale heterogeneity in the geochemistry of seagrass vegetated and non-vegetated estuarine sediments: causes and consequences. *Aquatic Geochemistry* **13**(1): 19-39.
- Herbert, D. A. (1986) The growth dynamics of *Halophila hawaiiiana*. *Aquatic Botany* **23**(4): 351-360.
- Herbert, D. A. & Fourqurean, J. W. (2008) Ecosystem structure and function still altered two decades after short-term fertilization of a seagrass meadow. *Ecosystems* **11**(5): 688-700.
- Herbert, D. A. & Fourqurean, J. W. (2009) Phosphorus Availability and Salinity Control Productivity and Demography of the Seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* in Florida Bay. *Estuaries and Coasts* **32**(1): 188-201.
- Holmer, M., Andersen, F. O., Nielsen, S. L. & Boschker, H. T. S. (2001) The importance of mineralization based on sulfate reduction for nutrient regeneration in tropical seagrass sediments. *Aquatic Botany* **71**(1): 1-17.
- Holmer, M. & Kendrick, G. A. (2013) High sulfide intrusion in five temperate seagrasses growing under contrasting sediment conditions. *Estuaries and Coasts* **36**(1): 116-126.
- Hoque, A., Sharma, S., Suwa, R., Mori, S. & Hagihara, A. (2012) Seasonal variation in the size-dependent respiration of mangroves *Kandelia obovata*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **404**: 31-37.
- Howe, A. J., Rodriguez, J. F. & Saco, P. M. (2009) Surface evolution and carbon sequestration in disturbed and undisturbed wetland soils of the Hunter estuary, southeast Australia. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* **84**(1): 75-83.
- Hu, Z., Lee, J. W., Chandran, K., Kim, S. & Khanal, S. K. (2012) Nitrous Oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) Emission from Aquaculture: A Review. *Environmental Science & Technology* **46**(12): 6470-6480.
- Hu, Z., Lee, J. W., Chandran, K., Kim, S., Sharma, K., Brotto, A. C. & Khanal, S. K. (2013) Nitrogen transformations in intensive aquaculture system and its implication to climate change through nitrous oxide emission. *Bioresource Technology* **130**: 314-320.
- Hussein, A. H., Rabenhorst, M. C. & Tucker, M. L. (2004) Modeling of carbon sequestration in coastal marsh soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **68**(5): 1786-1795.
- Hussey, A. & Long, S. P. (1982) Seasonal changes in weight of above- and below-ground vegetation and dead plant material in a salt marsh at Colne Point, Essex. *Journal of Ecology* **70**: 757-771.
- IPCC. (2010) Datasets for use in the IPCC Guidelines. In: *Meeting Report of the IPCC-FAO-IFAD Expert Meeting on FAO Data for LULUCF/AFOLU, Rome, Italy, 20-22 October, 2009*, eds. H. S. Eggleston, N. Srivastava, K. Tanabe & J. Baasansuren, Hayama, Japan.
- Ismail, N. (1993) Preliminary study of the seagrass flora of Sabah, Malaysia. *Pertanika Journal of Tropical Agricultural Science* **16**(2): 111-118.
- JAXA. (2010) The ALOS Kyoto & Carbon Initiative, Science Team Reports, Phase I (2006-2008) (NDX-100003). Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency, Earth Observation Research Center (JAXA-EORC), Japan. In.
- JAXA. (2010) Global Environmental Monitoring by ALOS PALSAR Science Results from the ALOS Kyoto & Carbon Initiative (NDX-100004). Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency, ALOS Science Program, Japan. In.
- Jensen, S. & Bell, S. (2001) Seagrass growth and patch dynamics: cross-scale morphological plasticity. *Plant Ecology* **155**(2): 201-217.



- Jones, D. A., Nithyanandan, M. & Williams, I. (2012) Sabah Al-Ahmad Sea City Kuwait: development of a sustainable man-made coastal ecosystem in a saline desert. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management* **15**: 84-92.
- Juliana, W. A. & Nizam, M. S. (2004) *Forest structure and aboveground biomass of two mangrove forest communities in Matang*. Ipoh, Perak, Malaysia.
- Kairo, J. G., Lang'at, J. K. S., Dahdouh-Guebas, F., Bosire, J. & Karachi, M. (2008) Structural development and productivity of replanted mangrove plantations in Kenya. *Forest Ecology and Management* **255**(7): 2670-2677.
- Kampschreur, M. J., Van der Star, W. R. L., Wielders, H. A., Mulder, J. W., Jetten, M. S. M. & Van Loosdrecht, M. C. M. (2008) Dynamics of nitric oxide and nitrous oxide emission during full-scale reject water treatment. *Water Research* **42**: 812-826.
- Kauffman, J. B., Heider, C., Cole, T. G., Dwire, K. A. & Donato, D. C. (2011) Ecosystem carbon stocks of Micronesian mangrove forests. *Wetlands* **31**(2): 343-352.
- Kearney, M. S. & Stevenson, J. C. (1991) Island land loss and marsh vertical accretion rate evidence for historical sea-level changes in Chesapeake Bay. *Journal of Coastal Research* **7**(2): 403-415.
- Keller, J. K., Sutton-Grier, A. E., Bullock, A. L. & Megonigal, J. P. (2013) Anaerobic metabolism in tidal freshwater wetlands: I. Plant removal effects on iron reduction and methanogenesis. *Estuaries and Coasts* **36**: 457-470.
- Khan, M. N. I., Suwa, R. & Hagihara, A. (2009) Biomass and aboveground net primary production in a subtropical mangrove stand of *Kandelia obovata* (S., L.) Yong at Manko Wetland, Okinawa, Japan. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **17**(6): 585-599.
- Kim, S. H., Kim, Y. K., Park, S. R., Li, W. T. & Lee, K. S. (2012) Growth dynamics of the seagrass *Halophila nipponica*, recently discovered in temperate coastal waters of the Korean peninsula. *Marine Biology* **159**(2): 255-267.
- Kirkman, H. & Reid, D. D. (1979) A study of the role of the seagrass *Posidonia australis* in the carbon budget of an estuary. *Aquatic Botany* **7**(2): 173-183.
- Kirue, B., Kairo, J. & Karachi, M. (2007) Allometric Equations for Estimating Above Ground Biomass of *Rhizophora mucronata* Lamk.(Rhizophoraceae) Mangroves at Gazi Bay, Kenya. *Western Indian Ocean Journal of Marine Science* **5**(1): 27-34.
- Kistritz, R. U., Hall, K. J. & Yesaki, I. (1983) Productivity, detritus flux, and nutrient cycling in a *Carex lyngbyei* tidal marsh. *Estuaries* **6**: 227-236.
- Koch, B. P., Souza, P. W. M., Behling, H., Cohen, M. C. L., Kattner, G., Rullkotter, J., Scholz-Bottcher, B. & Lara, R. J. (2011) Triterpenols in mangrove sediments as a proxy for organic matter derived from the red mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*). *Organic Geochemistry* **42**(1): 62-73.
- Komiyama, A., Havanond, S., Srisawatt, W., Mochida, Y., Fujimoto, K., Ohnishi, T., Ishihara, S. & Miyagi, T. (2000) Top/root biomass ratio of a secondary mangrove (*Ceriops tagal* (Perr.) CB Rob.) forest. *Forest Ecology and Management* **139**(1-3): 127-134.
- Komiyama, A., Moriya, H., Prawiroatmodjo, S., Toma, T. & Ogino, K. (1988) *Primary productivity of mangrove forest*. Ehime University, Ehime, Japan.
- Komiyama, A., Ogino, K., Aksornkoae, S. & Sabhasri, S. (1987) Root biomass of a mangrove forest in southern Thailand. 1. Estimation by the trench method and the zonal structure of root biomass. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* **3**: 97-108.
- Komiyama, A., Ong, J. E. & Pongparn, S. (2008) Allometry, biomass, and productivity of mangrove forests: A review. *Aquatic Botany* **89**(2): 128-137.
- Komiyama, A., Pongparn, S. & Kato, S. (2005) Common allometric equations for estimating the tree weight of mangroves. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* **21**: 471-477.
- Kowalski, J. L., DeYoe, H. R. & Allison, T. C. (2009) Seasonal Production and Biomass of the Seagrass, *Halodule wrightii* Aschers. (Shoal Grass), in a Subtropical Texas Lagoon. *Estuaries and Coasts* **32**(3): 467-482.
- Krauss, K. W., Doyle, T. W., Twilley, R. R., Smith, T. J., Whelan, K. R. T. & Sullivan, J. K. (2005) Woody debris in the mangrove forests of South Florida. *Biotropica* **37**(1): 9-15.

- Kristensen, E., Bouillon, S., Dittmar, T. & Marchand, C. (2008) Organic carbon dynamics in mangrove ecosystems: A review. *Aquatic Botany* **89**(2): 201-219.
- Kungvankij, P., Pudadera Jr, B., Tiro Jr, L., Potestas, I. & Chua, T. (1986) An improved traditional shrimp culture technique for increasing pond yield.
- Kusmana, C., Sabiham, S., Abe, K. & Watanabe, H. (1992) An estimation of above ground tree biomass of a mangrove forest in East Sumatra, Indonesia. *Tropics* **1**(4): 243-257.
- Larkum, A. W. D., Collett, L. C. & Williams, R. J. (1984) The standing stock, growth and shoot production of *Zostera capricorni* aschers. in Botany Bay, New South Wales, Australia. *Aquatic Botany* **19**(3-4): 307-327.
- Larkum, A. W. D. & West, R. J. (1990) Long-term changes of seagrass meadows in Botany Bay, Australia. *Aquatic Botany* **37**(1): 55-70.
- Larned, S. T. (2003) Effects of the invasive, nonindigenous seagrass *Zostera japonica* on nutrient fluxes between the water column and benthos in a NE Pacific estuary. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **254**: 69-80.
- Lebreton, B., Richard, P., Radenac, G., Bordes, M., Breret, M., Arnaud, C., Mornet, F. & Blanchard, G. F. (2009) Are epiphytes a significant component of intertidal *Zostera noltii* beds? *Aquatic Botany* **91**(2): 82-90.
- Lee, K. S., Park, S. R. & Kim, J. B. (2005) Production dynamics of the eelgrass, *Zostera marina* in two bay systems on the south coast of the Korean peninsula. *Marine Biology* **147**(5): 1091-1108.
- Lee, S. Y. (1997) Annual cycle of biomass of a threatened population of the intertidal seagrass *Zostera japonica* in Hong Kong. *Marine Biology* **129**(1): 183-193.
- Lee, S. Y., Oh, J. H., Choi, C. I., Suh, Y. & Mukai, H. (2005) Leaf growth and population dynamics of intertidal *Zostera japonica* on the western coast of Korea. *Aquatic Botany* **83**(4): 263-280.
- Liao, B., Zheng, D. & Zheng, S. (1990) Studies on the biomass of *Sonneratia caseolaris* stand. *Forest Research* **3**(1): 47-54.
- Lichacz, W., Hardiman, S. & Buckney, R. T. (1984) Below-ground biomass in some intertidal wetlands in New South Wales. *Wetlands* **4**: 56-62.
- Lillebo, A. I., Flindt, M. R., Pardal, M. A. & Marques, J. C. (2006) The effect of *Zostera noltii*, *Spartina maritima* and *Scirpus maritimus* on sediment pore-water profiles in a temperate intertidal estuary. *Hydrobiologia* **555**: 175-183.
- Lin, P. (1989) *Biomass and element cycle of Kandelia forest in China*. Xiamen: Xiamen Univ. Press.
- Lin, P., Lu, C., Wang, G. & Chen, H. (1990) Biomass and productivity of *Bruguiera sexangula* mangrove forest in Hainan Island, China. *Journal of Xiamen University (Natural Science)* **29**: 209-213.
- Lindeboom, H. J. & Sandee, A. J. J. (1989) Production and consumption of tropical seagrass fields in Eastern Indonesia measured with bell jars and microelectrodes. *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research* **23**(2): 181-190.
- Lipkin, Y. (1979) Quantitative aspects of seagrass communities, particularly of those dominated by *Halophila stipulacea*, in Sinai (Northern Red Sea). *Aquatic Botany* **7**(2): 119-128.
- Livesley, S., Andrusiak, S. & Idczak, D. (2010) Soil greenhouse gas exchange and carbon stocks in natural and managed ecosystems of the Mornington Peninsula. In: *Final Report to the Mornington Peninsula Shire Council*, Melbourne, Australia.
- Longstaff, B. J. & Dennison, W. C. (1999) Seagrass survival during pulsed turbidity events: the effects of light deprivation on the seagrasses *Halodule pinifolia* and *Halophila ovalis*. *Aquatic Botany* **65**(1-4): 105-121.
- Loomis, M. J. & Craft, C. B. (2010) Carbon sequestration and nutrient (nitrogen, phosphorus) accumulation in river-dominated tidal marshes, Georgia, USA. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **74**(3): 1028-1036.
- Lovelock, C. E., Ruess, R. W. & Feller, I. C. (2011) CO<sub>2</sub> efflux from cleared mangrove peat. *Plos One* **6**(6).
- Ma, A., Lu, J. & Wang, T. (2012) Effects of elevation and vegetation on methane emissions from a freshwater estuarine wetland. *Journal of Coastal Research* **6**: 1319-1329.
- Mackey, A. P. (1993) Biomass of the mangrove *Avicennia marina* (Forsk.) Vierh. Near Brisbane, South-eastern Queensland. *Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* **44**(5): 721-725.
- Madkour, F. F. & Gaballah, M. M. (2012) Phytoplankton assemblage of a solar saltern in Port Fouad, Egypt. *Oceanologia* **54**(4): 687-700.
- Mahall, B. E. & Park, R. B. (1976) The ecotone between *Spartina foliosa* Trin. and *Salicornia virginica* L. in salt marshes of Northern San Francisco Bay: II. Soil water and salinity. *Journal of Ecology* **64**(3): 793-809.

- Maher, D. T., Santos, I. R., Golsby-Smith, L., Gleeson, J. & Eyre, B. D. (2013) Groundwater-derived dissolved inorganic and organic carbon exports from a mangrove tidal creek: The missing mangrove carbon sink? *Limnology and Oceanography* **58**: 475-488.
- Mall, L. P., Singh, V. P. & Garge, A. (1999) Study of biomass, litter fall, litter decomposition and soil respiration in monogeneric mangrove and mixed mangrove forests of Andaman Islands. *Tropical Ecology* **32**: 144-152.
- Marba, N. & Duarte, C. M. (2001) Growth and sediment space occupation by seagrass *Cymodocea nodosa* roots. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **224**: 291-298.
- Marchand, C., Disnar, J. R., Lallier-Verg, E. & Lottier, N. (2005) Early diagenesis of carbohydrates and lignin in mangrove sediments subject to variable redox conditions (French Guiana). *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta* **69**(1): 131-142.
- Marchand, C., Lallier-Verges, E. & Baltzer, F. (2003) The composition of sedimentary organic matter in relation to the dynamic features of a mangrove-fringed coast in French Guiana. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* **56**(1): 119-130.
- Markewich, H. W., Wysocki, D. A., Pavich, M. J., Rutledge, E. M., Millard, H. T., Rich, F. J., Maat, P. B., Rubin, M. & McGeehin, J. P. (1998) Paleopedology plus TL, Be-10, and C-14 dating as tools in stratigraphic and paleoclimatic investigations, Mississippi River Valley, USA. *Quaternary International* **51-2**: 143-167.
- Mateo, M. A. & Romero, J. (1997) Detritus dynamics in the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica*: Elements for an ecosystem carbon and nutrient budget. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **151**(1-3): 43-53.
- Matsui, N., Morimune, K., Meepol, W. & Chukwamdee, J. (2012) Ten year evaluation of carbon stock in mangrove plantation reforested from abandoned shrimp pond. *Forests* **3**(2): 431-444.
- McCaffrey, R. J. & Thomson, J. (1980) A Record of the Accumulation of Sediment and Trace Metals in A Connecticut Salt Marsh. In: *Advances in Geophysics*, ed. S. Barry, pp. 165-236. Elsevier.
- McGlathery, K. J., Reynolds, L. K., Cole, L. W., Orth, R. J., Marion, S. R. & Schwarzschild, A. (2012) Recovery trajectories during state change from bare sediment to eelgrass dominance. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **448**: 209-221.
- McKenzie, L. (1994) Seasonal changes in biomass and shoot characteristics of a *Zostera capricorni* Aschers. Dominant meadow in Cairns Harbour, northern Queensland. *Marine and Freshwater Research* **45**(7): 1337-1352.
- McMahan, C. A. (1968) Biomass and salinity tolerance of shoalgrass and manateegrass in Lower Laguna Madre, Texas. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* **32**(3): 501-506.
- McRoy, C. P. (1974) Seagrass productivity: Carbon uptake experiments in eelgrass, *Zostera marina*. *Aquaculture* **4**: 131-137.
- Medeiros, T. & Sampaio, E. (2008) Allometry of aboveground biomasses in mangrove species in Itamaracá, Pernambuco, Brazil. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **16**(4): 323-330.
- Meling-Lopez, A. E. & Ibarro-Obando, S. E. (1999) Annual life cycles of two *Zostera marina* L.-populations in the Gulf of California: contrasts in seasonality and reproductive effort. *Aquatic Botany* **65**: 59-69.
- Mellors, J., Marsh, H., Carruthers, T. J. & Waycott, M. (2002) Testing the sediment-trapping paradigm of seagrass: Do seagrasses influence nutrient status and sediment structure in tropical intertidal environments? *Bulletin of Marine Science* **71**(3): 1215-1226.
- Moriarty, D. J., Roberts, D. G. & Pollard, P. C. (1990) Primary and bacterial productivity of tropical seagrass communities in the Gulf of Carpentaria, Australia. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **61**: 145-157.
- Morris, J. T., Edwards, J., Crooks, S. & Reyes, E. (2012) Assessment of carbon sequestration potential in coastal wetlands. In: *Recarbonization of the Biosphere: Ecosystems and the Global Carbon Cycle*, eds. R. Lal, K. Lorenz, R. F. Huttel, B. U. Schneider & J. von Braun, pp. 517-531. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Mukai, H., Aioi, K., Koike, I., Iizumi, H., Ohtsu, M. & Hattori, A. (1979) Growth and organic production of eelgrass *Zostera marina* L. in temperate waters of the Pacific coast of Japan. I. Growth analysis in spring-summer. *Aquatic Botany* **7**: 47-56.
- Nascimento, W. R. J., Souza-Filho, P. W. M., Proisy, C., Lucas, R. M. & Rosenqvist, A. (2013) Mapping changes in the largest continuous Amazonian mangrove belt using object-based classification of multisensor satellite imagery. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **117**: 83-93.

- Nelson, D. L. & Cox, M. M. (2013) *Lehninger Principles of Biochemistry*. New York, New York, USA: W.H. Freeman & Co.
- Neves, J. P., Ferreira, L. F., Simoes, M. P. & Gazarini, L. C. (2007) Primary production and nutrient content in two salt marsh species, *Atriplex portulacoides* L. and *Limoniastrum monopetalum* L., in Southern Portugal. *Estuaries and Coasts* **30**(3): 459-468.
- Nienhuis, P., Coosen, J. & Kiswara, W. (1989) Community structure and biomass distribution of seagrasses and macrofauna in the Flores Sea, Indonesia. *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research* **23**(2): 197-214.
- Norhayati, A. & Latiff, A. (2001) Biomass and species composition of a mangrove forest in Pulau Langkawi, Malaysia. *Malaysian Applied Biology* **30**(1/2): 75-80.
- Odum, H. T. (1963) Productivity measurements in Texas turtle grass and the effects of dredging an intracoastal channel. *Publications of the Institute of Marine Science* **9**: 48-58.
- Oenema, O. & DeLaune, R. D. (1988) Accretion rates in salt marshes in the Eastern Scheldt, south-west Netherlands. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **26**(4): 379-394.
- Ogden, J. C. & Ogden, N. B. (1982) A preliminary study of two representative seagrass communities in Palau, Western Caroline Islands (Micronesia). *Aquatic Botany* **12**: 229-244.
- Olesen, B. & Sand-Jensen, K. (1994) Biomass-density patterns in the temperate seagrass *Zostera marina*. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* **109**: 283-283.
- Ong, E. (1982) Mangroves and aquaculture in Malaysia. *Ambio* **11**(5): 252-257.
- Oren, A. (2009) Saltern evaporation ponds as model systems for the study of primary production processes under hypersaline conditions. *Aquat Microb Ecol* **56**: 193-204.
- Orson, R., Warren, R. & Niering, W. (1998) Interpreting sea level rise and rates of vertical marsh accretion in a southern New England tidal salt marsh. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **47**(4): 419-429.
- Orth, R. J., Moore, K. A., Marion, S. R., Wilcox, D. J. & Parrish, D. B. (2011) Seed addition facilitates eelgrass recovery in a coastal bay system. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **448**: 177-195.
- Ortiz-Milán, S. (2009) Project of recovery the biological conditions of the production system in saltworks of Industria Salinera de Yucatan SA de CV (ISYSA) damaged by the Hurricane Isidore in September of 2002. *Global NEST Journal* **11**(1): 91-95.
- Osborne, T. Z., Bruland, G. L., Newman, S., Reddy, K. R. & Grunwald, S. (2011) Spatial distributions and eco-partitioning of soil biogeochemical properties in the Everglades National Park. *Environmental monitoring and assessment* **183**(1-4): 395-408.
- Osland, M. J., Spivak, A. C., Nestlerode, J. A., Lessmann, J. M., Almario, A. E., Heitmuller, P. T., Russell, M. J., Krauss, K. W., Alvarez, F. & Dantin, D. D. (2012) Ecosystem development after mangrove wetland creation: plant-soil change across a 20-year chronosequence. *Ecosystems* **15**(5): 848-866.
- Paling, E. I. & McComb, A. J. (2000) Autumn biomass, below-ground productivity, rhizome growth at bed edge and nitrogen content in seagrasses from Western Australia. *Aquatic Botany* **67**(3): 207-219.
- Park, S. R., Kim, Y. K., Kim, J.-H., Kang, C.-K. & Lee, K.-S. (2011) Rapid recovery of the intertidal seagrass *Zostera japonica* following intense Manila clam (*Ruditapes philippinarum*) harvesting activity in Korea. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **407**(2): 275-283.
- Patrick Jr, W. H. & DeLaune, R. (1990) Subsidence, accretion, and sea level rise in south San Francisco Bay marshes. *Limnology and Oceanography* **35**(6): 1389-1395.
- Paynter, C. K., Cortés, J. & Engels, M. (2001) Biomass, productivity and density of the seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* at three sites in Cahuita National Park, Costa Rica. *Rev. Biol. Trop* **49**(Suppl 2): 265-272.
- Pendleton, L., Donato, D. C., Murray, B. C., Crooks, S., Jenkins, W. A., Sifleet, S., Craft, C., Fourqurean, J. W., Kauffman, J. B., Marba, N., Megonigal, P., Pidgeon, E., Herr, D., Gordon, D. & Baldera, A. (2012) Estimating Global "Blue Carbon" Emissions from Conversion and Degradation of Vegetated Coastal Ecosystems. *Plos One* **7**(9).
- Perillo, G. M., Wolanski, E., Cahoon, D. R. & Brinson, M. M. (2009) *Coastal wetlands: an integrated ecosystem approach*. Elsevier, Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Perry, C. L. & Mendelssohn, I. A. (2009) Ecosystem effects of expanding populations of *Avicennia germinans* in a Louisiana salt marsh. *Wetlands* **29**(1): 396-406.

- Pidgeon, E. (2009) *Carbon sequestration by coastal marine habitats: missing sinks in the management of natural coastal carbon sinks*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
- Poffenbarger, H. J., Needelman, B. A. & Megonigal, J. P. (2011) Salinity influence on methane emissions from tidal marshes. *Wetlands* **31**(5): 831-842.
- Poovachiranon, S. & Chansang, H. (1994) Community structure and biomass of seagrass beds in the Andaman Sea. I. Mangrove-associated seagrass beds. *Phuket Marine Biological Center Research Bulletin* **59**: 53-64.
- Povidisa, K., Delefosse, M. & Holmer, M. (2009) The formation of iron plaques on roots and rhizomes of the seagrass *Cymodocea serrulata* (R. Brown) Ascherson with implications for sulphide intrusion. *Aquatic Botany* **90**(4): 303-308.
- Powell, G. V., Kenworthy, J. W. & Fourqurean, J. W. (1989) Experimental evidence for nutrient limitation of seagrass growth in a tropical estuary with restricted circulation. *Bulletin of Marine Science* **44**(1): 324-340.
- Pozo, J. & Colino, R. (1992) Decomposition processes of *Spartina maritima* in a salt marsh of the Basque Country. *Hydrobiologia* **231**(3): 165-175.
- Prasad, M. B. & Ramanathan, A. L. (2009) Organic matter characterization in a tropical estuarine-mangrove ecosystem of India: Preliminary assessment by using stable isotopes and lignin phenols. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **84**(4): 617-624.
- Preen, A. (1995) Impacts of dugong foraging on seagrass habitats: observational and experimental evidence for cultivation grazing. *Marine ecology progress series. Oldendorf* **124**(1): 201-213.
- Purvaja, R. & Ramesh, R. (2001) Natural and anthropogenic methane emission from coastal wetlands of South India. *Environmental Management* **27**(4): 547-557.
- Putz, F. E. & Chan, H. (1986) Tree growth, dynamics, and productivity in a mature mangrove forest in Malaysia. *Forest Ecology and Management* **17**(2): 211-230.
- Q., K., J., Z., M., M., L., T., N., G. & S., L. (2013) Partial nitrification and nitrous oxide emission in an intermittently aerated sequencing batch biofilm reactor. *Chemical Engineering Journal* **17**: 435-444.
- Ramos e Silva, C. A., Oliveira, S. R., Rêgo, R. D. & Mozeto, A. A. (2007) Dynamics of phosphorus and nitrogen through litter fall and decomposition in a tropical mangrove forest. *Marine environmental research* **64**(4): 524-534.
- Ranjan, R. K., Routh, J., Ramanathan, A. & Klump, J. V. (2011) Elemental and stable isotope records of organic matter input and its fate in the Pichavaram mangrove-estuarine sediments (Tamil Nadu, India). *Marine Chemistry* **126**(1): 163-172.
- Rasheed, M. A. (1999) Recovery of experimentally created gaps within a tropical *Zostera capricorni* (Aschers.) seagrass meadow, Queensland Australia. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **235**(2): 183-200.
- Ray, R., Ganguly, D., Chowdhury, C., Dey, M., Das, S., Dutta, M., Mandal, S., Majumder, N., De, T. & Mukhopadhyay, S. (2011) Carbon sequestration and annual increase of carbon stock in a mangrove forest. *Atmospheric Environment* **45**(28): 5016-5024.
- Reddy, K. R. & DeLaune, R. D. (2008) *Biogeochemistry of wetlands: science and applications*. CRC Press I Llc.
- Ren, H., Chen, H., Li, Z. a. & Han, W. (2010) Biomass accumulation and carbon storage of four different aged *Sonneratia apetala* plantations in Southern China. *Plant and soil* **327**(1-2): 279-291.
- Richards, T. M., Krebs, J. M. & McIvor, C. C. (2011) Microhabitat associations of a semi-terrestrial fish, *Kryptolebias marmoratus* (Poey 1880) in a mosquito-ditched mangrove forest, west-central Florida. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **401**(1): 48-56.
- Rismondo, A., Curiel, D., Marzocchi, M. & Scattolin, M. (1997) Seasonal pattern of *Cymodocea nodosa* biomass and production in the lagoon of Venice. *Aquatic Botany* **58**(1): 55-64.
- Robertson, A. & Phillips, M. (1995) Mangroves as filters of shrimp pond effluent: predictions and biogeochemical research needs. *Hydrobiologia* **295**(1-3): 311-321.
- Robertson, A. I. & Daniel, P. A. (1989) Decomposition and the annual flux of detritus from fallen timber in tropical mangrove forests. *Limnology and Oceanography* **34**(3): 640-646.
- Rojstaczer, S. & Deverel, S. J. (1993) Time dependence in atmospheric carbon inputs from drainage of organic soils. *Geophysical Research Letters* **20**(13): 1383-1386.

- Roman, C., Peck, J., Allen, J., King, J. & Appleby, P. (1997) Accretion of a New England (USA) salt marsh in response to inlet migration, storms, and sea-level rise. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **45**(6): 717-727.
- Ross, M. S., Ruiz, P. L., Telesnicki, G. J. & Meeder, J. F. (2001) Estimating aboveground biomass and production in mangrove communities of Biscayne National Park, Florida (USA). *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **9**(1): 27-37.
- Saenger, P. (2002) *Mangrove ecology, silviculture and conservation*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Saintilan, N. (1997) Above-and below-ground biomasses of two species of mangrove on the Hawkesbury River estuary, New South Wales. *Marine and Freshwater Research* **48**(2): 147-152.
- Sand-Jensen, K. & Borum, J. (1983) Regulation of growth of eelgrass (*Zostera marina* L.) in Danish coastal waters. *Marine Technology Society Journal* **17**(2): 15-21.
- Scarton, F., Day, J. W. & Rismondo, A. (2002) Primary production and decomposition of *Sarcocornia fruticosa* (L.) Scott and *Phragmites australis* Trin. ex Steudel in the Po Delta, Italy. *Estuaries* **25**(3): 325-336.
- Schwarz, A.-M., Morrison, M., Hawes, I. & Halliday, J. (2006) *Physical and biological characteristics of a rare marine habitat: sub-tidal seagrass beds of offshore islands*. Department of Conservation.
- Setia, R., Marschner, P., Baldock, J., Chittleborough, D. & Verma, V. (2011) Relationships between carbon dioxide emission and soil properties in salt-affected landscapes. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **43**(3): 667-674.
- Sherman, R. E., Fahey, T. J. & Martinez, P. (2003) Spatial patterns of biomass and aboveground net primary productivity in a mangrove ecosystem in the Dominican Republic. *Ecosystems* **6**(4): 384-398.
- Sifleet, S., Pendleton, L. & Murray, B. (2011) State of the Science on Coastal Blue Carbon A Summary for Policy Makers. In: *Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions Report NI R 11-06*, p. 06.
- Simard, M., Zhang, K., Rivera-Monroy, V. H., Ross, M. S., Ruiz, P. L., Castañeda-Moya, E., Twilley, R. R. & Rodriguez, E. (2006) Mapping height and biomass of mangrove forests in Everglades National Park with SRTM elevation data. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* **72**(3): 299-311.
- Slim, F., Gwada, P., Kodjo, M. & Hemminga, M. (1996) Biomass and litterfall of *Ceriops tagal* and *Rhizophora mucronata* in the mangrove forest of Gazi Bay, Kenya. *Marine and Freshwater Research* **47**(8): 999-1007.
- Smith III, T. J. & Whelan, K. R. (2006) Development of allometric relations for three mangrove species in South Florida for use in the Greater Everglades Ecosystem restoration. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **14**(5): 409-419.
- Smith, K. K., Good, R. E. & Good, N. F. (1979) Production dynamics for above and below-ground components of a New Jersey *Spartina alterniflora* tidal marsh. *Estuarine and Coastal Marine Science* **9**(2): 189-201.
- Soares, M. L. G. & Schaeffer-Novelli, Y. (2005) Aboveground biomass of mangrove species. I. Analysis of models. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **65**(1): 1-18.
- Sotomayor, D., Corredor, J. E. & Morrell, J. M. (1994) Methane flux from mangrove sediments along the southwestern coast of Puerto Rico. *Estuaries* **17**: 140-147.
- Spain, A. V. & Holt, J. A. (1980) The elemental status of the foliage and branch-wood of seven mangrove species from northern Queensland. In: *Division of Soils divisional report ; no. 49*, eds. J. A. Holt & C. D. o. Soils, [Melbourne]: CSIRO.
- Steinke, T., Ward, C. & Rajh, A. (1995) Forest structure and biomass of mangroves in the Mgeni estuary, South Africa. *Hydrobiologia* **295**(1-3): 159-166.
- Suzuki, E. & Tagawa, H. (1983) Biomass of a mangrove forest and a sedge marsh on Ishigaki Island, south Japan. *Japanese Journal of Ecology* **33**: 231-234.
- Tam, N., Wong, Y., Lan, C. & Chen, G. (1995) Community structure and standing crop biomass of a mangrove forest in Futian Nature Reserve, Shenzhen, China. *Hydrobiologia* **295**(1-3): 193-201.
- Tamai, S., Tabuchi, R., Ogino, K. & Nakasuga, T. (1986) Standing biomass of mangrove forests in southern Thailand. *Journal of the Japanese Forestry Society* **68**(9): 384-388.
- Terrados, J. & Ros, J. (1992) Growth and primary production of *Cymodocea nodosa* (Ucria) Ascherson in a Mediterranean coastal lagoon: the Mar Menor (SE Spain). *Aquatic Botany* **43**(1): 63-74.
- Thant, Y. M. & Kanzaki, M. (2011) Biomass and carbon sequestration in community mangrove plantations and a natural regeneration stand in the Ayeyarwady Delta, Myanmar. In: *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts: American Geophysical Union*.

- Thiéry, A. & Puente, L. (2002) Crustacean assemblage and environmental characteristics of a man-made solar saltwork in southern France, with emphasis on anostracan (Branchiopoda) population dynamics. *Hydrobiologia* **486**(1): 191-200.
- Tong, C., Wang, W.-Q., Zeng, C.-S. & Marrs, R. (2010) Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emission from a tidal marsh in the Min River estuary, southeast China. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part A: Toxic/Hazardous Substances and Environmental Engineering* **45**: 506-516.
- Townsend, E. C. & Fonseca, M. S. (1998) Bioturbation as a potential mechanism influencing spatial heterogeneity of North Carolina seagrass beds. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **169**: 123-132.
- Twilley, R., Chen, R. & Hargis, T. (1992) Carbon sinks in mangroves and their implications to carbon budget of tropical coastal ecosystems. *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution* **64**(1-2): 265-288.
- Twilley, R. W., Lugo, A. E. & Patterson-Zucca, C. (1986) Litter production and turnover in basin mangrove forests in southwest Florida. *Ecology* **67**: 670-683.
- Udy, J. W. & Dennison, W. C. (1997) Growth and physiological responses of three seagrass species to evaluated sediment nutrients in Moreton Bay, Australia. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **217**: 253-277.
- Utrera-López, M. E. & Moreno-Casasola, P. (2008) Mangrove litter dynamics in la Mancha lagoon, Veracruz, México. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **16**(1): 11-22.
- Valiela, I., Kinney, E., Culbertson, J., Peacock, E. & Smith, S. (2009.) Global losses of mangroves and salt marshes. . In: *Global Loss of Coastal Habitats: rates, causes and consequences.*, ed. C. M. Duarte: Fundacion BBVA.
- Van den Heuvel, R., Hefting, M., Tan, N., Jetten, M. & Verhoeven, J. (2009) N<sub>2</sub>O emission hotspots at different spatial scales and governing factors for small scale hotspots. *Science of the Total Environment* **407**(7): 2325-2332.
- Van Houte-Howes, K., Turner, S. & Pilditch, C. (2004) Spatial differences in macroinvertebrate communities in intertidal seagrass habitats and unvegetated sediment in three New Zealand estuaries. *Estuaries* **27**(6): 945-957.
- Van Lent, F., Nienhuis, P. & Verschuure, J. (1991) Production and biomass of the seagrasses *Zostera noltii* Hornem. and *Cymodocea nodosa*(Ucria) Aschers. at the Banc d'Arguin (Mauritania, NW Africa): a preliminary approach. *Aquatic Botany* **41**(4): 353-367.
- Van Tussenbroek, B. I. (1998) Above-and below-ground biomass and production by *Thalassia testudinum* in a tropical reef lagoon. *Aquatic Botany* **61**(1): 69-82.
- Vegas-Vilarrúbia, T., Baritto, F., López, P., Meleán, G., Ponce, M. E., Mora, L. & Gómez, O. (2010) Tropical Histosols of the lower Orinoco Delta, features and preliminary quantification of their carbon storage. *Geoderma* **155**(3): 280-288.
- Vermaat, J., Agawin, N., Duarte, C., Fortes, M., Marba, N. & Uri, J. (1995) Meadow maintenance, growth and productivity of a mixed Philippine seagrass bed. *Marine ecology progress series. Oldendorf* **124**(1): 215-225.
- Vermaat, J., Beijer, J., Gijlstra, R., Hootsmans, M., Philippart, C., Van den Brink, N. & Van Vierssen, W. (1993) Leaf dynamics and standing stocks of intertidal *Zostera noltii* Hornem. and *Cymodocea nodosa* (Ucria) Ascherson on the Banc d'Arguin (Mauritania). *Hydrobiologia* **258**(1): 59-72.
- Walker, D. (1985) Correlations between salinity and growth of the seagrass *Amphibolis antarctica*(labill.) Sonder & Aschers., In Shark Bay, Western Australia, using a new method for measuring production rate. *Aquatic Botany* **23**(1): 13-26.
- Walters, B. B., Rönnbäck, P., Kovacs, J. M., Crona, B., Hussain, S. A., Badola, R., Primavera, J. H., Barbier, E. & Dahdouh-Guebas, F. (2008) Ethnobiology, socio-economics and management of mangrove forests: a review. *Aquatic Botany* **89**(2): 220-236.
- Wang, J.-K. (1990) Managing shrimp pond water to reduce discharge problems. *Aquacultural engineering* **9**(1): 61-73.
- West, R. & Larkum, A. (1979) Leaf productivity of the seagrass, *Posidonia australis*, in eastern Australian waters. *Aquatic Botany* **7**: 57-65.
- Whigham, D. F., McCormick, J., Good, R. E. & Simpson, R. L. (1978) *Biomass and primary production in freshwater tidal wetlands of the middle Atlantic coast*. New York: Academic Press.

- Williams, S. L. (1987) Competition between the seagrasses *Thalassia testudinum* and *Syringodium filiforme* in a Caribbean lagoon. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **35**: 91-98.
- Woodroffe, C. D. & Moss, T. J. (1984) Litter fall beneath *Rhizophora stylosa* Griff., Vaitupu, Tuvalu, South Pacific. *Aquatic Botany* **18**(3): 249-255.
- World Bank (2006) Aquaculture: Changing the Face of the Waters Meeting the Promise and Challenge of Sustainable Aquaculture.
- Yarbro, L. A. & Carlson Jr, P. R. (2008) Community oxygen and nutrient fluxes in seagrass beds of Florida Bay, USA. *Estuaries and Coasts* **31**(5): 877-897.
- Yu, O. & Chmura, G. (2009) Soil carbon may be maintained under grazing in a St Lawrence Estuary tidal marsh. *Environmental Conservation* **36**(04): 312-320.
- Zhang, J.-P., Shen, C.-D., Ren, H., Wang, J. & Han, W.-D. (2012) Estimating Change in Sedimentary Organic Carbon Content During Mangrove Restoration in Southern China Using Carbon Isotopic Measurements. *Pedosphere* **22**(1): 58-66.



# **CHAPTER 5**

---

## **INLAND WETLAND MINERAL SOILS**

### **Coordinating Lead Authors**

Kimberly P. Wickland (USA) and Alex V. Krusche (Brazil)

### **Lead Authors**

Randall K. Kolka (USA), Ayaka W. Kishimoto-Mo (Japan), Rodney A. Chimner (USA) and Yusuf Serengil (Turkey)

### **Contributing Authors**

Stephen Ogle (USA) and Nalin Srivastava (IPCC TFI TSU)

### **Review Editors**

Irineu Junior Bianchini (Brazil) and Michelle Garneau (Canada)

## Contents

5	Inland Wetland Mineral Soils .....	5
5.1	Introduction .....	5
5.2	Land remaining in a land-use category .....	8
5.2.1	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals .....	9
5.2.1.1	Biomass and dead organic matter .....	9
5.2.1.2	Soil carbon .....	10
5.2.2	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from managed lands with IWMS .....	17
5.2.2.1	Choice of method .....	17
5.2.2.2	Choice of emission factors .....	18
5.2.2.3	Choice of activity data .....	18
5.2.2.4	Uncertainty assessment .....	19
5.3	Land converted to a new land-use category .....	19
5.3.1	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and removals .....	19
5.3.1.1	Biomass and dead organic matter .....	19
5.3.1.2	Soil carbon .....	20
5.3.2	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions .....	21
5.3.2.1	Choice of method and emission factors .....	21
5.3.2.2	Choice of activity data .....	21
5.3.2.3	Uncertainty assessment .....	21
5.4	Completeness, reporting and documentation .....	21
5.4.1	Completeness .....	21
Annex 5A.1	Estimation of default stock change factors for long-term cultivated Cropland and rewetting with Inland Wetland Mineral Soil carbon emissions/removals .....	23
Annex 5A.2	Estimation of CH <sub>4</sub> emission factors for managed lands with Inland Wetland Mineral Soils, or dry mineral soils, where the water table has been raised .....	24
Appendix 5a.1	Future methodological development .....	29
References	.....	30

## Equations

Equation 5.1	Annual CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted and created wetlands on managed lands with IWMS.....	17
--------------	---	----

## Tables

Table 5.1	Updated and new guidance provided in Chapter 5.....	6
Table 5.2	Default reference soil organic carbon stocks (SOC <sub>REF</sub> ) for Wetland Mineral Soils <sup>a</sup> under native vegetation (0-30 cm depth).....	12
Table 5.3	Relative stock change factors for land-use (F <sub>LU</sub> ) for long term cultivation on Cropland with IWMS over 20 years) and rewetting of cropland with IWMS (over 20 years and 40 years).....	13
Table 5.4	Default emission factors for CH <sub>4</sub> from managed lands with IWMS where water table level has been raised .....	18
Table 5A.1.1	Studies used for the derivation of default SOC stock change factors.....	23
Table 5A.2.1	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from restored and created wetlands with IWMS where water table level has been raised, and natural wetlands, used to derive default value for EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub> .....	24
Table 5A.2.2	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from temperate, created/rewetted wetlands and natural wetlands with IWMS.....	27
Table 5A.2.3	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from temperate, rewetted, created and natural wetlands with IWMS, stratified by period of inundation.....	28

## Boxes

Box 5.1	Distribution of Wetland Mineral Soils .....	7
Box 5.2	Management activities on Inland Wetland Mineral Soils .....	8
Box 5.3	Example Calculations for SOC Stocks in Long-term Cultivated Croplands with Inland Wetland Mineral Soils, and Rewetting of Long-Term Cultivated Croplands with Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.....	16

## 5 INLAND WETLAND MINERAL SOILS

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides supplementary guidance for estimating and reporting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and removals from managed lands with Inland Wetland Mineral Soils (IWMS) for all land-use categories (see Chapter 1 and decision tree in Chapter 1 in this supplement for what is specifically covered in this chapter in relationship to other chapters in this supplement). Information on Tier 1 default methods for Wetland Mineral Soil (WMS) is found in Table 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006 IPCC Guidelines)*. This chapter covers “inland” managed lands with WMS; coastal lands with WMS are addressed in Chapter 4 (Coastal Wetlands) of this supplement. The distinction between “inland” and “coastal” zones is defined in Chapter 4. Constructed wetlands with IWMS are addressed in Chapter 6 (Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment) of this supplement.

Mineral soils are described as all soils that are not classified as organic soils in Annex 3A.5, Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provide a default mineral soil classification for categorizing mineral soil types, based on the USDA taxonomy (Soil Survey Staff, 1999) in Figure 3A.5.3, and based on the World Reference Base for Soil Resources Classification (FAO, 1998) in Figure 3A.5.4, where both classifications produce the same default IPCC soil types for Tier 1 methods. Under these soil classification schemes, Wetland Soils (e.g. Wetland Mineral Soils) are classified as Aquic soil (USDA) or Gleysols (World Reference Base), and are described as having restricted drainage, leading to periodic flooding and anaerobic conditions (Table 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4, *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). They can occur in any of the six land-use categories (Forest Land, Grassland, Cropland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land) depending upon the national land-use classification system. Emissions and removals from areas of managed land with IWMS should be reported in the land-use category under which they are classified, according to Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Note that a change in management practice may, or may not be accompanied by land-use conversion. For higher tier methods, countries may use country-specific national classification systems as long as they are transparently documented.

For the purposes of this supplement, IWMS comprise those that have formed under restricted drainage, and may or may not be artificially drained due to management activities. Guidance provided in this chapter applies to: (i) artificial drainage, defined here as the removal of free water from soils having aquic conditions to the extent that water table levels are changed significantly in connection with specific types of land use (adapted from Soil Survey Staff, 1999); (ii) IWMS that have been artificially drained and subsequently allowed to re-wet (hereafter called “rewetting”); and (iii) the artificial inundation of mineral soils for the purposes of “wetland creation.” There is no guidance provided for other IWMS such as saline IWMS (See Box 5.1 of this Chapter), or reservoirs. Guidance on methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) emissions from rice cultivation on IWMS is given in Chapter 5, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Guidance on carbon stock changes in *Land Converted to Flooded Land*<sup>1</sup> with IWMS is given in Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*<sup>2</sup>. This supplement does not update this guidance.

This chapter supplements guidance and methodologies provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for emissions and removals of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), and emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>, and provides additional information to be used in the application of the methodologies. Review of the current literature suggests there is insufficient data to provide robust emission factors and methodology to update the guidance on nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions from IWMS provided in Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* at this time (see Appendix 5A of this chapter for additional discussion). This chapter should be read in conjunction with Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

This chapter updates the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for:

- default reference Soil Organic Carbon stocks (SOC<sub>REF</sub>) for IWMS under all climate regions (referring to Table 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), to be used for Tier 1 methods in all six land-use categories; and
- default Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) stock change factor (F<sub>LU</sub>) for long-term cultivation of Cropland with IWMS.

This chapter gives new guidance not contained in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* by:

<sup>1</sup> In the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, Flooded Lands are defined as *water bodies where human activities have caused changes in the amount of surface area covered by water, typically through water level regulation*.

<sup>2</sup> Appendices 2 and 3 of Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* contain information on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from *Land Converted to Permanently Flooded Land* and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from Flooded Land as a basis for future methodological development.

- providing new default SOC stock change factors for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) for rewetting of drained IWMS classified as Cropland; and
- providing methodologies and emission factors (EFs) for  $CH_4$  emissions from managed lands with drained IWMS under any land-use category that has undergone rewetting, and from inland mineral soils that have been inundated for the purpose of wetland creation (Note that  $CH_4$  emissions from wetlands created for the purpose of wastewater treatment are addressed in Chapter 6 of this supplement).


Table 5.1 clarifies the scope and corresponding sections of this chapter, as well as the guidance for IWMS provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and in other chapters of this supplement.

<div>TABLE 5.1</div> <div>UPDATED AND NEW GUIDANCE PROVIDED IN CHAPTER 5</div>		
IPCC land-use category	Soil Organic Carbon <sup>A,B</sup> (SOC)	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions <sup>C,D</sup>
<i>Land Remaining in a Land-use Category</i>		
Forest Land	Updated SOC <sub>REF</sub> for IWMS	EF <sub>CH4-IWMS</sub> for rewetting of drained IWMS, and created wetlands on managed lands with mineral soils
Cropland	Updated SOC <sub>REF</sub> for IWMS; SOC stock change factors for land-use (F <sub>LU</sub> ) for long-term cultivation, and rewetting of drained IWMS	
Grassland	Updated SOC <sub>REF</sub> for IWMS	
Wetlands	Updated SOC <sub>REF</sub> for IWMS	
Settlements	Updated SOC <sub>REF</sub> for IWMS	
<i>Land Conversion to a New Land-use Category</i>		
All land-use conversions	Updated SOC <sub>REF</sub> for IWMS; SOC stock change factors for land-use (F <sub>LU</sub> ) for long-term cultivation, and rewetting of drained IWMS.	EF <sub>CH4-IWMS</sub> for rewetting of drained IWMS, and created wetlands on managed lands with mineral soils
A The overall guidance as provided in Chapters 2 and 4-9 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines will continue to apply along with elements mentioned in this table.		
B Guidance on SOC will apply to all wetlands with IWMS except Flooded Land.		
C Existing guidance on CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from rice cultivation given in Chapter 5, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines will continue to apply.		
D Guidance on CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from managed lands with IWMS does not apply to Flooded Land.		

### BOX 5.1 DISTRIBUTION OF WETLAND MINERAL SOILS

WMS, including both coastal and inland WMS, are estimated to cover ~5.3% of the world's land surface, or  $7.26 \times 10^6 \text{ km}^2$  (Batjes, 2010a). The distribution of the world's WMS across climate regions are as follows: boreal (moist plus dry): 2.07%; tropical moist: 0.67%; cool temperate moist: 0.63%; tropical wet: 0.61%; polar (moist plus dry): 0.60%; and warm temperate moist: 0.23% (Batjes, 2010a). Climate regions having less than 0.20% WMS include cool and warm temperate dry, tropical dry, and tropical montane (See Figures 3A.5.1 and 3A.5.2, Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for climate zone definitions). Figure 5.1 shows the global distribution of gleysols (WMS), based on the World Reference Base for Soil Resources (WRB) and the FAO/UNESCO soil map of the world. IWMS are found in a variety of landscape settings, including basins, channels, flats, slopes, and highlands (Semeniuk and Semeniuk, 1995). It is common to find IWMS adjacent to flowing waters and lake and pond margins (riparian wetlands). Lands containing IWMS are often classified by predominant vegetation community, and can include trees, woody shrubs, emergent and non-emergent vascular plants, and/or bare ground.

**Distribution of Gleysols (Wetland Mineral Soils; source: <http://www.isric.org>).**



One specific type of land containing IWMS, saline IWMS, is not covered in this chapter. Saline IWMS are generally defined as having salinity  $>5000 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$  when wet (Shaw and Bryant, 2011). Also known as playas, pans, salt lakes, brackish wetlands, salinas, and sabkhas, these lands are important parts of arid landscapes across the globe (Shaw and Bryant, 2011). In a recent review of the literature characterizing known information on pans, playas and salt lakes, the carbon stocks and  $\text{CO}_2$ ,  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  fluxes were not discussed (Shaw and Bryant, 2011). A broader review of the literature on lands containing saline IWMS indicates that only two studies have assessed soil carbon in saline IWMS (Bai *et al.*, 2007; Rodriguez-Murillo *et al.*, 2011), and no studies have yet measured GHG emissions and removals from saline IWMS. At present, the lack of data on saline IWMS prevents the determination of their default carbon stock changes or GHG emission factors. Countries are therefore encouraged to seek country-specific data in order to estimate changes in carbon pools in, and emissions and removals from, managed saline IWMS.

**Box 5.2****MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES ON INLAND WETLAND MINERAL SOILS**

Drainage of IWMS is a common practice in the preparation of land for agriculture, grazing, and forestry. Drainage leads to lower water levels, which increases both decomposition and vegetation productivity, but the balance generally favors decomposition, leading to reduced IWMS carbon stocks over time (Bedard-Haughn *et al.*, 2006; Huang *et al.*, 2010; Page and Dalal, 2011). The hydrology of IWMS may be altered in many ways: by dredging of canals for navigation and ditches through wetlands for flood control and to increase vegetation productivity (Mitsch and Gosselink, 2007); by management of river-floodplain systems through levee construction, channelization, and flow manipulation by dams (Dynesius and Nilsson, 1994); by irrigation systems that lower water tables; and by water level control for wildlife management by dikes, weirs, control gates, and pumps (Mitsch and Gosselink, 2007). Dams for hydroelectric generation and flood control can create riparian wetlands upstream and influence existing riparian wetlands by altering the frequency and duration of flood pulses, which impacts sediment deposition and nutrient loading to wetlands (Brinson and Malvárez, 2002; Noe and Hupp, 2005; Nilsson and Berggren, 2000).

Grazing on lands with IWMS within grassland or forest landscapes is widespread (Liu *et al.*, 2009; Oates *et al.*, 2008; Yao *et al.*, 2010). Forest management activities on wetlands with forest can vary in management intensity depending on the silvicultural system. The intensity may range from selective cutting treatments to large area clearcuts. There is currently not enough information available about the impacts of grazing or forest management activities on carbon stock changes or GHG emissions on lands with IWMS to allow us to provide new guidance.

One specific management activity that occurs on managed lands with IWMS is “rewetting”, where lands with IWMS that were previously drained are subsequently rewetted by raising the water table level to pre-drainage conditions. Active approaches to rewetting include the removal of drain tiles, filling or blocking of drainage ditches, breaching levees, removal of river dams and spillways, and contouring the land surface to mimic natural topography. Passive approaches include the elimination of water control structures and allowing natural flood events (Aber *et al.*, 2012). The rewetting of managed lands with IWMS is common in the conversion of agricultural lands back to wetlands, and may occur when active regulation of river hydrology is discontinued. A related management activity that occurs on mineral soils (wet or dry) is wetland creation, where lands are artificially inundated for the purposes of supporting a wetland ecosystem (Aber *et al.*, 2012). Wetlands are created for various purposes such as water-quality enhancement (treatment of wastewater, stormwater, acid mine drainage, agricultural runoff; Hammer, 1989), flood minimization, and habitat replacement (Mitsch *et al.*, 1998). Wetlands may be created unintentionally when regulation of river flows (i.e. installation of large dams) results in periodic inundation of lands that did not experience inundation prior to regulation (Chen *et al.*, 2009; Yang *et al.*, 2012). Wetland creation and rewetting of drained soils are common activities in response to significant wetland loss and degradation on a global scale (Mitsch *et al.*, 1998). There is a great potential for increasing carbon storage by the rewetting of wetlands (Euliss *et al.*, 2006; Bridgham *et al.*, 2006). Rewetted wetlands may also have higher emissions of CH<sub>4</sub>, however, potentially offsetting the increased carbon storage (Bridgham *et al.*, 2006), although recent studies have shown that created and rewetted wetlands can be net carbon sinks, even after accounting for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Badiou *et al.*, 2011; Mitsch *et al.*, 2012).

## **5.2 LAND REMAINING IN A LAND-USE CATEGORY**

The 2006 IPCC Guidelines define “land remaining in a land-use category” as those lands that have not undergone any land-use conversion for a default period of at least 20 years. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines provide generic and land-use category-specific guidance (Chapters 2 and Chapter 4-9, Volume 4) on stock changes in the carbon pools (above-ground and below-ground biomass; dead wood and litter; and soil organic matter), and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for land remaining in a land-use category for all land-use categories including those containing mineral soils. This Chapter updates the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for guidance on SOC reference stocks, SOC stock change factors, and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from managed lands with IWMS.



## 5.2.1 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals

As explained in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals from managed lands are estimated on the basis of changes in the carbon stocks in the carbon pools: biomass (above and below-ground biomass), dead organic matter (dead wood and litter) and soil organic carbon. The set of general equations to estimate the annual carbon stock changes of carbon pools for land remaining in a land-use category are given in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and also apply to managed lands with IWMS.

Figure 1.2 in Chapter 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* shows a decision tree for the identification of appropriate methodological tiers for land remaining in a land-use category.

### 5.2.1.1 BIOMASS AND DEAD ORGANIC MATTER

Guidance for changes in the carbon pools in biomass (above-ground, below-ground) and dead organic matter (dead wood, litter) is provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and remains unchanged for land remaining in a land-use category for managed lands with IWMS in this supplement. For managed lands with IWMS classified as land remaining in a land-use category in Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Settlements, or Other Land, the changes in biomass and dead organic matter are to be determined using the guidance provided in the corresponding chapters (Chapters 4-9) in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

### CHOICE OF METHOD AND EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

As explained in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, inventories can be developed using Tier 1, 2 and 3 methods. The decision trees have been provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* to guide the selection of the appropriate methodological tier for the estimation of changes in carbon stocks of biomass and dead organic matter (Fig. 2.2 and Fig. 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4). The Tier 1 methods use the default emission factors along with parameters relating to biomass and dead organic matter provided for specific land-use categories. These will also apply to managed lands with IWMS in any of the land-use categories. For lower Tier methods it may be assumed that wetland vegetation does not have substantially different biomass carbon densities than upland vegetation (e.g. Bridgman *et al.*, 2006). However, if country-specific data is available, it is *good practice* to use that data to estimate biomass carbon densities. There is currently no robust scientific information to support development of emission factors for biomass and dead organic matter for specific management activities, such as drainage of lands with IWMS, rewetting of drained IWMS, or wetland creation. If there are reliable data for rates of biomass and/or dead organic matter change upon drainage or rewetting/wetland creation, then country-specific estimates may be derived using a Tier 2 method.

### CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

For Tier 1 methods, activity data consist of areas of managed lands with IWMS in land remaining in a land-use category stratified by land-use category, climate region, soil type, and management practices. The total areas should be determined according to the Approaches outlined in Chapter 3 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and should be consistent with those reported under other sections of the inventory. Stratification of land-use categories according to climate region, based on default or country-specific classifications can be accomplished by overlays of land-use onto climate and soil maps. A global GIS database that shows the spatial distribution of generalized soil classes used for IPCC Tier 1 is available for download and use at <http://isirc.org/data/ipcc-default-soil-classes-derived-harmonized-world-soil-data-base-ver-11>. The database is derived from the Harmonized World Soil Data Base and FAO soil classifications, and includes the seven default IPCC soils classes, including Wetland Soils (termed “Wetland Soils” in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and “Wetland Mineral Soils” in this Supplement) (Batjes, 2010b). This dataset may be used at national and wider scales where more detailed soil information is lacking. Although no organisation catalogues changes in area as a result of rewetting or wetland creation either nationally or globally, local activity data for wetlands with rewetted IWMS may be obtained from agricultural, forestry, or natural resources agencies, non-governmental conservation organisations, or other government sources. In addition, organisations such as the Society for Ecological Restoration (<http://www.ser.org>), the Global Restoration Network (<http://www.globalrestorationnetwork.org>), Wetlands International (<http://www.wetlands.org>), and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (<http://www.ramsar.org>) may be sources of information for rewetting and/or wetland creation projects.

Higher Tier methods may use activity data suitably stratified by criteria such as vegetation type and/or water table level and hydroperiod (e.g. continuously inundated vs. intermittently inundated).

## UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Sources of uncertainty for the changes in biomass and dead organic matter in managed lands with IWMS vary depending on the specific land-use category. In general, uncertainty can arise from: 1) uncertainties in the mapping of lands, land-use classification and/or management activity data; and 2) uncertainties in carbon gain and loss, carbon stocks, and other parameters used for the estimation of carbon stock changes in biomass and dead organic matter, such as biomass expansion factors. Specific recommendations on how to reduce uncertainties are included in the appropriate land-use category chapter in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* under which managed lands with IWMS are classified.

### 5.2.1.2 SOIL CARBON

Soil carbon stocks in managed IWMS are primarily influenced by drainage and other management practices in Cropland, Forest Land, and Grassland (including long-term cultivation, drainage to improve production, and grazing), and rewetting after removal from active cropping and restoration of natural hydrologic conditions (e.g. removal of drainage tiles, plugging of drainage ditches, or similar activities). Other management practices that can significantly change IWMS soil carbon stocks include harvesting in forests that are prone to paludification (Lavoie *et al.*, 2005), and the management of river-floodplain systems through the construction of dams, levees, and river channelization which can disconnect floodplains from hydrologic interaction with rivers (Poff *et al.*, 1997), thus reducing sediment deposition rates in floodplains (Hupp, 1992; Kleiss, 1996). Only a small number of studies, however, have quantified the impacts of hydrologic alteration on soil carbon accumulation rates in IWMS in floodplains (Noe and Hupp, 2005; Cabezas *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, it is not possible to develop robust emission factors relating to the impacts of hydrologic alteration on soil carbon stocks of IWMS in floodplains at this time. Similarly, very little information is available on the impacts of other common management practices, such as grazing, on IWMS soil carbon stocks. Therefore, guidance provided in this chapter is largely based upon and updates the guidance provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

General information about mineral soil classification is provided in Chapters 2 and 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The generic methodological guidance for estimation of changes in the carbon stocks in the SOC pool in mineral soils is provided in Section 2.3.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and should be used along with the land-use category specific methodological guidance provided in Chapters 4 to 9, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. This supplement updates the guidance on IWMS provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* with regard to the following:

- Table 5.2 provides updated default SOC<sub>REF</sub> values for IWMS (e.g. wetland soils), for use in any land-use category; and
- Table 5.3 provides an updated stock change factor for land-use (F<sub>LU</sub>) associated with long-term cultivation of Cropland with IWMS, and a new stock change factor for land-use (F<sub>LU</sub>) for rewetting of drained IWMS in Cropland.

To account for changes in IWMS SOC stocks associated with changes in relevant management practices on land remaining in a land-use category, countries need, at a minimum, estimates of the area of managed land with IWMS in a land remaining in land-use category that is affected by changes in relevant management practices at the beginning and end of the inventory time period. Two assumptions are made for mineral soils (see details in Section 2.3.3.1, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*): (i) Over time, SOC reaches a spatially-averaged, stable value that is specific to the soil, climate, land-use and management practices; and (ii) SOC stock changes during the transition to a new equilibrium SOC occurs in a linear fashion. If land-use and management data are limited, aggregate data, such as FAO statistics on land-use (<http://www.fao.org/home/en/>), can be used as a starting point, along with expert knowledge about the approximate distribution of land management systems. Managed land with IWMS must be stratified according to climate regions, which can either be based on default or country-specific classifications. This can be accomplished with overlays of land-use onto suitable climate and soil maps.

## CHOICE OF METHOD

Inventories can be developed using a Tier 1, 2, or 3 approach, with each successive tier requiring more detail and resources than the previous one. A decision tree is provided for mineral soils in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Figure 2.4, Section 2.3.3.1, Chapter 2, Volume 4) to assist inventory compilers with selection of the appropriate tier for their soil carbon inventory.

**Tier 1**

The Tier 1 estimation method for mineral soils in land remaining in a land-use category, including IWMS, is based on changes in SOC stocks over a finite transition period following such changes in management that impact the SOC. Equation 2.25, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* ( $\Delta C_{\text{mineral}} = (\text{SOC}_0 - \text{SOC}_{(0-T)})/D$ ; see the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for full equation) is used to estimate change in SOC stocks in mineral soils by subtracting the SOC stock in the last year of an inventory time period ( $\text{SOC}_0$ ) from the C stock at the beginning of the inventory time period ( $\text{SOC}_{(0-T)}$ ) and dividing by the time dependence of the stock change factors (D). SOC stocks are estimated for the beginning and the end of the inventory time period using default reference carbon stocks ( $\text{SOC}_{\text{REF}}$ ) (Table 5.2) and default stock change factors ( $F_{\text{LU}}$ ,  $F_{\text{MG}}$ ,  $F_{\text{I}}$ ), based on the land use (LU), the management regime (MG) and the input of organic matter (I) at the time of the inventory. In practice, country-specific data on land use and management must be obtained and classified into appropriate land management systems, and then stratified by IPCC climate region and soil type. The Tier 1 assumptions for carbon stock changes in mineral soils in land remaining in a land-use category for specific land-use categories will also apply to managed lands with IWMS in those land-use categories.

**Tier 2**

For Tier 2, the same basic equations are used as in Tier 1 (Equation 2.25 in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*), but country-specific information is incorporated to improve the accuracy of the stock change factors, reference SOC stocks, climate regions, soil types, and/or land management classification systems.

**Tier 3**

Tier 3 approaches may use empirical, process-based or other types of models as the basis for estimating annual carbon stock changes. Examples include the Century ecosystem model (Parton *et al.*, 1987, 1994, 1998; Ogle *et al.*, 2010), and the Wetland-DNDC model (Zhang *et al.*, 2002). Estimates from models are computed using equations that estimate the net change in soil carbon. Key criteria in selecting an appropriate model include its capability to represent all of the relevant management practices/systems for the land-use category; model inputs (i.e. driving variables) that are compatible with the availability of country-wide input data; and verification against experimental, monitoring or other measurement data (e.g. Ogle *et al.*, 2010).

A Tier 3 approach may also be developed using a measurement-based approach in which a monitoring network is sampled periodically to estimate SOC stock changes. A much higher density of benchmark sites will likely be needed than with models to adequately represent the combination of land use and management systems, climate, and soil types. Additional guidance is provided in Section 2.3.3.1 of Chapter 2 of this supplement.

**CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS****Tier 1**

Table 5.2 gives updated default reference SOC stocks ( $\text{SOC}_{\text{REF}}$ ) for IWMS<sup>3</sup>. Inventory compilers should use the stock change factors provided in the appropriate chapters for the six land-use categories (Chapters 4-9) in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* in conjunction with the data in Table 5.2 for Tier 1 methods.

<sup>3</sup> These values are given under “wetland soils” in Table 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

<b>TABLE 5.2</b> <b>DEFAULT REFERENCE SOIL ORGANIC CARBON STOCKS (SOC<sub>REF</sub>) FOR WETLAND MINERAL SOILS<sup>A</sup> UNDER NATIVE VEGETATION (0-30 CM DEPTH).</b>				
<b>Climate region</b>	<b>tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup></b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>Error (95% confidence interval<sup>B</sup>)</b>	<b>Number of sites</b>
Boreal	116	94	±99	6
Cold temperate, dry	87 <sup>C</sup>	n/a <sup>D</sup>	n/a <sup>D</sup>	n/a <sup>D</sup>
Cold temperate, moist	128	55	±17	42
Warm temperate, dry	74	45	±13	49
Warm temperate, moist	135	101	±39	28
Tropical, dry	22	11	±4	32
Tropical, moist	68	45	±12	55
Tropical, wet	49	27	±9	33
Tropical, montane	82	73	±46	12
<p>A Batjes (2011) presents revised estimates (means, standard deviations) of the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> SOC stocks for wetland mineral soils (gleysols) under natural vegetation based on an expanded version of the ISRIC-WISE database (Batjes, 2009) which contains 1.6 times the number of soil profiles compared to the databases used in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> SOC stocks estimate.</p> <p>B The 95% confidence interval is calculated from the mean, standard deviation, and the critical values of t distribution according to the degrees of freedom.</p> <p>C No revised estimate was presented in Batjes (2011); values are from Table 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>.</p> <p>D "n/a" indicates that information is not available.</p>				

The updated SOC<sub>REF</sub> values for WMS presented in Table 5.2 for WMS should be used for calculating SOC stock changes in IWMS when soils are classified as Wetland Soils, for land remaining in a land-use category in the following sections of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*:

- Forest Land (Chapter 4): Section 4.2.3, Tier 1;
- Cropland (Chapter 5): Section 5.2.3, Tier 1; and
- Grassland (Chapter 6): Section 6.2.3, Tier 1.

Default stock change factors for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ), input ( $F_I$ ), and management ( $F_{MG}$ ) that apply to managed land on IWMS in the *Cropland Remaining Cropland* land-use category are presented in Table 5.5, Chapter 5, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Similarly, default stock change factors for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ), input ( $F_I$ ), and management ( $F_{MG}$ ) that apply to managed land with IWMS in the *Grassland Remaining Grassland* land-use category are presented in Table 6.2, Chapter 6, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Table 5.3 in this supplement provides an updated Tier 1 default stock change factor for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) that should be applied to Cropland with IWMS under “long-term cultivation.” Note that the updated factor applies only to long-term cultivated land use in the temperate or boreal dry and moist climate regions. All other default stock change factors in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are unchanged. The updated value is similar to those values in Table 5.5 of Chapter 5 of Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for temperate/boreal moist climate but lower than the temperate/boreal dry climate values. Consequently, this update should reduce uncertainties associated with estimating soil carbon stock changes for IWMS in dry climates. The method and studies used to derive the updated default stock change factor are provided in Annex 5A.1. The default time period for stock changes (D) is 20 years, and management practices are assumed to influence stocks up to 30 cm depth, although greater depths can also be affected. As a result, for Tier 1 and 2 methods, SOC stocks for mineral soils are computed to a default depth of 30 cm. Greater soil depth may be selected and used at Tier 2, if data are available.

A new default stock change factor for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) following rewetting of Cropland with IWMS is also provided in Table 5.3, for a Tier 1 approach. This factor applies to Cropland with IWMS where natural hydrology has been restored, and where crop production may or may not continue. Note that the factor applies to all climate regions, with the caveat that this value is likely to be more representative of rewetting activities in temperate and boreal climates, as it is derived from studies limited to these regions (see Annex 5A.1 for method and studies). The default time period for stock changes (D) is 20 years, however additional C gain from restoring natural hydrology continues for a further 20 years and will reach the reference SOC stock level (SOC<sub>REF</sub> values in Table 5.2) after 40 years. It is also important to note that the long-term cultivation factor is used for areas that

have been drained and are cultivated for crop production. If the high water table is restored, i.e. in the case of rewetted Cropland, then  $F_{LU}$  for rewetting should be used for two sets of 20 year periods (i.e. 0–20 and 21–40 years).

TABLE 5.3 RELATIVE STOCK CHANGE FACTORS FOR LAND-USE (F <sub>LU</sub> ) FOR LONG TERM CULTIVATION ON CROPLAND WITH IWMS (OVER 20 YEARS) AND REWETTING OF CROPLAND WITH IWMS (OVER 20 YEARS AND 40 YEARS)						
Factor value type	Management	Temperature regime	Moisture regime	Default	Error <sup>A</sup>	Description
Land-use (F <sub>LU</sub> )	Long-term cultivated <sup>B</sup>	Temperate/ Boreal	Dry and moist	0.71	41%	Represents Cropland with IWMS that has been continuously managed for > 20 years, for predominantly annual crops.
Land-use (F <sub>LU</sub> )	Rewetting (Years 1–20)	Boreal, temperate, and tropical	Dry and moist	0.80	10%	Represents cropland with IWMS that has undergone rewetting (restoration of natural hydrology) and may or may not be under active crop production.
	Rewetting (Years 21–40)			1.0	N/A	
A ± two standard deviations, expressed as a percentage of the mean.						
B The long-term cultivation factor is used for areas that have been drained and are cultivated for crop production. In the case of rewetted Cropland, stock change factors for land-use (F <sub>LU</sub> ) for rewetting are used for two sets of 20-year periods (i.e. 0–20 and 21–40 years since rewetting).						

The following are the key considerations in the application of the new stock change factors to Cropland with IWMS subject to long-term cultivation and rewetting (Table 5.3) for land remaining in a land-use category:

- The stock change factors for SOC in mineral soils provided for Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, and Settlements in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are applicable to *all* managed lands with IWMS, classified as land remaining in a land-use category under any of the land-use categories.
- The new stock change factors for long-term cultivation and rewetting of Cropland with IWMS provided in this supplement (Table 5.3) should be applied to *Cropland Remaining Cropland with IWMS*, taking account of the following:
  - (i) The new stock change factor for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) for Cropland with IWMS under long-term cultivation in this supplement should be used in place of the existing stock change factor for Cropland under long-term cultivation for all mineral soil types provided in Table 5.5, Chapter 5, Volume 4 in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.
  - (ii) The stock change factors for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) for Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting should be used for *Cropland Remaining Cropland* according to the following:
    - For Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting, for the first 20 years following the initial year of rewetting, the final SOC stock i.e. SOC stocks in the last year of an inventory time period ( $SOC_0$ ) is determined using  $F_{LU} = 0.80$ , along with the other stock change factors for management and input. The stock change factors used for estimating the initial SOC stocks ( $SOC_{(0-T)}$ ) will correspond to the Cropland land use (long-term cultivated, perennial, etc.) and management and input regimes prior to rewetting.
    - For the next set of 20 years (i.e. 21–40 years since the initial year of rewetting),  $F_{LU} = 1$  should be used to estimate the final SOC stock ( $SOC_0$ ) along with appropriate stock change factors for management and input. The stock change factors for estimating the initial stocks ( $SOC_{(0-T)}$ ) will correspond to the rewetted Cropland land-use ( $F_{LU} = 0.8$ ) and management and input regimes at 20 years following rewetting.

- For the period longer than 40 years following the initial year of rewetting,  $F_{LU}$  will remain 1. The changes in SOC stocks as a result of changes in management/input regimes in Cropland with IWMS may be estimated using appropriate stock change factors from Table 5.2, Chapter 5, Volume 4 in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Box 5.3 shows an example calculation using the stock change factors for land use ( $F_{LU}$ ) for Cropland with IWMS under long-term cultivation, and for Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting.

## Tier 2

A Tier 2 approach involves the estimation of country-specific stock change factors. It is *good practice* to derive values for a higher resolution classification of management and climate if there are significant differences in the stock change factors among more disaggregated categories based on an empirical analysis. Reference SOC stocks can also be derived from country-specific data in a Tier 2 approach. Additional guidance is provided in Section 2.3.3.1, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

## Tier 3

In a Tier 3 approach, constant stock change rate factors *per se* are less likely to be estimated in favour of variable rates that more accurately capture land use and management effects. See Section 2.3.3.1, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for further discussion.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

At a minimum, activity data consist of areas of managed lands with IWMS remaining in a land-use category stratified by land-use category, climate region, soil type, and management practices. In addition, the areas of Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting need to be stratified by time since rewetting (0–20 or 21–40 years since rewetting) for the correct application of stock change factors. If the compiler does not have sufficient information to disaggregate areas of rewetted Cropland with IWMS by the time since conversion, all rewetted Cropland with IWMS areas can be assumed to be within 0–20 years of rewetting, and thus  $F_{LU} = 0.8$  could be applied to the entire rewetted Cropland with IWMS. Total areas should be determined according to the approaches outlined in Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and should be consistent with those reported under other sections of the inventory. Stratification of land-use categories according to climate region, based on default or country-specific classifications, can be accomplished with overlays of land use on climate and soil maps. In the case of using methods such as models, and/or data as proxies for estimation, clear and complete documentation is encouraged for transparency.

## Tier 1

The Tier 1 approach requires area of managed land on IWMS for each land-use category stratified by climate region and soil type. As an initial approach, available land cover/land-use maps, either country-specific or based on global datasets such as IGBP\_DIS (<http://daac.ornl.gov>), can be joined with soil and climate maps (country-specific, or global maps such as ISRIC, <http://www.isric.org>, or FAO, <http://www.fao.org/home/en>). A global GIS database that shows the spatial distribution of generalized soil classes used for IPCC Tier 1 is available for download and use at <http://isirc.org/data/ipcc-default-soil-classes-derived-harmonized-world-soil-data-base-ver-11>. The database is derived from the Harmonized World Soil Database and FAO soil classifications, and includes the seven default IPCC soils classes, including Wetland Soils (termed “Wetland Soils” in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and “Wetland Mineral Soils” in this supplement) (Batjes, 2010b). This dataset may be used at national and broader scales where more detailed soil information is lacking.

Classification systems for activity data for a Tier 1 inventory are provided in the respective land-use chapters of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Land-use activity data and management activity data specific to the respective land-use category are typically required for a Tier 1 approach. Although no organisation catalogues changes in area as a result of rewetted or created wetlands either nationally or globally, local activity data for rewetting of managed lands with IWMS or the creation of wetlands may be obtained from agricultural, forestry, or natural resources agencies, non-governmental conservation organisations, or other government sources. In addition, organisations such as the Society for Ecological Restoration (<http://www.ser.org>), the Global Restoration Network (<http://www.globalrestorationnetwork.org>), Wetlands International (<http://www.wetlands.org>), and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (<http://www.ramsar.org>) may be sources of information for rewetting and wetland creation projects.

## Tier 2

Tier 2 approaches are likely to involve a more detailed stratification of management systems, under the respective land-use category, than Tier 1 approaches if sufficient data are available. This may include further divisions of management practices and finer stratification of climate regions. At Tier 2, a higher spatial resolution of activity data is required and may be obtained by disaggregating global data into country-specific categories or by collecting country-specific activity data.

### Tier 3

Tier 3 approaches may include the use of empirical, process-based or other types of models and/or direct measurement-based inventories. In this case more detailed data on climate, soils, and management practices are needed, as compared to Tier 1 and 2 methods. The exact requirements will be dependent on the model or measurement design. Examples of model input data include activity data on cropland management practices (crop type, tillage practices, fertilizer and organic amendments), as well as climate, soil, biomass, and water table position (Ogle *et al.*, 2010; Zhang *et al.*, 2002).

### CALCULATION STEPS FOR TIER 1

The steps for estimating  $SOC_0$ ,  $SOC_{(0-T)}$  and net soil organic carbon stock change per hectare for managed land with IWMS for land remaining in a land-use category are as follows:

**Step 1:** Organize data into time series according to the years in which activity data were collected.

**Step 2:** Classify land into the appropriate management system in accordance with its respective land-use category.

**Step 3:** Determine areas of managed land with IWMS under each land-use category for lands remaining in that land-use category, disaggregated according to climate region at the beginning of the first inventory time period. The first year of the inventory time period will depend on the time step of the activity data (0-T; e.g. 5, 10, or 20 years ago).

**Step 4:** Assign a native reference SOC stock value ( $SOC_{REF}$ ) for IWMS from Table 5.2, based on climate region.

**Step 5:** Assign a land-use factor ( $F_{LU}$ ), management factor ( $F_{MG}$ ), and organic matter input factor ( $F_I$ ) based on the management classification for the respective land-use category (Step 2). Values for  $F_{LU}$ ,  $F_{MG}$ , and  $F_I$  are provided in the respective chapters relating to land-use categories; an updated value for long-term cultivation  $F_{LU}$  is given in Table 5.3 for IWMS in Cropland.

**Step 6:** Multiply the appropriate stock change factors ( $F_{LU}$ ,  $F_{MG}$ ,  $F_I$ ) by  $SOC_{REF}$  to estimate an ‘initial’ SOC stock ( $SOC_{(0-T)}$ ) for the inventory time period.

**Step 7:** Estimate the final SOC stock ( $SOC_0$ ) by repeating Steps 1 to 5 using the same  $SOC_{REF}$ , but with land use, management, and input factors that represent conditions for the managed land in the last (year 0) inventory year.

**Step 8:** Estimate the average annual change in SOC stocks for managed land on IWMS remaining in a land-use category ( $\Delta C_{Mineral}$ ) by subtracting the  $SOC_{(0-T)}$  from  $SOC_0$  and then dividing by the time dependence of the stock change factors (D) which is 20 years for default factors. If an inventory time period is greater than 20 years, then divide by the difference in the initial and final year of the time period.

**Step 9:** Repeat steps 2 to 8 if there are additional inventory time periods.

**Box 5.3****EXAMPLE CALCULATIONS FOR SOC STOCKS IN LONG-TERM CULTIVATED CROPLAND WITH IWMS, AND  
REWETTING OF LONG-TERM CULTIVATED CROPLAND WITH IWMS**

Assume an area with a cold temperate, dry climate. A crop is newly cultivated on an IWMS. For the first 20 years after the initiation of cultivation, the SOC will decrease linearly by 71% (see 0.71 as default value in Table 5.3) down to a depth of 30 cm. From Table 5.2, it can be seen that the reference SOC for this climate region is 87 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>. After 20 years of cultivation, the amount of SOC will be 61.8 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> (87 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> × 0.71 = 61.8 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>), which represents a loss of 25.2 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> over the 20 years, or 1.26 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>. After 20 years, it is assumed that the SOC is stable at 61.8 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>.

If we take this same soil and rewet it following drainage for crop production, the SOC will be 80% of the reference condition after 20 years, or 69.6 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> (87 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> × 0.80 = 69.6 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>). The increase from 61.8 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> (from calculation above) is 7.8 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> or 0.39 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> for the first 20 years. From year 21–40, the SOC will increase an additional 20% (1.0–0.8 from Table 5.3) so that at year 40 the SOC is at the reference level of 87 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> (Table 5.2). In the Tier 1 method, the SOC is assumed to accrue linearly from years 21–40. The difference between the SOC at year 20 (69.6 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>) and year 40 (87.0 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>) is 17.4 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>, thus the annual accrual rate is 0.87 tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> between years 21 and 40.

**UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT**

Three broad sources of uncertainty exist in soil C inventories: 1) uncertainties in land use and management activity, and environmental data; 2) uncertainties in reference soil carbon stocks if using a Tier 1 or 2 approach, or initial conditions if using a Tier 3 approach; and 3) uncertainties in the stock change/emission factors for Tier 1 or 2 approaches, model structure/parameter error for Tier 3 model-based approaches, or measurement error/sampling variability associated with Tier 3 measurement-based inventories. In general, precision of an inventory is increased and confidence ranges are smaller with more sampling to estimate values for the three broad sources of uncertainty, while reducing bias (i.e. improve accuracy) is more likely to occur as a result of development of a higher tier inventory that incorporates country-specific information. An additional source of uncertainty arises from the difficulty in accurately mapping wetlands for the purposes of classification under soil or vegetation types and different management activities, for example; this has been an issue since inventory methods were first developed (Cowardin, 1982), and still continues even with advances in technology and remote sensing techniques (Arnesen *et al.*, 2013). As mapping techniques tend to rely on vegetation and soils information, defining the area of IWMS is especially difficult because their vegetation range from marsh to forested systems, and soils range from near organic to near non-wetland mineral. Moreover, the extent of areas subject to water table variation and flooding may increase or decrease frequently, depending on interannual climate variability and management activities. However, given no dramatic changes in hydrology, wetland soil and vegetation properties will remain consistent over time, even with interannual climate variability, and mapped areas should remain relatively unchanged.

For Tier 1, uncertainties are provided alongside the reference SOC stocks in Table 5.2, and stock change factors in the respective land-use category chapters in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and Table 5.3 for the updated F<sub>LU</sub>. Uncertainties in land-use and management data will need to be addressed by the inventory compiler, and combined with uncertainties for the default factors and reference SOC stocks using an appropriate method, such as simple error propagation equations. If using aggregate land-use area statistics for activity data (e.g. FAO data), the inventory compiler may need to apply a default level of uncertainty for the land area estimates (±50%). It is *good practice* to apply country-specific uncertainty estimates to country-specific area estimates rather than use a default level. Default reference SOC stocks and stock change factors for mineral soils can have inherently high uncertainties when applied to specific countries. The defaults represent globally averaged values of land-use and management impacts or reference SOC stocks that may deviate from region-specific values (Powers *et al.*, 2004; Ogle *et al.*, 2006). Bias can be reduced by deriving country-specific factors using a Tier 2 method or by developing a Tier 3 country-specific estimation system. The underlying basis for higher Tier approaches will be experiments or soil carbon monitoring data in the country or neighbouring regions that address the effect of land use and management on soil carbon and/or can be used to evaluate model predictions of soil carbon change (e.g. Ogle *et al.*, 2010). Further reduction in bias can be obtained by accounting for significant within-country differences in land-use and management impacts, such as variation among climate regions and/or soil types, even



at the expense of reduced precision in the factor estimates (Ogle *et al.*, 2006). Bias is considered more problematic for reporting stock changes because it is not necessarily captured in the uncertainty range (i.e. the true stock change may be outside of the reported uncertainty range if there is significant bias in the factors).

Uncertainties in land-use activity statistics may be reduced through a better national system, such as developing or extending a ground-based survey with additional sample locations and/or incorporating remote sensing to provide additional coverage. It is *good practice* to design a classification that captures the majority of land-use and management activities with a sufficient sample size to minimize uncertainty at the national scale.

## 5.2.2 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from managed lands with IWMS

Management activities that alter the water table level on lands containing IWMS can impact CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from those areas. Two common management activities that involve raising water table levels include the rewetting of previously drained IWMS, and the creation of wetlands on wet or dry mineral soils. Both rewetting and wetland creation are often undertaken as conservation efforts for habitat and wildlife. Studies have shown that raising water table levels on managed lands with IWMS, through rewetting and/or wetland creation, can increase CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Pennock *et al.*, 2010; Badiou *et al.*, 2011; Nahlik and Mitsch, 2010; Herbst *et al.*, 2011; Yang *et al.*, 2012). Here we provide guidance for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions as a result of raising the water table level on managed lands with IWMS; drainage and lowering water tables typically results in lower or negligible CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Morse *et al.*, 2012). In a modeling study of global CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, Spahni *et al.* (2011) suggest that IWMS that are not inundated, but have soil moisture content above a critical threshold, can still be a net CH<sub>4</sub> source. Due to the lack of studies, however, we are unable to develop guidance for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained IWMS at this time.

Although our current understanding of the processes involved in CH<sub>4</sub> production and emission is improving, it remains difficult to estimate CH<sub>4</sub> emissions with a high degree of confidence due mainly to the large spatial variability, as well as to seasonal and interannual variability in the controlling factors such as water level and temperature. Studies show high spatial variability in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions across large areas that have similar climate, vegetation, and topography, and within small areas that have microscale variations in topography (Ding *et al.*, 2003; Saarnio *et al.*, 2009). In addition, there are very few studies into CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted or created wetlands on managed lands with IWMS in Europe (Saarnio *et al.*, 2009), tropical regions (Mitsch *et al.*, 2010), and certain regions of North America. Therefore, the default emission factors we present will necessarily have large uncertainties. Due to the relative lack of data on rewetted and created wetlands with IWMS, we have included studies of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from natural wetlands on IWMS in the development of default emission factors (see Annex 5A.2 for further details).

### 5.2.2.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

#### Tier 1

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from managed lands on IWMS, or dry mineral soils, where management activities have resulted in the water table being raised to, or above, the land surface are estimated using a simple emission factor approach (Equation 5.1), stratified by climate region. The default methodology considers boreal, temperate, and tropical climate regions.

**EQUATION 5.1**  
**ANNUAL CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM REWETTED AND CREATED WETLANDS ON MANAGED LANDS WITH IWMS**

$$CH_{4-IWMS} = \sum_c (A_{IWMS} \bullet EF_{CH_4-IWMS})_c$$

Where:

CH<sub>4-IWMS</sub> = Annual CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from managed lands on IWMS where management activities have raised the water table level to or above the land surface, kg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>

A<sub>IWMS, c</sub> = Total area of managed lands with mineral soil where the water table level has been raised in climate region c, ha

EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>-IWMS, c</sub> = Emission factor from managed lands with mineral soil where water table level has been raised in climate region c, kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>

The area of managed lands with IWMS, or dry mineral soil, where water table level has been raised, should be stratified by climate region (boreal, temperate, or tropical), and the appropriate emission factor applied.

## Tier 2

The Tier 2 approach uses country-specific emission factors based on information on important parameters such as water table level and hydroperiod. It is *good practice* when developing and using country-specific emission factors to consider the water table position and its relationship to CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Annual CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from IWMS are generally larger when the water table is continuously at or above the land surface, rather than intermittently at or below the land surface (Annex 5A.2). Seasonal and interannual changes in water table position, and duration above the land surface, are determined by multiple variables including fluctuations in water source such as river discharge in the case of riparian wetlands, as well as evapotranspiration and precipitation.

## Tier 3

A Tier 3 approach involves a detailed consideration of the dominant drivers of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from IWMS, including but not limited to: water table position; seasonal changes in inundation; temperature of soils; importance of CH<sub>4</sub> ebullition; and vegetation community dynamics. CH<sub>4</sub> ebullition is a poorly quantified component of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from inundated soils, but has been shown to be a significant contributor to annual CH<sub>4</sub> emission in some systems (Wilson *et al.*, 1989). Vegetation can have important implications for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, by facilitating transport from inundated soils to the atmosphere, and by providing a substrate for CH<sub>4</sub> production. Possible methods to determine the importance of these drivers to CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, and thus to reduce uncertainty in emission factors, include detailed field studies of CH<sub>4</sub> emission and/or the use of models specific to carbon cycling in wet soils, such as the Wetland-DNDC model (Zhang *et al.*, 2002; <http://www.globaldndc.net>).

### 5.2.2.2 CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

#### Tier 1

The default emission factors for IWMS (EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>-IWMS</sub>), stratified by climate region, are provided in Table 5.4. The Tier 1 emission factors do not distinguish between continuous and intermittent inundation, as they were derived from studies covering a range of inundation durations, therefore capturing a degree of variability in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions (Annex 5A.2). The uncertainties in the EFs can be reduced by using country-specific EFs that incorporate information on water table position and period of inundation at higher Tier levels.

TABLE 5.4 DEFAULT EMISSION FACTORS FOR CH <sub>4</sub> FROM MANAGED LANDS WITH IWMS WHERE WATER TABLE LEVEL HAS BEEN RAISED			
Climate Region	EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub>-IWMS</sub> (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	95% Confidence Interval <sup>A</sup>	Number of Studies
Boreal	76	±76 <sup>B</sup>	1 <sup>C</sup>
Temperate	235	±108	21
Tropical	900	±456	18
<sup>A</sup> The 95% confidence interval is calculated from the mean, standard deviation, and the critical values of the t distribution, according to the degrees of freedom. These are not expressed as a percentage of the mean. <sup>B</sup> Bridgman <i>et al.</i> (2006) <sup>C</sup> This study (Bridgman <i>et al.</i> , 2006) is a synthesis of numerous studies; see publication for details.			

### 5.2.2.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

The Tier 1 method requires data on areas of managed lands with IWMS where the water table level has been raised, for instance as in rewetting or wetland creation, stratified by climate region. Although no organisation catalogues changes in area as a result of rewetting or wetland creation, either nationally or globally, local activity data for rewetting of managed lands with IWMS or the creation of wetlands may be obtained from agricultural, forestry, or natural resources agencies, non-governmental conservation organisations, or other government sources. In addition, organisations such as the Society for Ecological Restoration (<http://www.ser.org>), the Global Restoration Network (<http://www.globalrestorationnetwork.org>), Wetlands International

(<http://www.wetlands.org>), and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (<http://www.ramsar.org>) may be used as sources of information for rewetting and/or wetland creation projects. In addition to the above, Tier 2 and Tier 3 methods generally require the areas of managed lands with IWMS stratified by annual average water table level, and the seasonal and/or interannual changes in inundation. For the development of country-specific emission factors and models, areas may be further stratified by vegetation community composition, vegetation biomass, soil temperature, and previous land-use. The use of Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) on the Japanese Satellite JERS, for example, can improve the accuracy of the quantification of inundated areas, by overcoming the bias caused by clouds in more common satellite imagery on the visible spectrum (e.g. Landsat images). Also, higher resolution satellite images (e.g. QuickBird) can reduce uncertainties in land-use and vegetation classifications.

#### 5.2.2.4 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

Estimates of uncertainty for  $EF_{CH_4-IWMS}$ , as  $\pm 95\%$  Confidence Interval, are provided in Table 5.4 for each climate region. Major sources of uncertainty in these values are the small number of studies on which the estimates are based, and the combination of studies with different inundation periods (continuously-inundated and intermittently-inundated). The development of country-specific emission factors will aid in reducing uncertainty.

### 5.3 LAND CONVERTED TO A NEW LAND-USE CATEGORY

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* define land converted to a new land-use category as lands that have been converted in the last 20 years as a default period. The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provide generic and land-use category-specific guidance (Chapters 2, Chapters 4-9, Volume 4) for estimating carbon stock changes in the carbon pools and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from managed land on mineral soils for land converted to a new land-use category for all land-use categories. This chapter updates the guidance provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* on changes in SOC stocks and non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from managed lands with IWMS that have been classified as land converted to a new land-use category in all six land-use categories.

#### 5.3.1 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and removals

The set of general equations used to estimate the annual carbon stock changes of carbon pools in land remaining in a land-use category for managed lands with IWMS are given in Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, and these will also apply to managed lands with IWMS for land converted to a new land-use category.

Figure 1.3, Chapter 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* presents a decision tree for the identification of appropriate methodological Tier for the inventory of land converted to a new land-use category.

##### 5.3.1.1 BIOMASS AND DEAD ORGANIC MATTER

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.1 also applies to lands converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS. The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should be used.

#### CHOICE OF METHOD AND EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.1 also applies to lands converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS. The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should be used.

#### CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

The activity data consist of areas of managed lands with IWMS in land converted to a new land-use category, stratified by land-use category, climate region, soil type, and management practices, at a minimum. The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.1 also applies to lands converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS. The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should be used.

## UNCERTAINTY

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.1 also applies to lands converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS. The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should be used.

### 5.3.1.2 SOIL CARBON

Conversion of land on IWMS to other land uses can result in an increase in SOC stocks (e.g. in Forest Land; see Chapter 4, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*) or a decrease in SOC stocks (e.g. in Cropland; see Chapter 5, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). In general, the guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS. However, there are specific applications of the new SOC stock change factors for rewetting, depending on the specific land-use conversion (see Choice of Emission/Removal Factors below for details). The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should be used.

## CHOICE OF METHOD

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS. The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should be used.

## CHOICE OF EMISSION/REMOVAL FACTORS

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.2 also applies to all land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS in any land-use category, including the updated  $SOC_{REF}$  for IWMS (Table 5.2) and the updated and new stock change factors ( $F_{LU}$ , Table 5.3). The following are the key considerations in the application of stock change factors for managed lands with IWMS:

- The stock change factors for SOC stock changes in mineral soils provided for Forest, Cropland, Grassland, and Settlements in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are applicable for *all* land-use conversions (both to and from), involving managed lands with IWMS classified under any of the land-use categories.
- The new stock change factors for long-term cultivation and rewetting of Cropland with IWMS provided in this supplement (Table 5.3) can be applied to land-use conversions involving Cropland taking account of the following:
  - (i) The new stock change factor for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) for Cropland with IWMS under long-term cultivation provided in this supplement should be used in place of the existing stock change factor for Cropland under long-term cultivation for all mineral soil types provided in Table 5.5, Chapter 5, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.
  - (ii) The stock change factors for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) for Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting can be used for land-use conversions involving Cropland in the following ways:
    - For land-use conversion to Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting, the final SOC stock ( $SOC_0$ ) is determined using  $F_{LU} = 0.80$  for a period of 0–20 years following the first year of rewetting, along with the relevant stock change factors corresponding to the management and input regimes after land-use conversion. The stock change factors used for estimating the initial SOC stocks ( $SOC_{(0-T)}$ ) should correspond to the land use, management and input regimes before the land-use conversion.
    - For Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting undergoing land-use conversion to any other land-use category,  $F_{LU} = 1$  should be used for a period of 21–40 years, or more than 40 years since the first year of rewetting activity respectively, along with relevant stock change factors corresponding to the management and input regime before conversion. The stock change factors for land-use, management and input for the new land-use category (e.g. Forest Land or Grassland) should be used to determine the final SOC stock ( $SOC_0$ ) along with relevant stock change factors corresponding to the management and input regimes following the land-use conversion.
    - The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should also be used.

## CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

The activity data consist of areas of managed lands with IWMS in land converted to a new land-use category stratified by land-use category, climate region, soil type, management practices, and time since conversion, at a minimum. The area of Cropland with IWMS subject to rewetting need to be stratified by the time since rewetting

(0–20 or 21–40 years since rewetting) for the correct application of stock change factors. If the compiler does not have sufficient information to disaggregate the areas of rewetted Cropland with IWMS by the time since conversion, all the areas of rewetted Cropland with IWMS can be assumed to be within 0–20 years of rewetting, and therefore  $F_{LU} = 0.8$  may be applied to the entire rewetted Cropland with IWMS. The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS.

## UNCERTAINTY

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.1.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS where the water table has been raised. The guidance in sections pertaining to land converted to a new land-use category in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* should also be used.

### 5.3.2 CH<sub>4</sub> emissions

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS.

#### 5.3.2.1 CHOICE OF METHOD AND EMISSION FACTORS

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS.

#### 5.3.2.2 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

The activity data consist of areas of managed lands with IWMS in land converted to a new land-use category, stratified by land-use category, climate region, soil type, and management practices, at a minimum. The guidance provided in Section 5.2.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS.

#### 5.3.2.3 UNCERTAINTY ASSESSMENT

The guidance provided in Section 5.2.2 also applies to land converted to a new land-use category for managed lands with IWMS.

## 5.4 COMPLETENESS, REPORTING AND DOCUMENTATION

### 5.4.1 Completeness

It is *good practice* to disaggregate the types of managed lands with IWMS according to national circumstances and employ country-specific emission factors if possible. It is suggested that flooded lands (including reservoirs), peatlands, and coastal wetlands, are clearly excluded from land with IWMS, and that this separation is applied consistently throughout the reporting period.

Where guidance not provided for IWMS in this Chapter for some lands, some climates, some carbon pools, and some GHGs, it is the result of a lack of relevant data that allow the development of emission factors. Countries are encouraged to develop new research and accounting practices to fill gaps to better account for changes in carbon stocks and GHG emissions and removals from drained wetlands, rewetted wetlands, or created wetlands on lands with IWMS.

General guidance on consistency in time-series is given in Chapter 7 of this supplement. The classification of land, criteria for using activity data and emission factors and inventory methods should also be consistent with the generic methodologies described in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and in this supplement. Chapter 6, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and Chapter 7 of this supplement provide general guidance on the issues concerning Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC).

### 5.4.2 Reporting and Documentation

General guidance on reporting and documentation is given in Chapter 8, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Section 7.4.4, Chapter 7, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* states the following with regard to reporting and documentation.

## **EMISSION FACTORS**

The scientific basis for new country-specific emission factors, parameters and models should be fully described and documented. This includes defining the input parameters and describing the process by which the emission factors, parameters, and models were derived, as well as describing sources of uncertainties.

## **ACTIVITY DATA**

Sources of all activity data used in the calculations including data sources, databases and soil map references, should be recorded, as well as communications with industry subject to any confidentiality considerations. This documentation should include the frequency of data collection and estimation, estimates of accuracy and precision, and reasons for any significant changes in emission levels.

## **TREND ANALYSIS**

Any significant fluctuations in emissions between years should be explained. A distinction should be made between changes in activity levels and changes in emission factors, parameters and methods from year to year, and the reasons for these changes documented. If different emission factors, parameters and methods are used for different years, then the reasons for this should be explained and documented.

## Annex 5A.1 Estimation of default stock change factors for long-term cultivated Cropland and rewetting with Inland Wetland Mineral Soil carbon emissions/removals

Default stock change factors that were computed using a dataset of experimental results for land use are provided in Table 5.3. The land-use factor for long-term cultivation represents the loss of SOC that occurs after 20 years of continuous cultivation. The rewetting factor represents the effect of the restoration of natural hydrology of cultivated cropland with IWMS (such as through the removal of drainage tiles, or plugging of drainage ditches), which may or may not have continued crop production. The influence of this change on IWMS SOC stocks may continue up to 40 years. Experimental data (citations listed below, and provided in the list of references) were analysed in linear mixed-effects models, accounting for both fixed and random effects (Ogle *et al.*, 2005). Fixed effects included depth and the number of years since a management change. For depth, data were not aggregated but included SOC stocks measured for each depth increment (e.g. 0–5 cm, 5–10 cm, and 10–30 cm) as a separate point in the dataset. Similarly, time series data were not aggregated, despite those measurements being made on the same plots. Consequently, random effects were used to account for the dependencies in times-series data and among data points representing different depths from the same study. If significant, a country-level random effect was used to assess an additional uncertainty associated with applying a global default value to a specific country. This is included in the default uncertainties. The long-term cultivation factor represents the average loss of SOC at 20 years or longer time period following cultivation of IWMS. Users of the Tier 1 method can approximate the annual change in SOC storage by dividing the inventory estimate by 20. The rewetting factor represents the average net gain in SOC after rewetting of cultivated cropland, 20 and 40 years after the first year of rewetting. Variance was calculated for each of the factor values, and can be used with simple error propagation methods, or to construct probability distribution functions with a normal density.

**TABLE 5A.1.1**  
**STUDIES USED FOR THE DERIVATION OF DEFAULT SOC STOCK CHANGE FACTORS**

Study	Location	Stock Change Factor (LC = Long-term cultivation; R = Rewetting)
Badiou <i>et al.</i> , 2011	Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba, Canada	LC, R
Ballantine <i>et al.</i> , 2009	New York, USA	R
Bedard-Haughn <i>et al.</i> , 2006	Saskatchewan, Canada	LC
Besatie <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Wisconsin, USA	LC, R
David <i>et al.</i> , 2009	Illinois, USA	LC
Euliss <i>et al.</i> , 2006	North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, Iowa, USA	LC, R
Gleason <i>et al.</i> , 2009	North Dakota, USA	R
Huang <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Sanjiang Plain, China	LC
Hunter <i>et al.</i> , 2008	Louisiana, USA	LC, R
Jacinthe <i>et al.</i> , 2001	Ohio, USA	LC
Lu <i>et al.</i> , 2007	Lake Taihu, China	LC, R
Meyer <i>et al.</i> , 2008	Nebraska, USA	LC, R
Morse <i>et al.</i> , 2012	North Carolina, USA	LC
Norton <i>et al.</i> , 2011	California, USA	LC
van Wesemael <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Belgium	LC
Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Sanjiang Plain, China	LC, R

## Annex 5A.2 Estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors for managed lands with Inland Wetland Mineral Soils, or dry mineral soils, where the water table has been raised

The Tier 1 default emission factors in Table 5.4 were derived from the published studies listed in Table 5A.2.1. The number of studies of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted IWMS as a result of rewetting of drained IWMS, and from wetted mineral soils as a result of wetland creation, is very limited. They are also restricted to temperate climate regions. Thus, studies of CH<sub>4</sub> emission from natural IWMS were included to derive emission factors from boreal and tropical regions, and to supplement the number of studies in temperate region. Studies varied in their reporting of emissions: some reported annual fluxes, while others reported seasonal fluxes or mean daily fluxes. In the case of seasonal or daily flux reporting, an annual flux was estimated by assuming that no emissions occurred during cold seasons and/or by applying mean daily fluxes to part or all of the annual period depending on the climate region and/or specific recommendations made by the study authors.

Climate region	Wetland type	Location	Annual period of inundation	CH <sub>4</sub> emission (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux measurement method	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux reported	Reference
Boreal	Natural wetlands	Canada	Unspecified	76	Chamber, EC	Annual	Bridgman <i>et al.</i> , 2006
Temperate	Restored wetlands, previous use Cropland	Canada	Intermittent	49	Chamber	Mean daily	Badiou <i>et al.</i> , 2011
Temperate	Restored wetlands, previous use Cropland	Canada	Intermittent	349	Chamber	Annual (modified for diurnal variation as stated in study)	Pennock <i>et al.</i> , 2010
Temperate	Restored wetlands, previous use Cropland	North Dakota, USA	Intermittent	142	Chamber	Mean daily	Gleason <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Temperate	Restored wetlands, previous use Cropland	North Carolina, USA	Intermittent	7	Chamber	Annual	Morse <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Temperate	Restored wetland, previous use Cropland	Denmark	Intermittent	110	EC	Annual (minus emissions from cattle on-site as stated in study)	Herbst <i>et al.</i> , 2011
Temperate	Created wetlands, riparian	China	Intermittent	13	Chamber	Annual (diffusive and ebullitive fluxes combined)	Yang <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Temperate	Created wetlands	Ohio, USA	Continuous	402	Chamber	Annual (mean of two different years from same site)	Nahlik and Mitsch, 2010; Altor and Mitsch,
Temperate	Natural wetland, marsh	Nebraska, USA	Continuous	800	EC	Annual	Kim <i>et al.</i> , 1999



**TABLE 5A.2.1(CONTINUED)**  
**CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM RESTORED AND CREATED WETLANDS WITH IWMS WHERE WATER TABLE LEVEL HAS BEEN RAISED, AND NATURAL WETLANDS, USED TO DERIVE DEFAULT VALUE FOR EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub>**

Climate region	Wetland type	Location	Annual period of inundation	CH <sub>4</sub> emission (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux measurement method	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux reported	Reference
Temperate	Natural wetlands, marshes	Sanjiang Plain, NE China	Continuous	468	Chamber	Annual	Ding and Cai, 2007
Temperate	Natural wetlands, <i>Carex</i> marshes	Sanjiang Plain, NE China	Continuous	434	Chamber	Annual (as reported in Ding and Cai, 2007)	Song <i>et al.</i> , 2003
Temperate	Natural wetland, riparian	Ohio, USA	Continuous	758	Chamber	Annual	Nahlik and Mitsch, 2010
Temperate	Natural wetlands, <i>Decussata</i> marshes	Sanjiang Plain, NE China	Intermittent	289	Chamber	Annual (as reported in Ding and Cai, 2007)	Song <i>et al.</i> , 2003
Temperate	Natural wetlands, riparian	Georgia, USA	Intermittent	226	Chamber	Annual	Pulliam, 1993
Temperate	Natural wetlands, marshes	Sanjiang Plain, NE China	Intermittent	225	Chamber	Annual	Huang <i>et al.</i> , 2010
Temperate	Natural wetlands, marsh	Sanjiang Plain, NE China	Intermittent	58	Chamber	Annual	Song <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Temperate	Natural wetlands, shrub swamp	Sanjiang Plain, NE China	Intermittent	3	Chamber	Annual	Song <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Temperate	Natural wetlands, swamps	Global	Intermittent	113	Chamber	Mean daily	Bartlett and Harriss, 1993
Temperate	Natural wetlands, marshes	Global	Intermittent	105	Chamber	Mean daily	Bartlett and Harriss, 1993
Temperate	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Global	Intermittent	72	Chamber	Mean daily	Bartlett and Harriss, 1993
Temperate	Natural wetlands	Continental USA	unspecified	76	Chamber, EC	Annual	Bridgham <i>et al.</i> , 2006
Tropical	Natural wetlands, rainforest swamp	Costa Rica	Continuous	2930	Chamber	Annual	Nahlik and Mitsch, 2011
Tropical	Natural wetlands, alluvial marsh	Costa Rica	Intermittent	3500	Chamber	Annual	Nahlik and Mitsch, 2011

**TABLE 5A.2.1(CONTINUED)**  
**CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM RESTORED AND CREATED WETLANDS WITH IWMS WHERE WATER TABLE LEVEL HAS BEEN RAISED, AND NATURAL WETLANDS, USED TO DERIVE DEFAULT VALUE FOR EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub>**

Climate region	Wetland type	Location	Annual period of inundation	CH <sub>4</sub> emission (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux measurement method	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux reported	Reference
Tropical	Natural wetlands, swamps	Global	Intermittent	297	Chamber	Mean daily	Bartlett and Harriss, 1993
Tropical	Natural wetlands, marshes	Global	Intermittent	419	Chamber	Mean daily	Bartlett and Harriss, 1993
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Global	Intermittent	328	Chamber	Mean daily	Bartlett and Harriss, 1993
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Amazon, Upper Negro Basin	Intermittent	54	Chamber, Ebullition funnel	Annual	Belger <i>et al.</i> , 2011
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Pantanal, Brazil (Arara-Azul)	Intermittent	516	Chamber	Mean daily	Marani and Alvala, 2007
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Pantanal, Brazil (Bau)	Intermittent	1033	Chamber	Mean daily	Marani and Alvala, 2007
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Pantanal, Brazil (Sao Joao)	Intermittent	510	Chamber	Mean daily	Marani and Alvala, 2007
Tropical	Natural wetlands, flooded forests	Solimoes/Amazon floodplain	Intermittent	567	Chamber	Annual (as reported in Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	Melack and Forsberg, 2001
Tropical	Natural wetlands, aquatic macrophytes	Solimoes/Amazon floodplain	Intermittent	184	Chamber	Annual (as reported in Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	Melack and Forsberg, 2001
Tropical	Natural wetlands, flooded forests	Jau River basin floodplains/Amazon	Intermittent	306	Chamber	Annual (as reported in Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	Rosenqvist <i>et al.</i> , 2002
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Mojos basin/Amazon	Intermittent	948	Chamber	Annual	Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Roraima/ Amazon	Intermittent	1341	Chamber	Annual	Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Bananal	Intermittent	954	Chamber	Annual	Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Orinoco	Intermittent	951	Chamber	Annual	Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004

**TABLE 5A.2.1(CONTINUED)**  
**CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM RESTORED AND CREATED WETLANDS WITH IWMS WHERE WATER TABLE LEVEL HAS BEEN RAISED, AND NATURAL WETLANDS, USED TO DERIVE DEFAULT VALUE FOR EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub>**

Climate region	Wetland type	Location	Annual period of inundation	CH <sub>4</sub> emission (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux measurement method	CH <sub>4</sub> Flux reported	Reference
Tropical	Natural wetlands, floodplains	Pantanal	Intermittent	949	Chamber	Annual	Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004
Tropical	Natural wetlands, flooded forest, aquatic macrophytes, open water	Solimoes/Amazon floodplain	Continuous & Intermittent	404	Chamber	Annual	Melack <i>et al.</i> , 2004

The climate region with the greatest number of studies is the temperate region, including natural and created/rewetted wetlands, and sites under continuous and intermittent inundation. We tested for differences in CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors between wetland types (natural vs. created/rewetted wetlands under intermittent inundation) and hydrologic regime (continuous vs. intermittent inundation) using paired Student's t-test, two-tailed, at a significance level of  $\alpha=0.05$  to: 1) determine whether it is valid to include studies of natural wetlands in the development of CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors from created/rewetted wetlands; and 2) determine whether there is a significant difference in CH<sub>4</sub> emission between continuously and intermittently inundated wetlands.

There is no significant difference in the CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for natural vs. created/rewetted wetlands under intermittent inundation located in temperate regions (Table 5A.2.2; t-test value = 0.24). Therefore the inclusion of studies of natural wetlands in the development of the CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors for created/rewetted wetlands on IWMS is valid for temperate regions. As there are not sufficient studies on created/rewetted wetlands on IWMS in boreal or tropical regions to carry out the same analysis, we make the assumption that, as above, there is no significant difference between the CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from natural and created/rewetted wetlands in boreal or tropical regions, and thus include studies of natural wetlands in the development of the CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors.

**TABLE 5A.2.2**  
**CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM TEMPERATE, CREATED/REWETTED WETLANDS AND NATURAL WETLANDS WITH IWMS**

Climate region	Wetland type	Mean CH <sub>4</sub> emission (kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	Standard deviation	95% confidence interval <sup>A</sup>	Number of studies
Temperate	Created/Rewetted	153	160	±148	7 <sup>B</sup>
	Natural	136	99	±83	8 <sup>C</sup>

Note: All values are derived from studies of temperate wetlands listed in Table 5A.2.1.

A The 95% confidence interval is calculated from the mean, standard deviation, and the critical values of t distribution, according to the degrees of freedom.

B The studies used to determine this value are listed in Table 5A.2.1: Altor and Mitsch, 2008 and Nahlik and Mitsch, 2010 (mean value for the same system determined by two studies); Gleason *et al.*, 2009; Pennock *et al.*, 2010; Badiou *et al.*, 2011; Herbst *et al.*, 2011; Morse *et al.*, 2012; and Yang *et al.*, 2012.

C The studies used to determine this value are listed in Table 5A.2.1; Pulliam, 1993; Bartlett and Harriss, 1993 (n=3 wetland types); Song *et al.*, 2003; Song *et al.*, 2009 (n=2 wetland types); Huang *et al.*, 2010.

There is a significant difference in CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for temperate region wetlands (created/rewetted and natural wetlands are combined) under the two hydrologic regimes (Table 5A.2.3; t-test value = 6.47,  $p<0.0001$ ). This highlights the importance of the period of inundation in annual CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Thus, the development of country-specific emission factors that incorporate the period of inundation will reduce uncertainties.

<b>TABLE 5A.2.3</b> <b>CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM TEMPERATE, REWETTED, CREATED AND NATURAL WETLANDS WITH IWMS, STRATIFIED BY PERIOD OF INUNDATION</b>					
<b>Climate region</b>	<b>Annual period of inundation</b>	<b>Mean CH<sub>4</sub> emission (kg CH<sub>4</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>	<b>95% confidence interval<sup>A</sup></b>	<b>Number of studies</b>
Temperate	Continuous	572	191	±125	5 <sup>B</sup>
	Intermittent	126	108	±75	14 <sup>C</sup>
<p>Note: All values are derived from studies of temperate wetlands listed in Table 5A.2.1.</p> <p>A The 95% confidence interval is calculated from the mean, standard deviation, and the critical values of the t distribution, according to the degrees of freedom.</p> <p>B The studies used to determine this value are listed in Table 5A2.1; Kim et al., 1999; Song et al., 2003 (<i>Carex</i> marshes); Ding and Cai, 2007; Altor and Mitsch, 2008; Nahlik and Mitsch, 2010.</p> <p>C The studies used to determine this value are listed in Table 5A2.1; Pulliam, 1993; Bartlett and Harriss, 1993 (n=3 wetland types); Song et al., 2003 (<i>Deyeuxia</i> marshes); Song et al., 2009 (n=2 wetland types); Huang <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Badiou <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Pennock <i>et al.</i>, 2010; Gleason <i>et al.</i>, 2009; Morse <i>et al.</i>, 2012; Herbst <i>et al.</i>, 2011; Yang <i>et al.</i>, 2012.</p>					

## Appendix 5a.1 Future methodological development

Lands with IWMS occupy significant areas in some countries and are important carbon stock compartments; conversion of this land to other uses and management practices can potentially affect these stocks. However, at the time of preparation of this supplement, except for changes in SOC stocks and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in rewetted/created wetlands on lands with IWMS, and changes in SOC stocks as a result of long-term cultivation and rewetting on Croplands with IWMS, little information was available to provide emission factors specific to different land uses and management practices, or to derive emission factors for N<sub>2</sub>O.

Particular effort should be made to differentiate between multiple uses on lands with IWMS (e.g. wetland forest and wetland grasslands) for future methodological improvements. A good example of the methodological approach necessary for this task can be found in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Report to the Congress (Dahl, 2011). This document describes how wetland inventories have been made in the United States and, although not providing figures for SOC stock changes, gives reference for future work to obtain such data with the National Wetland Condition Assessment (NWCA), with methods described in detail at [www.epa.gov/wetlands/survey](http://www.epa.gov/wetlands/survey). Another example of a methodological approach for assessing carbon stocks and GHG fluxes at a national level is found in a United States Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report (Zhu *et al.*, 2010). This document describes SOC stock changes and GHG emissions from managed and unmanaged lands and it may serve as a useful example for a national-level carbon assessment. Surveys that quantify the areas of land on IWMS under different land use and management practices, in conjunction with carbon pool quantification, allow the future application of the general equations for carbon stock changes that are described in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Other databases are available that contain flux information (mainly CO<sub>2</sub> measured with the eddy covariance technique) at the ecosystem level, including IWMS (e.g. [www.ghg-europe.eu](http://www.ghg-europe.eu), [fluxnet.ornl.gov](http://fluxnet.ornl.gov), [ameriflux.ornl.gov](http://ameriflux.ornl.gov), [www.tern-supersites.net.au](http://www.tern-supersites.net.au) and [fluxnet.ccrp.ec.gc.ca](http://fluxnet.ccrp.ec.gc.ca)).

New research is needed to fill a number of gaps for IWMS. Additional studies are needed to evaluate the effects of IWMS land-use conversion on SOC stock changes following conversion to Grassland, Forest Land, Settlements and Other Land. Moreover, new research is needed to understand the effect of IWMS conversion on other carbon stocks (biomass, dead organic matter) as well as CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes. Although we were able to develop guidance for CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from IWMS for some climate regions, specific guidance for climate and region combinations would improve our estimates of CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes. New research assessing N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes following conversion of IWMS to other land-uses, especially Cropland, would add considerably to our ability to assess GHG impacts and develop Tier 2 methods for GHG fluxes. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from IWMS are typically very low, unless there is a significant input of organic or inorganic nitrogen from runoff. Such inputs typically result from anthropogenic activities such as agricultural fertilizer application (Hefting *et al.*, 2006; Phillips and Beeri, 2008; DeSimone *et al.*, 2010), or Grassland management (Chen *et al.*, 2011; Oates *et al.*, 2008; Liebig *et al.*, 2012; Jackson *et al.*, 2006; Holst *et al.*, 2007; Walker *et al.*, 2002). A review of the current literature suggests there is insufficient data to provide robust emission factors and methodology to estimate N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from IWMS at this time. We suggest that N<sub>2</sub>O emissions should be more thoroughly addressed in future updates to this guidance, as research on this topic progresses. For future methodological improvement of N<sub>2</sub>O emission factors, it is important to avoid double-counting N<sub>2</sub>O emissions already accounted for properly according to Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

Fully functional models that consider the influence of changes in hydrology on carbon cycling and GHG fluxes cannot be developed or tested until more databases are available for IWMS. Process-based models such as Wetland-DNDC (Zhang *et al.*, 2002) have substantial capabilities but have not been tested or calibrated across IWMS. Future model testing and development on IWMS could lead to development of Tier 3 approaches for IWMS.

## References

- Aber, J. S., Pavri, F. & Aber, S. W. Environmental Cycles and Feedback. In: *Wetland environments: A Global Perspective*: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Altor, A. E. & Mitsch, W. J. (2008) Methane and carbon dioxide dynamics in wetland mesocosms: Effects of hydrology and soils. *Ecological Applications* **18**(5): 1307-1320.
- Arnesen, A. (2013) Monitoring flood extent in the lower Amazon River floodplain using ALOS/PALSAR ScanSAR images. *Remote Sensing of the Environment* **130**: 51-61.
- Badiou, P., McDougal, R., Pennock, D. & Clark, B. (2011) Greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration potential in restored wetlands of the Canadian prairie pothole region. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **19**(3): 237-256.
- Bai, J., Cui, B., Deng, W., Yang, Z., Wang, Q. & Ding, Q. (2007) Soil organic carbon contents of two natural inland saline-alkaline wetlands in northeastern China. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* **62**: 447-452.
- Ballantine, K. & Schneider, R. (2009) Fifty-five years of soil development in restored freshwater depressional wetlands. *Ecological Applications* **19**(6): 1467-1480.
- Bartlett, K. B. & Harriss, R. C. (1993) Review and assessment of methane emissions from wetlands. *Chemosphere* **26**(1-4): 261-320.
- Batjes, N. H. (2009) Harmonized soil profile data for applications at global and continental scales: updates to the WISE database. *Soil Use and Management* **25**(2): 124-127.
- Batjes, N. H. (2010a) A global framework for soil organic carbon stocks under native vegetation for use with the simple assessment option of the Carbon Benefits Project system. In: p. 72. Wageningen: Carbon Benefits Project (CBP) and ISRIC World Soil Information.
- Batjes, N. H. (2010b) IPCC default soil classes derived from the Harmonized World Soil Data Base (Ver. 1.1). In: *Report 2009/02b, Carbon Benefits Project (CBP) and ISRIC – World Soil Information, Wageningen (with dataset)*. [http://www.isirc.org/isric/Webdocs/Docs/ISIRC\\_Report\\_2009\\_02.pdf](http://www.isirc.org/isric/Webdocs/Docs/ISIRC_Report_2009_02.pdf).
- Batjes, N. H. (2011) Soil organic carbon stocks under native vegetation - Revised estimates for use with the simple assessment option of the Carbon Benefits Project system. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **142**(3-4): 365-373.
- Bedard-Haughn, A., Jongbloed, F., Akkennan, J., Uijl, A., de Jong, E., Yates, T. & Pennock, D. (2006) The effects of erosional and management history on soil organic carbon stores in ephemeral wetlands of hummocky agricultural landscapes. *Geoderma* **135**: 296-306.
- Belger, L., Forsberg, B. R. & Melack, J. M. (2011) Carbon dioxide and methane emissions from interfluvial wetlands in the upper Negro River basin, Brazil. *Biogeochemistry* **105**(1-3): 171-183.
- Besasio, N. J. & Buckley, M. E. (2012) Carbon Sequestration Potential at Central Wisconsin Wetland Reserve Program Sites. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **76**(5): 1904-1910.
- Bridgham, S., Megonigal, J., Keller, J., Bliss, N. & Trettin, C. (2006) The carbon balance of North American wetlands. *Wetlands* **26**(4): 889-916.
- Brinson, M. & Malvarez, A. (2002) Temperate freshwater wetlands: types, status, and threats. *Environmental Conservation* **29**(2): 115-133.
- Cabezas, A., Comin, F. A., Begueria, S. & Trabucchi, M. (2009) Hydrologic and landscape changes in the Middle Ebro River (NE Spain): implications for restoration and management. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* **13**(2): 273-284.
- Chen, H., Wang, M., Wu, N., Wang, Y., Zhu, D., Gao, Y. & Peng, C. (2011) Nitrous oxide fluxes from the littoral zone of a lake on the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau. *Environmental monitoring and assessment* **182**: 545-553.
- Chen, H., Wu, N., Gao, Y. H., Wang, Y. F., Luo, P. & Tian, J. Q. (2009) Spatial variations on methane emissions from Zoige alpine wetlands of Southwest China. *Science of the Total Environment* **407**(3): 1097-1104.
- Cowardin, L. (1982) Some conceptual and schematic problems in wetland classification and inventory. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* **10**(1): 57-60.

- Dahl, T. (2011) Status and Trends of Wetlands on the Conterminous United States 2004 to 2009. In: ed. U. S. Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *Report to the Congress*. 107 pgs.
- David, M. B., McIsaac, G. F., Darmody, R. G. & Omonode, R. A. (2009) Long-Term Changes in Mollisol Organic Carbon and Nitrogen. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **38**(1): 200-211.
- DeSimone, J., Macrae, M. & Bourbonniere, R. (2010) Spatial variability in surface N<sub>2</sub>O fluxes across a riparian zone and relationships with soil environmental conditions and nutrient supply. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* **138**(1-2): 1-9.
- Ding, W. X. & Cai, Z. C. (2007) Methane emission from natural wetlands in China: Summary of years 1995-2004 studies. *Pedosphere* **17**(4): 475-486.
- Ding, W. X., Cai, Z. C., Tsuruta, H. & Li, X. P. (2003) Key factors affecting spatial variation of methane emissions from freshwater marshes. *Chemosphere* **51**(3): 167-173.
- Dynesius, M. & Nilsson, C. (1994) Fragmentation and flow regulation of river systems in the northern 3rd of the world. *Science* **266**(5186): 753-762.
- Euliss, N. H., Gleason, R. A., Olness, A., McDougal, R. L., Murkin, H. R., Robarts, R. D., Bourbonniere, R. A. & Warner, B. G. (2006) North American prairie wetlands are important nonforested land-based carbon storage sites. *Science of the Total Environment* **361**(1-3): 179-188.
- FAO. World reference base for soil resources. *World Soil Resources Report* 84.
- Gleason, R. A., Tangen, B. A., Browne, B. A. & Euliss, N. H., Jr. (2009) Greenhouse gas flux from cropland and restored wetlands in the Prairie Pothole Region. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* **41**(12): 2501-2507.
- Hammer, D. A. (1989) *Constructed wetland for wastewater treatment – municipal, industrial and agricultural*. Chelsea, Michigan, USA: Lewis Publishers.
- Hefting, M., Bobbink, R. & Janssens, M. (2006) Spatial variation in denitrification and N<sub>2</sub>O emission in relation to nitrate removal efficiency in a n-stressed riparian buffer zone. *Ecosystems* **9**(4): 550-563.
- Herbst, M., Friborg, T., Ringgaard, R. & Soegaard, H. (2011) Interpreting the variations in atmospheric methane fluxes observed above a restored wetland. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **151**(7): 841-853.
- Holst, J., Liu, C., Yao, Z., Bruggemann, N., Zheng, X., Han, X. & Butterbach-Bahl, K. (2007) Importance of point sources on regional nitrous oxide fluxes in semi-arid steppe of Inner Mongolia, China. *Plant and Soil* **296**(1-2): 209-226.
- Huang, Y., Sun, W., Zhang, W., Yu, Y., Su, Y. & Song, C. (2010) Marshland conversion to cropland in northeast China from 1950 to 2000 reduced the greenhouse effect. *Global Change Biology* **16**(2): 680-695.
- Hunter, R. G., Faulkner, S. P. & Gibson, K. A. (2008) The importance of hydrology in restoration of bottomland hardwood wetland functions. *Wetlands* **28**(3): 605-615.
- Hupp, C. R. (1992) Riparian vegetation recovery patterns following stream channelization: a geomorphic perspective. *Ecology* **73**(4): 1209-1226.
- IPCC. (2006) *IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. Japan: IGES.
- Jacinthe, P. A., Lal, R. & Kimble, J. M. (2001) Organic carbon storage and dynamics in croplands and terrestrial deposits as influenced by subsurface tile drainage. *Soil Science* **166**(5): 322-335.
- Jackson, R., Allen-Diaz, B., Oates, L. & Tate, K. (2006) Spring-water nitrate increased with removal of livestock grazing in a California oak savanna. *Ecosystems* **9**(2): 254-267.
- Kim, J., Verma, S. B. & Billesbach, D. P. (1999) Seasonal variation in methane emission from a temperate Phragmites-dominated marsh: effect of growth stage and plant-mediated transport. *Global Change Biology* **5**(4): 433-440.
- Kleiss, B. A. (1996) Sediment Retention in a Bottomland Hardwood Wetland in Eastern Arkansas. *Wetlands* **16**(3): 321-333.
- Lavoie, M., Pare, D. & Bergeron, Y. (2005) Impact of global change and forest management on carbon sequestration in northern forested peatlands. *Env. Rev.* **13**(4): 199-240.
- Liebig, M., Dong, X., Melain, J. & Dell, C. (2012) Greenhouse gas flux from managed grasslands in the U.S. In: *Managing agricultural greenhouse gases: Coordinated agricultural research through GRACEnet to address our changing climate*, eds. M. Liebig, A. Franzluebbers & R. Follet, pp. 183-202. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Liu, C., Hoist, J., Yao, Z., Bruggemann, N., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Han, S., Han, X., Tas, B., Susenbeth, A. & Zheng, X. (2009) Growing season methane budget of an Inner Mongolian steppe. *Atmospheric Environment* **43**(19): 3086-3095.
- Lu, J. W., Wang, H. J., Wang, W. D. & Yin, C. Q. (2007) Vegetation and soil properties in restored wetlands near Lake Taihu, China. *Hydrobiologia* **581**: 151-159.
- Marani, L. & Alvala, P. C. (2007) Methane emissions from lakes and floodplains in Pantanal, Brazil. *Atmospheric Environment* **41**(8): 1627-1633.
- Melack, J. M. & Forsberg, B. (2001) Biogeochemistry of Amazon floodplain lakes and associated wetlands. In: *The Biogeochemistry of the Amazon Basin and its Role in a Changing World*, eds. M. E. McClain, R. L. Victoria & J. E. Richey, pp. 235-276. Oxford University Press.
- Melack, J. M., Hess, L. L., Gastil, M., Forsberg, B. R., Hamilton, S. K., Lima, I. B. T. & Novo, E. (2004) Regionalization of methane emissions in the Amazon Basin with microwave remote sensing. *Global Change Biology* **10**(5): 530-544.
- Meyer, C. K., Baer, S. G. & Whiles, M. R. (2008) Ecosystem recovery across a chronosequence of restored wetlands in the platte river valley. *Ecosystems* **11**(2): 193-208.
- Mitsch, W. J. & Gosselink, J. G. (2007) *Wetlands*. John Wiley & Sons, New York. 572 p.
- Mitsch, W. J., Nahlik, A., Wolski, P., Bernal, B., Zhang, L. & Ramberg, L. (2010) Tropical wetlands: seasonal hydrologic pulsing, carbon sequestration, and methane emissions. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **18**(5): 573-586.
- Mitsch, W. J., Wu, X., Nairn, R. W., Weihe, P. E., Wang, N., Deal, R. & Boucher, C. E. (1998) Creating and restoring wetlands: A whole-ecosystem experiment in self-design. *BioScience* **48**(12): 1019-1030.
- Mitsch, W. J., Zhang, L., Stefanik, K. C., Nahlik, A. M., Anderson, C. J., Bernal, B., Hernandez, M. & Song, K. (2012) Creating Wetlands: Primary Succession, Water Quality Changes, and Self-Design over 15 Years. *Bioscience* **62**(3): 237-250.
- Morse, J. L., Ardon, M. & Bernhardt, E. S. (2012) Greenhouse gas fluxes in southeastern U.S. coastal plain wetlands under contrasting land uses. *Ecological Applications* **22**(1): 264-280.
- Nahlik, A. (2011) Methane emissions from tropical freshwater wetlands located in different climatic zones of Costa Rica. *Global Change Biology* **17**: 1321-1334.
- Nahlik, A. M. & Mitsch, W. J. (2010) Methane Emissions From Created Riverine Wetlands. *Wetlands* **30**(4): 783-793.
- Nilsson, C. & Berggren, K. (2000) Alterations of riparian ecosystems caused by river regulation. *Bioscience* **50**(9): 783-792.
- Noe, G. & Hupp, C. (2005) Carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus accumulation in floodplains of Atlantic Coastal Plain rivers, USA. *Ecological Applications* **15**(4): 1178-1190.
- Norton, J. B., Jungst, L. J., Norton, U., Olsen, H. R., Tate, K. W. & Horwath, W. R. (2011) Soil Carbon and Nitrogen Storage in Upper Montane Riparian Meadows. *Ecosystems* **14**(8): 1217-1231.
- Oates, L. G., Jackson, A. R. D. & Allen-Diaz, B. (2008) Grazing removal decreases the magnitude of methane and the variability of nitrous oxide emissions from spring-fed wetlands of a California oak savanna. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **16**: 395-404.
- Ogle, S. (2005) Agricultural management impacts on soil organic matter storage under moist and dry climatic conditions of temperate and tropical regions. *Biogeochemistry* **72**(1): 87-121.
- Ogle, S. M., Breidt, F. J., Easter, M., Williams, S., Killian, K. & Paustian, K. (2010) Scale and uncertainty in modeled soil organic carbon stock changes for US croplands using a process-based model. *Global Change Biology* **16**(2): 810-822.
- Ogle, S. M., Breidt, F. J. & Paustian, K. (2006) Bias and variance in model results associated with spatial scaling of measurements for parameterization in regional assessments. *Global Change Biology* **12**(3): 516-523.
- Page, K. & Dalal, R. (2011) Contribution of natural and drained wetland systems to carbon stocks, CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes: an Australian perspective. *Soil Research* **49**(5): 377-388.
- Parton, W. J., Hartman, M., Ojima, D. & Schimel, D. (1998) Daycent and Its Land Surface Submodel: Description and Testing. *Global and Planetary Change* **19**(1-4): 35-48.



- Parton, W. J., Ojima, D. S. & Schimel, D. S. (1994) Environmental-Change in Grasslands - Assessment Using Models. *Climatic Change* **28**(1-2): 111-141.
- Parton, W. J., Schimel, D. S., Cole, C. V. & Ojima, D. S. (1987) Analysis of factors controlling soil organic matter levels in Great Plains grasslands. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **51**: 1173-1179.
- Pennock, D., Yates, T., Bedard-Haughn, A., Phipps, K., Farrell, R. & McDougal, R. (2010) Landscape controls on N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from freshwater mineral soil wetlands of the Canadian Prairie Pothole region. *Geoderma* **155**(3-4): 308-319.
- Phillips, R. & Beeri, O. (2008) The role of hydopedologic vegetation zones in greenhouse gas emissions for agricultural wetland landscapes. *Catena* **72**(3): 386-394.
- Poff, N. L., Allan, J. D., Bain, M. B., Karr, J. R., Prestegard, K. L., Richter, B. D., Sparks, R. E. & Stromberg, J. C. (1997) The natural flow regime. *Bioscience* **47**(11): 769-784.
- Powers, J. S., Read, J. M., Denslow, J. S. & Guzman, S. M. (2004) Estimating soil carbon fluxes following land-cover change: a test of some critical assumptions for a region in Costa Rica. *Global Change Biology* **10**(2): 170-181.
- Pulliam, W. M. (1993) Carbon dioxide and methane exports from a southeastern floodplain swamp. *Ecological Monographs* **63**(1): 29-53.
- Rodriguez-Murillo, J. C., Almendros, G. & Knicker, H. (2011) Wetland soil organic matter composition in a Mediterranean semiarid wetland (Las Tablas de Daimiel, Central Spain): Insight into different carbon sequestration pathways. *Organic Geochemistry* **42**(7): 762-773.
- Rosenqvist, A., Forsberg, B. R., Pimentel, T., Rauste, Y. A. & Richey, J. E. (2002) The use of spaceborne radar data to model inundation patterns and trace gas emissions in the central Amazon floodplain. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* **23**(7): 1303-1328.
- Saarnio, S., Winiwarter, W. & Leitaio, J. (2009) Methane release from wetlands and watercourses in Europe. *Atmospheric Environment* **43**(7): 1421-1429.
- Semeniuk, C. & Semeniuk, V. (1995) A geomorphic approach to global classification for inland wetlands. *Vegetatio* **118**(1-2): 103-124.
- Shaw, P. A. & Bryant, R. G. (2011) Chapter 15: Pans, Playas and Salt Lakes. In: *Arid Zone Geomorphology: Process, Form and Change in Drylands, Third Edition*, ed. D. S. G. Thomas, pp. 373-401. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd.
- Song, C., Xu, X., Tian, H. & Wang, Y. (2009) Ecosystem-atmosphere exchange of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O and ecosystem respiration in wetlands in the Sanjiang Plain, Northeastern China. *Global Change Biology* **15**(3): 692-705.
- Song, C. C., Yan, B. X., Wang, Y. S., Wang, Y. Y., Lou, Y. J. & Zhao, Z. C. (2003) Fluxes of carbon dioxide and methane from swamp and impact factors in Sanjiang Plain, China. *Chinese Science Bulletin* **48**(24): 2749-2753.
- Spahni, R., Wania, R., Neef, L., van Weele, M., Pison, I., Bousquet, P., Frankenberg, C., Foster, P. N., Joos, F., Prentice, I. C. & van Velthoven, P. (2011) Constraining global methane emissions and uptake by ecosystems. *Biogeosciences* **8**(6): 1643-1665.
- Staff, S. S. *Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition.* Natural Resources Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436.
- van Wesemael, B., Paustian, K., Meersmans, J., Goidts, E., Barancikova, G. & Easter, M. (2010) Agricultural management explains historic changes in regional soil carbon stocks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **107**(33): 14926-14930.
- Walker, J., Geron, C., Vose, J. & Swank, W. (2002) Nitrogen trace gas emissions from a riparian ecosystem in southern Appalachia. *Chemosphere* **49**(10): 1389-1398.
- Wang, Y., Liu, J. S., Wang, J. D. & Sun, C. Y. (2012) Effects of Wetland Reclamation on Soil Nutrient Losses and Reserves in Sanjiang Plain, Northeast China. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture* **11**(3): 512-520.
- Wilson, J. O., Crill, P. M., Bartlett, K. B., Sebachner, D. I., Harriss, R. C. & Sass, R. L. (1989) Seasonal variation of methane emissions from a temperate swamp. *Biogeochemistry* **8**(1): 55-71.
- Yang, L., Lu, F., Wang, X. K., Duan, X. N., Song, W. Z., Sun, B. F., Chen, S., Zhang, Q. Q., Hou, P. Q., Zheng, F. X., Zhang, Y., Zhou, X. P., Zhou, Y. J. & Ouyang, Z. Y. (2012) Surface methane emissions from different land use types during various water levels in three major drawdown areas of the Three Gorges Reservoir. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* **117**.

- Yao, Z. (2010) Spatial variability of N<sub>2</sub>O, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes within the Xilin River catchment of Inner Mongolia, China: a soil core study. *Plant and Soil* **331**: 341-359.
- Zhang, Y., Li, C. S., Trettin, C. C., Li, H. & Sun, G. (2002) An integrated model of soil, hydrology, and vegetation for carbon dynamics in wetland ecosystems. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **16**(4).
- Zhu, Z. (2010) A method for assessing carbon stocks, carbon sequestration, and greenhousegas fluxes in ecosystems of the United States under present conditions and future scenarios. In: *U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report*, p. 190.

## **CHAPTER 6**

---

# **CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT**

### **Coordinating Lead Authors**

Yoshitaka Ebie (Japan) and Sirintornthep Towprayoon (Thailand)

### **Lead Authors**

Chart Chiemchaisri (Thailand), Ülo Mander (Estonia) and Sandra Furlan Nogueira (Brazil)

### **Contributing Author**

Baasansuren Jamsranjav (IPCC TFI TSU)

### **Review Editors**

Christopher Gordon (Ghana) and Detelina Rumyanova Petrova (Bulgaria)

## Contents

6	Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.....	5
6.1	Introduction .....	5
6.1.1	Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.....	5
6.1.2	Relation to <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .....	8
6.2	Methane emissions from constructed wetlands.....	10
6.2.1	Methodological issues.....	10
6.2.1.1	Choice of method.....	11
6.2.1.2	Choice of emission factors .....	13
6.2.1.3	Choice of activity data.....	13
6.2.2	Time series consistency.....	14
6.2.3	Uncertainties.....	14
6.2.4	QA/QC, Completeness and Reporting .....	15
6.3	Nitrous oxide emissions from constructed wetlands .....	16
6.3.1	Methodological issues.....	16
6.3.1.1	Choice of method.....	16
6.3.1.2	Choice of emission factors .....	19
6.3.1.3	Choice of activity data.....	19
6.3.2	Time series consistency.....	20
6.3.3	Uncertainties.....	20
6.3.4	QA/QC, Completeness and Reporting .....	20
	References.....	22
	Annex 6A.1 Estimation of default emission factors for CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O in constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment .....	25

## Equations

Equation 6.1	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from constructed wetlands .....	11
Equation 6.2	CH <sub>4</sub> emission factor for constructed wetlands .....	13
Equation 6.3	Total organically degradable material in domestic wastewater .....	14
Equation 6.4	Total organically degradable material in industrial wastewater .....	14
Equation 6.5	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from constructed wetlands .....	16
Equation 6.6	Total nitrogen in domestic wastewater .....	19
Equation 6.7	Total nitrogen in industrial wastewater .....	19

## Figures

Figure 6.1	Classification and configuration of constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment .....	6
Figure 6.2	Wastewater treatment systems and discharge pathways .....	9
Figure 6.3	Decision tree for CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from constructed wetlands .....	12
Figure 6.4	Decision tree for N <sub>2</sub> O emission from constructed wetland .....	18
Figure 6A1.1	The relationship between inflow TOC loading and CH <sub>4</sub> -C emission (left column) and between inflow TN loading and N <sub>2</sub> O-N emission (right columns) in SF, HSSF, and VSSF CWs. In all cases, $p < 0.05$ . .....	26

## Tables

Table 6.1	Selected factors impacting CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O emissions in constructed wetlands .....	8
Table 6.2	Influent total organic carbon (TOC) and total nitrogen (TN) values, relevant CH <sub>4</sub> -C and N <sub>2</sub> O-N emissions, and share (%) of CH <sub>4</sub> -C and N <sub>2</sub> O-N in the initial loading of TOC and TN in constructed wetlands .....	8
Table 6.3	Coverage of wastewater types and greenhouse gas emissions from constructed wetlands ....	10
Table 6.4	Methane Correction Factors by type of constructed wetland .....	13
Table 6.5	Default uncertainty ranges for domestic and industrial wastewater .....	15
Table 6.6	Example of N content in some nitrogen-rich industrial wastewater .....	20
Table 6.7	Nitrous oxide methodology default uncertainties .....	20
Table 6A1. 1	Average, standard error, median, 2.5% and 97.5% percentile values of CH <sub>4</sub> -C and N <sub>2</sub> O-N emission factors (%) for different types of constructed wetlands .....	25

## 6 CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

#### 6.1.1 Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment

Wetland ecosystems can act as sources, sinks, or transformers of nutrients and carbon (C) (Mitsch and Gosselink, 1993). This ability of wetlands has led to a widespread use of natural and constructed wetlands (CWs) for water quality improvement (Brix, 1997).

Constructed wetlands systems are fully human-made wetlands for wastewater treatment, which apply various technological designs, using natural wetland processes, associated with wetland hydrology, soils, microbes and plants. Thus, CWs are engineered systems that have been designed and constructed to utilize the natural processes involving wetland vegetation, soils, and their associated microbial assemblages to assist in treating wastewater. Synonymous terms to “constructed” include “man-made”, “engineered” or “artificial” (Vymazal, 2007).

“Semi-natural treatment wetlands” (SNTWs) for wastewater treatment are natural wetland systems that have been modified for this purpose. Modifications made within these systems are usually based on increasing the volume of water reserved (i.e. dams) and constructing channels for targeting the influent and effluent. These systems can be found in both freshwater and coastal wetlands. The functioning of SNTWs is similar to those of surface flow CWs.

This chapter only provides guidance for CWs and SNTWs for wastewater treatment. Decision tree for finding the appropriate guidance chapter within this supplement or the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006 IPCC Guidelines)* is provided as Figure 1.1 in Chapter 1 of this supplement.

It is *good practice* that reporting of emissions from wastewater treatment be complete, covering all domestic and industrial wastewater. CW is a wastewater treatment pathway not specifically described in *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. It is *good practice* that countries apply the guidance in this chapter on “constructed wetlands”, if emissions from CWs represent a key wastewater treatment pathway. In accordance with Chapter 4 of Volume 1, those subcategories that together contribute more than 60 percent to a *key category* should be treated as significant<sup>1</sup>. When wastewater treatment is identified as a *key category*, key pathways are identified in the same way as significant subcategories. When countries have access to data and information on wastewater treatment by CWs, it is a *good practice* to use this guidance to estimate emissions from CWs.

Emissions from CWs and SNTWs must be reported in the waste sector. If freshwater and coastal wetlands are modified to SNTWs, inventory compilers should check with relevant land-use category in this supplement to avoid double-counting. Constructed wetlands and SNTWs can be used to improve the quality of collected wastewater including domestic wastewater, industrial wastewater such as wastewater from processing factories of agricultural products and dairy farms, collected runoff from agricultural lands and leachate from landfills. For some wastewaters, CWs are the sole treatment; for others, they are one component in a sequence of treatment processes (US EPA, 1995).


There are various types of CWs used for treatment of wastewater, the following paragraphs highlight the main classification of CWs.

#### TYPE OF CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT

Constructed wetlands may be categorized according to various design parameters, but the three most important criteria are hydrology (water surface flow and subsurface flow), macrophyte growth form (emergent, submerged, free-floating, and floating leaved plants) and flow path (horizontal and vertical) (see Figure 6.1; Vymazal 2007, 2011). Different types of CWs may be combined (which are called hybrid or combined systems) to utilize the specific advantages of the different systems. For instance, to guarantee more effective removal of ammonia and total nitrogen (N), during the 1990s and 2000s an enhanced design approach combined vertical and horizontal flow CWs to achieve higher treatment efficiency (Vymazal, 2011).

<sup>1</sup> An assessment of significance can be based on expert judgment following the protocol described in Annex 2A.1 of Chapter 2, Volume 1 of *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Protocol for Expert Elicitation). Information concerning the percentage of population connected to wastewater treatment, which may facilitate expert judgment can be obtained from international sources (notably UNSTAT or FAO).

**Figure 6.1**      **Classification and configuration of constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment**



Note: Adapted from Vymazal, 2007, 2011. Lower part is original. Most of SNTWs represent surface flow type wetlands.

### Constructed Wetlands with Surface Flow

Constructed wetlands with *surface flow* (SF), known as *free water surface CWs*, contain areas of open water and floating, submerged, and emergent plants (Kadlec and Wallace 2008). The shallow water depth, low flow velocity, and presence of plant stalks and litter regulate water flow and, particularly in long, narrow channels (Crites *et al.* 2005), ensure better water purification. The most common applications for SF CWs are for tertiary treatment of municipal wastewater and also for stormwater runoff and mine drainage waters (Kadlec and Knight 1996; Kadlec and Wallace 2008). SF CWs are suitable in all climates, including the far north (Mander and Jenssen 2003).

### Constructed Wetlands with Subsurface Flow

In *horizontal subsurface flow constructed wetlands* (HSSF CWs), the wastewater flows from the inlet and flows slowly through the porous medium under the surface of a bed planted with emergent vegetation to the outlet where it is collected before leaving via a water level control structure (Vymazal *et al.*, 1998). During passage the wastewater comes into contact with a network of aerobic, anoxic, and anaerobic zones. Most of the bed is anoxic/anaerobic because of permanent saturation of the beds. The aerobic zones occur around roots and rhizomes that leak oxygen into the substrate (Brix 1987). HSSF CWs are commonly sealed with a liner to prevent seepage and to ensure the controllable outflow. HSSF CWs are commonly used for secondary treatment of municipal wastewater although many other applications have been reported in the literature (Vymazal and Kröpfelova 2008). The oxygen transport capacity in these systems is insufficient to ensure aerobic decomposition, thus, anaerobic processes play an important role in HSSF CWs (Vymazal and Kröpfelova 2008). Some HSSF CWs, having the ability to insulate the surface of the bed, are capable of operation under colder conditions than SF systems (Mander and Jenssen 2003).



*Vertical subsurface flow constructed wetlands* (VSSF CWs) comprise a flat bed of graded gravel topped with sand planted with macrophytes. VSSF CWs are fed with large intermittent wastewater flows, which flood the surface of the bed, then percolate down through the bed and are collected by a drainage network at the bottom. The bed drains completely which allows air to refill the bed. Thus, VSSF CWs provide greater oxygen transfer into the bed, producing a nitrified (high  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) effluent (Cooper *et al.*, 1996; Cooper 2005). Consequently, VSSF CWs do not provide suitable conditions for denitrification to complete conversion to gaseous nitrogen forms, which then escape to the atmosphere.

In recently developed tidal (“fill and drain”) flow systems better contact of wastewater with the microorganisms growing on the media is guaranteed. This significantly enhances the purification processes (Vymazal 2011).

### Hybrid Constructed Wetlands

Various types of CWs can be combined to achieve higher removal efficiency, especially for nitrogen. The design consists of two stages, several parallel vertical flow (VF) beds followed by 2 or 3 horizontal flow (HF) beds in series (VSSF-HSSF system). The VSSF wetland is intended to remove organics and suspended solids and to promote nitrification, while in HSSF wetland denitrification and further removal of organics and suspended solids occur.

Another configuration is a HSSF-VSSF system. A large HSSF bed is placed first to remove organics and suspended solids and to promote denitrification. An intermittently loaded small VF bed is used for additional removal of organics and suspended solids and for nitrification of ammonia into nitrate. To maximize removal of total N, however, the nitrified effluent from the VF bed must be recycled to a sedimentation tank (Vymazal 2011).

VSSF-HSSF and HSSF-VSSF CWs are the most common hybrid systems, but in general, any kind of CWs could be combined to achieve higher treatment efficiency (Vymazal 2007).

### GREENHOUSE GASES EMISSIONS FROM VARIOUS TYPES OF CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS

Emissions of greenhouse gases such as methane ( $\text{CH}_4$ ) and nitrous oxide ( $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ) are a byproduct of CWs, the importance of which has been increasing recently.  $\text{CH}_4$  is produced by methanogenesis whereas  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  is a product of denitrification and/or nitrification of N compounds by microorganisms. Among several environmental factors controlling the greenhouse gases emissions, the availability of C and nutrients (especially N) which directly depend on wastewater loading, temperature, hydrological regime (pulsing vs steady-state flow), groundwater depth, moisture of the filter material (water filled soil pores (WFSP)), and the presence of aerenchyma plants play a significant role (see Table 6.1).

Soil temperature, oxidation reduction potential and soil moisture (WFSP, depth of the ground water level) are the most significant factors affecting the emissions of  $\text{CH}_4$  from CWs (Mander *et al.*, 2003; Van der Zaag *et al.*, 2010). Several investigations have shown that a water table deeper than 20 cm from the surface of the wetlands and/or water-logged soils oxidizes most of the  $\text{CH}_4$  fluxes (Soosaar *et al.*, 2011; Salm *et al.*, 2012). Fluxes of  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ , however do not show a clear correlation with soil/air temperature, and significant emissions of  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  from CWs have been observed in winter (Søvik *et al.*, 2006). Likewise, freezing and thawing cycles enhance  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions (Yu *et al.*, 2011). The hydrological regime also plays a significant role in greenhouse gases emissions from CWs. Altor and Mitsch (2008) and Mander *et al.*, (2011) demonstrated that the intermittent loading (pulsing) regime and fluctuating water table in CWs enhance  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions and significantly decrease  $\text{CH}_4$  emissions.  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions, in contrast, do not show a clear pattern regarding the pulsing regime.

Table 6.2 shows  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  conversion rates derived from the relationship between the initial (input) C and N loadings and respective  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions from the main types of CWs. There is a significant positive correlation ( $p < 0.05$ ) between the initial loadings and  $\text{CH}_4$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  emissions from both SF and VSSF CWs, whereas no correlation was found for HSSF CWs types. Seemingly, high variability of conditions and combination of several factors in HSSF CWs may be the reason for that. The limited amount of available data did not allow derivation of reliable relationships for HSSF CWs. These shares (%) can be used as a base for the calculation of emission factors for Tier 1 and Tier 2 methodologies. The high emission factor for  $\text{CH}_4$  from SF CWs (Table 6.4) is thought to be due to the additional  $\text{CH}_4$  from sediments accumulated at the bottom of SF CWs.

**TABLE 6.1**  
**SELECTED FACTORS IMPACTING CH<sub>4</sub> AND N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS IN CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS**

Factors/processes	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O
Higher water/soil/air temperature	Increase in almost all cases <sup>1-6</sup> with few exceptions <sup>7</sup>	No clear relationship <sup>1-4, 7, 8</sup>
Higher moisture of soil or filter material (higher value of WFSP)	Clear increase <sup>9, 10</sup>	Decrease <sup>9, 10</sup>
Higher wastewater loading	Increase <sup>1-4, 11, 12</sup>	Increase <sup>1, 2, 4, 13</sup>
Presence of aerenchymal plants	Increase <sup>14-16</sup> Decrease (depends on conditions) <sup>17</sup>	Increase <sup>16, 18</sup> Decrease <sup>16, 19</sup>
Pulsing hydrological regime (intermittent loading)	Clear decrease <sup>9, 20</sup>	Increase <sup>9, 21, 22</sup> Decrease in some SF CWs <sup>23</sup>
Deeper water table (from the surface) in HSSF CWs	Decrease <sup>9, 10</sup>	Increase <sup>9, 10</sup>

Source:

<sup>1</sup> Mander and Jenssen 2003; <sup>2</sup> Mander *et al.*, 2005; <sup>3</sup> Teiter and Mander 2005; <sup>4</sup> Søvik *et al.*, 2006; <sup>5</sup> Kayranli *et al.*, 2010; <sup>6</sup> Van der Zaag *et al.*, 2010; <sup>7</sup> Søvik and Kløve 2007; <sup>8</sup> Fey *et al.*, 1999; <sup>9</sup> Mander *et al.*, 2011; <sup>10</sup> Yang *et al.*, 2013; <sup>11</sup> Tanner *et al.*, 1997; <sup>12</sup> Tai *et al.*, 2002; <sup>13</sup> Hunt *et al.*, 2009; <sup>14</sup> Inamori *et al.*, 2007; <sup>15</sup> Inamori *et al.*, 2008; <sup>16</sup> Wang *et al.*, 2008; <sup>17</sup> Maltais-Landry *et al.*, 2009; <sup>18</sup> Rückauf *et al.*, 2004; <sup>19</sup> Silvan *et al.*, 2005; <sup>20</sup> Altor and Mitsch 2008; <sup>21</sup> Jia *et al.*, 2011; <sup>22</sup> Van de Riet *et al.*, 2013; <sup>23</sup> Hernandez and Mitsch 2006

**TABLE 6.2**  
**INFLUENT TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON (TOC) AND TOTAL NITROGEN (TN) VALUES, RELEVANT CH<sub>4</sub>-C AND N<sub>2</sub>O-N EMISSIONS, AND SHARE (%) OF CH<sub>4</sub>-C AND N<sub>2</sub>O-N IN THE INITIAL LOADING OF TOC AND TN IN CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS**

Type of CW	Influent TOC* (mg C m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )	CH <sub>4</sub> -C emission* (mg CH <sub>4</sub> -C m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )	CH <sub>4</sub> -C/ TOC** (%)	Influent TN* (mg N m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )	N <sub>2</sub> O-N emission* (mg N <sub>2</sub> O-N m <sup>-2</sup> h <sup>-1</sup> )	N <sub>2</sub> O-N/TN** (%)
SF	1.04-173.6 (10) <sub>1-11</sub>	0.15-181.0 (10.7) <sup>1-</sup> <sub>11</sub>	42 (20)	0.76-202.8 (12) <sup>2, 3, 6-11, 21-23</sup>	0.009-0.65 (0.03) <sup>2, 6-11, 21-23</sup>	0.13 (0.02)
HSSF	15.0-2190.2 (177) <sup>8, 10-12, 15-20</sup>	0.048-17.5 (1.7) <sup>8, 10,</sup> <sub>11, 15-20</sub>	12 (6.9)	1.04-295.20 (40) <sup>6, 10, 12, 15-17,</sup> <sub>24, 25</sub>	0.014-0.89 (0.10) <sup>6, 10-12, 15-17, 25</sup>	0.79 (0.4)
VSSF	17.88-1417.50 (317) <sup>6, 8, 10, 12</sup>	0.3-5.4 (1.3) <sup>6, 8, 10, 12</sup>	1.17 (0.33)	102.5-2105.0 (155) <sup>6, 8, 10, 12-14</sup>	0.033-0.424 (0.03) <sup>6, 8, 10, 11,</sup> <sub>12-14</sub>	0.023 (0.005)


\* Range and standard error (in parentheses)

\*\* Average and standard error (in parentheses)

Source: <sup>1</sup> Tanner *et al.*, 1997; <sup>2</sup> Wild *et al.*, 2001; <sup>3</sup> Tai *et al.*, 2002; <sup>4</sup> Johansson *et al.*, 2004; <sup>5</sup> Stadmark and Leonardson 2005; <sup>6</sup> Søvik *et al.*, 2006; <sup>7</sup> Søvik and Kløve 2007; <sup>8</sup> Gui *et al.*, 2007; <sup>9</sup> Ström *et al.*, 2006; <sup>10</sup> Liu *et al.*, 2009; <sup>11</sup> Van der Zaag *et al.*, 2010; <sup>12</sup> Teiter and Mander 2005; <sup>13</sup> Inamori *et al.*, 2007; <sup>14</sup> Wang *et al.*, 2008; <sup>15</sup> Mander *et al.*, 2003; <sup>16</sup> Mander *et al.*, 2008; <sup>17</sup> Liikanen *et al.*, 2006; <sup>18</sup> Garcia *et al.*, 2007; <sup>19</sup> Picek *et al.*, 2007; <sup>20</sup> Chiemchaisri *et al.*, 2009; <sup>21</sup> Xue *et al.*, 1999; <sup>22</sup> Johansson *et al.*, 2003; <sup>23</sup> Wu *et al.*, 2009; <sup>24</sup> Inamori *et al.*, 2008; <sup>25</sup> Fey *et al.*, 1999

## 6.1.2 Relation to 2006 IPCC Guidelines

This chapter is a supplement to Chapter 6 Wastewater Treatment and Discharge of Volume 5 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. The 2006 IPCC Guidelines include a section on estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from uncollected wastewater. This *Wetlands Supplement* includes guidance on estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from CWs and SNTWs. Emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from CWs and SNTWs treating industrial wastewater are the same as those for treating domestic wastewater. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not included in greenhouse gases emissions from wastewater treatment as CO<sub>2</sub> from wastewater is considered biogenic.

**Figure 6.2 Wastewater treatment systems and discharge pathways**

Note: This figure was modified from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Emissions from boxes with bold frames are accounted for in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. This supplement provides emission factors for grey-coloured box: CWs and SNTWs for treatment of collected and uncollected wastewater.

### Coverage of wastewater types and gases

Chapter 6 of Volume 5 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines provides guidance on estimating CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from domestic wastewater using emission factors based on treatment technology. Constructed wetlands in this supplement are an additional treatment technology. The emission factors provided in this chapter cover CWs and SNTWs (collected/uncollected and treated; see Figure 6.2).

Methodology is provided for estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from both domestic and industrial wastewater (Table 6.3). Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N leaching and runoff from agricultural land are covered in Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. Emissions from processing factories of agricultural products and dairy farm wastewater, collected runoff from agricultural lands and leachate from landfills are considered as industrial wastewater. According to Chapter 3 of Volume 5 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, all amount of degradable organic carbon (DOC) in solid waste is subjected to estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> in landfill site, and carbon loss with leachate is not considered because of its low percentage. That means that CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from leachate treatment are already covered, and are not included in Section 6.2, while N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are considered in Section 6.3 of this supplement. If CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from CWs are accounted for, the amount of DOC in the leachate must be subtracted from that in the solid waste to avoid double counting. Because the C in the leachate is normally presented in terms of COD, conversion rate from COD in the leachate to TOC in the solid waste is required to subtract the amount of DOC entering the CW from that in the solid waste. This logic can be applied in Tier 2 or 3 estimation.

<b>TABLE 6.3</b> <b>COVERAGE OF WASTEWATER TYPES AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS</b>		
<b>Type of wastewater</b>	<b>Methane</b>	<b>Nitrous oxide</b>
Domestic wastewater	Included in this supplement (Section 6.2) with provision of methane correction factors (MCFs)	Included in this supplement (Section 6.3) with the provision of default emission factors
Industrial wastewater including wastewater from processing factories of agricultural products and dairy farms *	Included in this supplement (Section 6.2) with provision of MCFs	Included in this supplement (Section 6.3) with provision of default emission factors
Collected runoff from agricultural lands	Emissions can be calculated using the same methodology as for industrial wastewater and are covered in this supplement (Section 6.2)	Emissions can be calculated using the same methodology as for industrial wastewater and are covered in this supplement (Section 6.3)  Note: Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from N leaching and runoff from agricultural land are considered in Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> . If agricultural runoff is collected and treated by CWs or SNTWs, the amount of N flowing into CWs or SNTWs must be subtracted to avoid double counting.
Leachate from landfill	The amount of DOC leached from a solid waste disposal site is not considered in the estimation of DOC <sub>f</sub> . Generally the amount of DOC lost with the leachate is less than 1 percent and can be neglected in the calculations (Chapter 3, Volume 5, <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> ) and is not considered in this supplement	Emissions can be calculated using the same methodology as for industrial wastewater and are covered in this supplement (Section 6.3)

\*Dairy farm wastewater does not cover the manure itself but comes from other activities in the farm.

## 6.2 METHANE EMISSIONS FROM CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS

### 6.2.1 Methodological issues

Methane emissions are a function of the organic materials loaded into CWs and the emission factor.

Three tiers of methods for estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> from CWs are summarised below.

The Tier 1 method applies default values for the emission factor and activity parameters. This method is considered *good practice* for countries with limited data.

The Tier 2 method follows the same method as Tier 1 but allows for incorporation of country-specific emission factor and country-specific activity data. For example, a specific emission factor based on field measurements can be incorporated under this method.

The Tier 3 method is used by countries with good data and advanced methodologies. A more advanced country-specific method can be based on treatment system-specific data such as plant species, climate, temperature, seasonal effects and composition of wastewater.

In general anaerobic conditions occur in CWs. However, CH<sub>4</sub> generated by CWs is usually not recovered and combusted in a flare or energy device, and thus CH<sub>4</sub> recovery is not considered here.

The amount of vegetation harvested from CWs is generally very small and its impact on total emissions from CWs is considered insignificant. Moreover, the harvesting is usually not performed on regular basis and the quantity of harvested biomass is typically not recorded so it is not considered in this supplement.

### 6.2.1.1 CHOICE OF METHOD


A decision tree for domestic and industrial wastewater is shown in Figure 6.3.

The general equation for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from CWs treating domestic and industrial wastewater is given in Equation 6.1.

<p><b>EQUATION 6.1</b></p> <p><b>CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSIONS FROM CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS</b></p> $CH_4Emissions = \sum_j (TOW_j \cdot EF_j) + \sum_{i,j} (TOW_{i,j} \cdot EF_j)$
---

Where:

CH <sub>4</sub> emissions	=	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions in inventory year, kg CH <sub>4</sub> /yr
TOW <sub>j</sub>	=	total organics in the wastewater entering the CW in inventory year, kg BOD/yr or kg COD/yr
EF <sub>j</sub>	=	emission factor, kg CH <sub>4</sub> /kg BOD (for domestic wastewater only) or kg CH <sub>4</sub> /kg COD (for both domestic and industrial wastewater)
		If more than one type of CW is used in an industrial sector this factor would be a TOW <sub>i,j</sub> -weighted average.
<i>i</i>	=	industrial sector
<i>j</i>	=	type of CW

**Figure 6.3** Decision tree for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from constructed wetlands

### 6.2.1.2 CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

The emission factor for wastewater treatment using CWs is a function of the maximum CH<sub>4</sub> producing potential (B<sub>0</sub>) and the methane correction factor (MCF).

**EQUATION 6.2**  
**CH<sub>4</sub> EMISSION FACTOR FOR CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS**  

$$EF_j = B_0 \cdot MCF_j$$

Where:

EF <sub>j</sub>	=	emission factor, kg CH <sub>4</sub> /kg BOD or kg CH <sub>4</sub> / kg COD
j	=	type of CWs
B <sub>0</sub>	=	maximum CH <sub>4</sub> producing capacity, kg CH <sub>4</sub> /kg BOD or kg CH <sub>4</sub> / kg COD
MCF <sub>j</sub>	=	methane correction factor (fraction), See Table 6.4

*Good practice* is to use country-specific data for B<sub>0</sub>, where available, expressed in terms of kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg BOD removed for domestic wastewater or kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD removed for industrial wastewater to be consistent with the activity data. If country-specific data are not available, the following default values can be used.

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provide default B<sub>0</sub> values for domestic and industrial wastewater: 0.6 kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg BOD and 0.25 kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD, respectively

The MCF indicates the extent to which B<sub>0</sub> is realised in each type of CWs. It is an indication of the degree to which the system is anaerobic. The proposed MCFs for SF, HSSF and VSSF CWs are provided in Table 6.4 and derived from literature-based analysis of CH<sub>4</sub> conversion rates. Each MCF in Table 6.4 is calculated from the relation of initial TOC loading to CH<sub>4</sub> emission flux derived from references provided in Table 6.2.

<b>TABLE 6.4</b> <b>METHANE CORRECTION FACTORS (MCF) BY TYPE OF CONSTRUCTED WETLAND (CW)</b>		
<b>CW type</b>	<b>MCF</b>	<b>Range</b>
Surface flow (SF)	0.4	0.08-0.7
Horizontal subsurface flow (HSSF)	0.1	0.07-0.13
Vertical subsurface flow (VSSF)	0.01	0.004-0.016

These MCF values are based on actual measurement data derived under different operating and environmental conditions thus factors such as vegetation types and temperature effect have been taken into account. Based on the reported scientific data, there was insufficient information to differentiate the MCF values by vegetation type and operating temperature. Nevertheless, these influencing factors can be considered for the estimation using higher tier approach. There was insufficient actual measurement data of hybrid systems to derive default MCF values. If the area fractions of SF, VSSF and HSSF for hybrid systems can be determined, the MCF values of the hybrid systems can be estimated as the area-weighted average of the MCFs for SF, VSSF and HSSF. Most commonly, SNTWs are the SF type (Kadlec and Wallace, 2008), therefore, the default MCF of 0.4 can be used. If the type of CW cannot be recognized, the MCF for surface flow can be used as a conservative value. Otherwise country-specific data should be used in higher tier method.

### 6.2.1.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

The activity data for this source category is the amount of organic materials (TOW) in the wastewater treated by the CW. This parameter is a function of the population served by the CW system, and the biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) generation per person per day. BOD default values for selected countries are provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Table 6.4, Chapter 6 of Volume 5 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). In the case of industrial wastewater, COD loading to the CW system per day (kg COD/day) can be used. Examples of industrial wastewater data for various industries are provided in Table 6.9, Chapter 6, Volume 5 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

If industrial wastewater is released into domestic sewers, it is estimated together with domestic wastewater.

The equations for TOW are:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{EQUATION 6.3} \\ &\text{TOTAL ORGANICALLY DEGRADABLE MATERIAL IN DOMESTIC WASTEWATER} \\ &TOW_j = P_j \cdot BOD \cdot I \cdot 0.001 \cdot 365 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{EQUATION 6.4} \\ &\text{TOTAL ORGANICALLY DEGRADABLE MATERIAL IN INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER} \\ &TOW_{i,j} = COD_i \cdot W_{i,j} \cdot 365 \end{aligned}$$

Where:

$TOW_j$	=	total organics in domestic wastewater treated in the CW in inventory year (kg BOD/year)
$TOW_{i,j}$	=	total organics in wastewater from industry $i$ treated in the CW in inventory year (kg COD/year)
$i$	=	industrial sector
$P_j$	=	population whose wastewater is treated in the CW. The population should be subtracted from total the population used in Equation 6.3 in Chapter 6, Volume 5 in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> to avoid double-counting.
BOD	=	per capita BOD generation in inventory year (g BOD/person/day)
$I$	=	correction factor for additional industrial BOD discharged into sewers (for collected the default is 1.25, for uncollected the default is 1.00 as given in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> )
$COD_i$	=	COD concentration in wastewater from industry $i$ entering the CW in inventory year (kg COD/m <sup>3</sup> )
$W_{i,j}$	=	daily flow rate of industrial wastewater treated by the CW, m <sup>3</sup> /day

## 6.2.2 Time series consistency

The same method and data sets should be used for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from CWs treating wastewater for each year. The MCF for different treatment systems should not change from year to year, unless such a change is justifiable and documented. If the share of wastewater treated in different treatment systems changes over the time period, the reasons for these changes should be documented.

For activity data that are derived from population data, countries must determine the fraction of the population served by CW systems. If data on the share of wastewater treated are missing for one or more years, the splicing techniques such as use of surrogate data and extrapolation/interpolation described in Chapter 5, Time Series Consistency, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* can be used to estimate emissions. Emissions from wastewater treated in CWs typically do not fluctuate significantly from year to year.

## 6.2.3 Uncertainties

Chapter 3 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provides guidance on quantifying uncertainties in practice. It includes guidance on eliciting and using expert judgments which in combination with empirical data can provide overall uncertainty estimates. Table 6.5 provides default uncertainty ranges for emission factors and activity data for domestic and industrial wastewater. The following parameters are believed to be very uncertain:

- The quantity of wastewater that is treated in CWs or SNTWs.
- The fraction of organics that is converted anaerobically to CH<sub>4</sub> during wastewater collection. This will depend on hydraulic retention time and temperature in the wastewater collection pipeline, as well as other



factors including the presence of anaerobic condition in the wastewater collection pipeline and possibly components that are toxic to anaerobic bacteria in some industrial wastewater.

- The amount of industrial TOW from small or medium-scale industries and rural domestic wastewater that is discharged into CWs in developing countries.
- Different plant species applied in CWs that are involved in gas exchange.

TABLE 6.5 DEFAULT UNCERTAINTY RANGES FOR DOMESTIC AND INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER	
Parameter	Uncertainty range*
<b>Emission factor</b>	
Maximum CH <sub>4</sub> producing capacity (B <sub>0</sub> )	± 30%
Methane correction factor (MCF)	SF: ± 79% HSSF: ± 31% VSSF: ± 56%
<b>Activity data</b>	
Human population	± 5%
BOD per person	± 30%
Correction factor for additional industrial BOD discharged into sewers (I)	For uncollected, the uncertainty is zero %. For collected the uncertainty is ± 20%
COD loading from industrial wastewater	-55%, +103%

\* Uncertainty of MCF calculated as 95% confidence interval is shown in Table 1 in the Annex. Uncertainty in the COD loading from industrial wastewater is calculated based on Table 6.10 in Chapter 6 in Volume 5 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Others are the same to Table 6.7 in Chapter 6 in Volume 5 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

## 6.2.4 QA/QC, Completeness and Reporting

It is *good practice* to conduct quality control (QC) checks and quality assurance (QA) procedures as outlined in Chapter 6, QA/QC and Verification, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Some fundamental QA/QC procedures include:

### Activity Data

- Make sure that the sum of the wastewater flows for all types of wastewater treatment processes including CWs equal 100 percent of the wastewater collected/uncollected and treated in the country.
- Inventory compilers should compare country-specific data on BOD in domestic wastewater to IPCC default values. If the inventory compilers use country-specific values they should provide documented justification why their country-specific values are more appropriate for their national circumstances.

### Emission Factors

- For domestic wastewater, inventory compilers can compare country-specific values for B<sub>0</sub> with the IPCC default value (0.25 kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg COD or 0.6 kg CH<sub>4</sub>/kg BOD). As there are no IPCC default values for the fraction of wastewater treated anaerobically, inventory compilers are encouraged to compare values for MCFs against those from other countries with similar wastewater handling practices.
- Inventory compilers should confirm agreement between the units used for organic degradable material in wastewater (TOW) with the units for B<sub>0</sub>. Both parameters should be based on the same units (either BOD or COD) in order to calculate emissions. This same consideration should be taken into account when comparing the emissions.
- For countries that use country-specific parameters or higher-tier methods, inventory compilers should crosscheck the national estimates with emissions estimated using the IPCC default method and parameters.
- For industrial wastewater, inventory compilers should cross-check values for MCFs against those from other national inventories with similar CW types.

## COMPLETENESS

Completeness can be verified on the basis of the degree of utilization of a treatment or discharge system or pathway (T) for all wastewater treatment systems used. The sum of T should equal 100 percent. It is a *good practice* to draw a diagram for the country to consider all potential anaerobic treatment and discharge systems

and pathways, including collected and uncollected, as well as treated and untreated. CWs and SNTWs are under treated and collected/uncollected pathway. In general, the amount of vegetation harvested from CWs is very small. If vegetation biomass is removed for the purpose of composting, incineration and burning, disposal in landfills or as fertilizer on agricultural lands, the amount of biomass should be consistent with the data used in the relevant sectors.

Completeness for estimating emissions from industrial wastewater depends on accurate characterization of industrial sectors that produce organic wastewater and the organic loading applied to CW systems. So inventory compilers should ensure that these sectors are covered. Periodically, inventory compilers should re-survey industrial sources, particularly if some industries are growing rapidly. This category should only cover industrial wastewater treated onsite. Emissions from industrial wastewater released into domestic sewer systems should be addressed and included with domestic wastewater.

## REPORTING

Methane emissions from CWs for wastewater treatment are reported in the waste sector under the categories of domestic or industrial wastewater. Methane emissions from CWs treating collected runoff from agricultural lands are reported under the category of industrial wastewater.

## 6.3 NITROUS OXIDE EMISSIONS FROM CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS

### 6.3.1 Methodological issues

Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions can occur as direct emissions from wastewater treatment in CWs through nitrification and denitrification. Emissions are calculated based on the total nitrogen loaded into the CWs and emission factor.

Three tier methods for estimating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from this category are summarised below.

The Tier 1 method applies default values for the emission factor and activity parameters. This method is considered *good practice* for countries with no country-specific data.

The Tier 2 method follows the same method as Tier 1 but allows for incorporation of country-specific emission factors and country-specific activity data.

The Tier 3 method is used by countries with good data and advanced methodologies. A more advanced country-specific method is based on treatment system-specific data such as plant species and composition of wastewater.

The methodology provided assumes typical vegetation harvesting practices. However, to date, the amount of vegetation harvested from CWs is generally very small and the harvested plant biomass is commonly not recorded. Therefore, harvesting practice is not considered as an influencing factor in the estimation of emissions.

Emissions from SNTWs treating collected/uncollected wastewater are estimated using the same methodology. Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emission from domestic wastewater treatment effluent that is discharged into aquatic environments has already been covered in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

#### 6.3.1.1 CHOICE OF METHOD

A decision tree for domestic and industrial wastewater is shown in Figure 6.4.

The general equation for estimating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from CWs treating domestic or industrial wastewater is shown in Equation 6.5.

<p><b>EQUATION 6.5</b></p> <p><b>N<sub>2</sub>O EMISSIONS FROM CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS</b></p> $N_2O \text{ Emissions} = \sum_j (N_j \cdot EF_j \cdot 44/28) + \sum_{i,j} (N_{i,j} \cdot EF_j \cdot 44/28)$
--


Where:

N<sub>2</sub>O emissions = N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in inventory year, kg N<sub>2</sub>O/yr

---

$N_j$	=	total nitrogen in domestic wastewater entering CWs in inventory year, kg N/year
$N_{i,j}$	=	total nitrogen in industrial wastewater entering CW in inventory year, kg N/year
$EF_j$	=	emission factor, kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N/kg N  If more than one type of CW is used in an industrial sector this factor would be a $N_{i,j}$ -weighted average.
$i$	=	industrial sector
$j$	=	type of CWs

The factor 44/28 is the conversion of kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N into kg N<sub>2</sub>O.

**Figure 6.4** Decision tree for N<sub>2</sub>O emission from constructed wetland

### 6.3.1.2 CHOICE OF EMISSION FACTORS

The default emission factors for N<sub>2</sub>O emitted from domestic and industrial wastewater treated by CWs are 0.0013 kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N for SF, 0.0079 kgN<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N for HSSF and 0.00023 kgN<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N for VSSF. These values are based on data provided in the literature (Table 6.2) and are influenced by the extent of nitrification and denitrification taking place in CWs, coverage of vegetation in CWs and climatic conditions. There was insufficient actual measurement data for hybrid systems to derive emission factors. If the area fractions of SF, VSSF and HSSF for hybrid systems can be determined, the emission factors of the hybrid systems can be estimated as the area-weighted average of the emission factors for SF, VSSF and HSSF CWs. *Good practice* is to use country-specific data for emission factor, where available, expressed in term of kg N<sub>2</sub>O-N/kg N loaded for domestic and industrial wastewater to be consistent with the activity data. The amount of N associated with N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from CWs must be back calculated and subtracted from the N<sub>EFFLUENT</sub> (Equation 6.7 in Chapter 6, Volume 5 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines).

### 6.3.1.3 CHOICE OF ACTIVITY DATA

The activity data for this source category are the amount of nitrogen in the wastewater entering CWs (TN). This parameter is a function of the population served by the CW system, annual per capita protein consumption (protein) and a factor for non-consumed nitrogen added to the wastewater for domestic wastewater. In case of industrial wastewater, TN loading to the CW system in the inventory year (kg N) can be used directly. The equations for determining TN for domestic and industrial wastewater are:

#### EQUATION 6.6

##### TOTAL NITROGEN IN DOMESTIC WASTEWATER

$$N_j = P_j \cdot \text{Protein} \cdot F_{\text{NPR}} \cdot F_{\text{NON-CON}} \cdot F_{\text{IND-COM}}$$

#### EQUATION 6.7

##### TOTAL NITROGEN IN INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER

$$N_{i,j} = \text{TN}_i \cdot W_{i,j}$$

Where:

$N_j$	=	total nitrogen in domestic wastewater entering the CW in inventory year (kg N/year)
$N_i$	=	total nitrogen in wastewater from industry $i$ entering the CW in inventory year (kg N/year)
$i$	=	industrial sector
$P_j$	=	human population whose wastewater entering the CWs
Protein	=	annual per capita protein consumption, kg/person/yr
$F_{\text{NPR}}$	=	fraction of nitrogen in protein (default is 0.16 kg N/ kg protein as given in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines)
$F_{\text{NON-CON}}$	=	factor for non-consumed nitrogen added to the wastewater (default is 1.1 for countries with no garbage disposals, 1.4 for countries with garbage disposals as given in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines)
$F_{\text{IND-COM}}$	=	factor for industrial and commercial co-discharged protein into sewer system (default is 1.25 as given in 2006 IPCC Guidelines)
$\text{TN}_i$	=	total nitrogen concentration in wastewater from industry $i$ entering the CWs in inventory year (kg N/m <sup>3</sup> )
$W_{i,j}$	=	flow rate of industrial wastewater entering the CW, m <sup>3</sup> /yr

$N_i$  is a function of the total N concentration and the flow rate which can be estimated by multiplying the industrial production  $P$  (ton/yr), wastewater generation (m<sup>3</sup>/ton product) (Table 6.9, Chapter 6, Volume 5 in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines) and the N content in Table 6.6 of this supplement.

**TABLE 6.6**  
**EXAMPLE OF N CONTENT IN SOME NITROGEN-RICH INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER**

Industry type	Wastewater generation W (m <sup>3</sup> /ton product)	N content (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )
Alcohol refining	24 (16-32) <sup>1</sup>	2.40 (0.94-3.86) <sup>2</sup>
Fish processing industry	5 (2-8) <sup>2</sup>	0.60 (0.21-0.98) <sup>3</sup>
Seasoning source industry	NA	0.60 (0.22-1.00) <sup>3</sup>
Meat & poultry	13 (8-18) <sup>1</sup>	0.19 (0.17-0.20) <sup>3</sup>
Starch production	9 (4-18) <sup>1</sup>	0.90 (0.80-1.10) <sup>4</sup>
Nitrogen fertilizer plant	2.89 (0.46-8.3) <sup>2</sup>	0.50 (0.10-0.80) <sup>2</sup>
Landfill leachate	15-20% of annual precipitation in well compacted landfill site. 25-50% of annual precipitation for not well compacted landfill site <sup>6</sup> .	0.74 (0.01-2.50) <sup>5</sup>

Note: Average value and range (in brackets) are presented

Sources: <sup>1</sup> IPCC 2006; <sup>2</sup> Samokhin (1986); <sup>3</sup> Pilot Plant Development and Training Institute (1994); <sup>4</sup> Hulle *et al.* (2010); <sup>5</sup> Kjeldsen *et al.* (2002); <sup>6</sup> Ehrig (1983)

## 6.3.2 Time series consistency

The same method and data sets should be used for estimating N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from CWs for each year. If a country decides to change the estimation method from the default methodology (Tier 1) to country-specific (Tier 2), this change must be made for the entire time series.

## 6.3.3 Uncertainties

Large uncertainties are associated with the default emission factors for N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from CWs due to limited available data (Table 6.7).

**TABLE 6.7**  
**NITROUS OXIDE METHODOLOGY DEFAULT UNCERTAINTIES**

Parameter	Default value	Range
<b>Emission factor</b> (kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N/kg N)	0.0013 for SF 0.0079 for HSSF 0.00023 for VSSF	± 90% for SF ± 79% for HSSF ± 70% for VSSF
<b>Activity data</b>		
Human population	Country-specific	± 10%
Annual per capita protein consumption	Country-specific	± 10%
Fraction of nitrogen in protein	0.16	0.15-0.17
Factor for non-consumed nitrogen	1.1 for countries with no garbage disposals, 1.4 for countries with garbage disposals	1.0-1.5
TN loading from industrial wastewater	Country-specific	-55%, +103%

\* Uncertainties of emission factors calculated as 95% confidence interval are shown in Table 6A1.1 in Annex. The uncertainty in TN loading from industrial wastewater is the same to that of COD loading from industrial wastewater (Expert judgement by Authors of this chapter). Others are derived from Tables 6.11 in Chapter 6 in Volume 5 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

## 6.3.4 QA/QC, Completeness and Reporting

This method makes use of several default parameters. It is recommended to solicit experts' advice in evaluating the appropriateness of the proposed default factors. The methodology for estimating emissions is based on N

associated with domestic and industrial discharges either collected in the collection system and treated in CWs/SNTWs or uncollected and discharged into CWs/SNTWs. This estimate can be seen as conservative and covers the entire source associated with domestic and industrial wastewater discharge.

## **REPORTING**

Nitrous oxide emission from CWs for wastewater treatment is reported in waste sector under the categories of domestic or industrial wastewater. Nitrous oxide emissions from CWs treating collected runoff from agricultural lands and landfill leachate are reported under the category of industrial wastewater. If agricultural runoff is collected and treated by CWs or SNTWs, the amount of nitrogen flowing into the CWs/SNTWs must be subtracted to avoid double counting.

## References

- Altor, A. E. & Mitsch, W. J. (2008) Pulsing hydrology, methane emissions, and carbon dioxide fluxes in created marshes: a 2- year ecosystem study. *Wetlands* **28**: 423-438.
- Brix, H. (1987) Treatment of wastewater in the rhizosphere of wetlands plants - the root zone method. *Water Sci. Technol.* **19**(10): 107-118.
- Brix, H. (1997) Do macrophytes play a role in constructed treatment wetlands? *Water Sci. Technol.* **35**(5): 11-17.
- Chiemchaisri, C., Chiemchaisri, W., Junsod, J., Threedeach, S. & Wicranarachchi, P. N. (2009) Leachate treatment and greenhouse gas emission in subsurface horizontal flow constructed wetland. *Bioresour. Technol.* **100**(16): 3808-3814.
- Cooper, P. F., Job, G. D., Green, M. B. & Shutes, R. B. E. (1996) Reed Beds and Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment. WRc Publications, Medmenham, Marlow, UK.
- Cooper, P. F. (2005) The performance of vertical flow constructed wetland systems with special reference to the significance of oxygen transfer and hydraulic loading rates. *Water Sci. Technol.* **51**(9): 81-90.
- Crites, R. W., Middlebrooks, E. J. & Reed, S. C. (2005) Natural wastewater treatment systems. CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, pp. 552.
- Ehrig, H. J. (1983) Quality and quantity of sanitary landfill leachate. *Waste Manage. Res.* **1**: 53-68.
- Fey, A., Benckiser, G. & Ottow, J. C. G. (1999) Emissions of nitrous oxide from a constructed wetland using a groundfilter and macrophytes in waste-water purification of a dairy farm. *Biol. Fertil. Soils* **29**: 354-359.
- Garcia, J., Capel, V., Castro, A., Ruiz, I. & Soto, M. (2007) Anaerobic biodegradation tests and gas emissions from subsurface flow constructed wetlands. *Bioresour. Technol.* **98**(16): 3044-3052.
- Gui, P., Inamori, R., Matsumura, M. & Inamori, Y. (2007) Evaluation of constructed wetlands by waste water purification ability and greenhouse gas emissions. *Water Sci. Technol.* **56**(3): 49-55.
- Hernandez, M. E. & Mitsch, W. J. (2006) Influence of hydrologic pulses, flooding frequency, and vegetation on nitrous oxide emissions from created riparian marshes. *Wetlands* **26**(3): 862-877.
- Hulle, V. S., Vandeweyer, H. J. P., Meesschaert, D., Vanrolleghem A. P., Dejans, P. & Dumoulin, A. (2010) Engineering aspects and practical application of autotrophic nitrogen removal from nitrogen rich streams. *Chem. Eng. J.* **162**: 1-20.
- Hunt, P. G., Stone, K. C., Matheny, T. A., Poach, M. E., Vanotti, M. B. & Ducey, T. F. (2009) Denitrification of nitrified and non-nitrified swine lagoon wastewater in the suspended sludge layer of treatment wetlands. *Ecol. Eng.* **35**(10): 1514-1522.
- Inamori, R., Gui, P., Dass, P., Matsumura, M., Xu, K. Q., Kondo, T., Ebie, Y. & Inamori, Y. (2007) Investigating CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from eco-engineering wastewater treatment processes using constructed wetland microcosms. *Proc. Biochem.* **42**(3): 363-373.
- Inamori, R., Wang, Y., Yamamoto, T., Zhang, J., Kong, H., Xu, K. & Inamori, Y. (2008) Seasonal effect on N<sub>2</sub>O formation in nitrification in constructed wetlands. *Chemosphere* **73**(7): 1071-1077.
- IPCC (2006) 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston, H.S., Buendia, L., Miwa K., Ngara, T., and Tanabe, K. (eds). Published: IGES, Japan.
- Jia, W., Zhang, J., Li, P., Xie, H., Wu, J. & Wang, J. (2011) Nitrous oxide emissions from surface flow and subsurface flow constructed wetland microcosms: Effect of feeding strategies. *Ecol. Eng.* **37**(11): 1815-1821.
- Johansson, A. E., Klemetsson, K., Klemetsson, L., Svensson, B. N. & Dass, P. (2003) Nitrous oxide exchanges with the atmosphere of a constructed wetland treating wastewater - Parameters and implications for emission factors. *Tellus* **55B**: 737-750.
- Johansson, A. E., Gustavsson, A. M., Oquist, M. G. & Svensson, B. H. (2004) Methane emissions from a constructed wetland treating wastewater- seasonal and spatial distribution and dependence on edaphic factors. *Water Res.* **38**(18): 3960-3970.
- Kadlec, R. H. & Knight, R. L. (1996) Treatment Wetlands. CRC Press/Lewis Publishers: Boca Raton, FL, pp. 893.
- Kadlec, R. H. & Wallace, S. D. (2008) Treatment Wetlands, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 1016



- Kayranli, B., Scholz, M. Mustafa, A. & Hedmark, Å. (2010) Carbon storage and fluxes within freshwater wetlands: a critical review. *Wetlands* **30**: 111-124.
- Kjeldsen, P., Barlaz, M. A., Rooker, A. P., Baun, A., Ledin, A. & Christensen, T. H. (2002) Present and long-term composition of MSW landfill leachate: a review. *Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol.* **32**(4): 297-336.
- Liikanen, A., Huttunen, J. T., Karjalainen, S. M., Heikkinen, K., Väisänen, T. S., Nykänen, H. & Martikainen, P. J. (2006) Temporal and seasonal changes in greenhouse gas emissions from a constructed wetland purifying peat mining runoff waters. *Ecol. Eng.* **26**(3): 241-251.
- Liu, C., Xu, K., Inamori, R., Ebie, Y., Liao, J. & Inamori, Y. (2009) Pilot-scale studies of domestic wastewater treatment by typical constructed wetlands and their greenhouse gas emissions. *Front. Environ. Sci. Engin. China* **3**(4): 477-482.
- Maltais-Landry, G., Maranger, R. & Brisson, J. (2009) Effect of artificial aeration and macrophyte species on nitrogen cycling and gas flux in constructed wetlands. *Ecol. Eng.* **35**: 221-229.
- Mander, Ü. & Jenssen, P. D. (eds.) (2003) Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment in cold climates. WIT Press, Southampton, UK, pp. 325.
- Mander, Ü., Kuusemets, V., Lõhmus, K., Mäuring, T., Teiter, S. & Augustin, J. (2003) Nitrous oxide, dinitrogen, and methane emission in a subsurface flow constructed wetland. *Water Sci. Technol.* **48**(5): 135-142.
- Mander, Ü., Teiter, S. & Augustin, J. (2005) Emission of greenhouse gases from constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment and from riparian buffer zones. *Water Sci. Technol.* **52**(10-11): 167-176.
- Mander, Ü., Lõhmus, K., Teiter, S., Mäuring, T., Nurk, K., & Augustin, J. (2008) Gaseous fluxes in the nitrogen and carbon budgets of subsurface flow constructed wetlands. *Sci. Total Environ.* **404**: 343-353.
- Mander, Ü., Maddison, M., Soosaar, K. & Karabelnik, K. (2011) The impact of intermittent hydrology and fluctuating water table on greenhouse gas emissions from subsurface flow constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment. *Wetlands* **31**(6): 1023-1032.
- Mitsch, W. J. & Gosselink, J.G. (2007) Wetlands. John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, NJ, USA, pp. 582.
- Picek, T., Čížková, H. & Dušek, J. (2007) Greenhouse gas emissions from a constructed wetland plants as important sources of carbon. *Ecol. Eng.* **31**(2): 98-106.
- Pilot Plant Development and Training Institute (1994) The study and survey of environment in agro-industry for canning tuna industry King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok, Thailand, pp. 13-17.
- Rückauf, U., Augustin, J., Russow, R. & Merbach, W. (2004) Nitrate removal from drained and reflooded fen soils affected by soil N transformation processes and plant uptake. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **36**(1): 77-90.
- Salm, J. O., Maddison, M., Tammik, S., Soosaar, K., Truu, J. & Mander, Ü. (2012) Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O from undisturbed, drained and mined peatlands in Estonia. *Hydrobiologia* **692**: 41-55.
- Samokhin, V. N. (1986) Design handbook of wastewater systems: Volume 3 Municipal and industrial systems, Allerton Press, Inc., New York, pp. 1060.
- Silvan, N., Tuittila, E. S., Kitunen, V., Vasander, H. & Laine, J. (2005) Nitrate uptake by *Eriophorum vaginatum* controls N<sub>2</sub>O production in a restored peatland. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **37**(8): 1519-1526.
- Soosaar, K., Mander, Ü., Maddison, M., Kanal, A., Kull, A., Lõhmus, K., Truu, J. & Augustin, J. (2011) Dynamics of gaseous nitrogen and carbon fluxes in riparian alder forests. *Ecol. Eng.* **37**: 40-53.
- Søvik, A. K., Augustin, J., Heikkinen, K., Huttunen, J. T., Necki, J. M., Karjalainen, S. M., Kløve, B., Liikanen, A., Mander, Ü., Puustinen, M., Teiter, S. & Wachniew, P. (2006) Emission of the greenhouse gases nitrous oxide and methane from constructed wetlands in Europe. *J. Environ. Qual.* **35**: 2360-2373.
- Søvik, A. K. & Kløve, B. (2007) Emission of N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> from a constructed wetland in southeastern Norway. *Sci. Total Environ.* **380**: 28-37.
- Stadmark, J. & Leonardson, L. (2005) Emissions of greenhouse gases from ponds constructed for nitrogen removal. *Ecol. Eng.* **25**(5): 542-551.
- Ström, L., Lamm, A. & Christensen, T. R. (2006) Greenhouse gas emissions from a constructed wetland in southern Sweden. *Wetlands Ecol. Manage.* **15**(1): 43-50.
- Tai, P. D., Li, P. J., Sun, T. H., He, Y. W., Zhou, Q. X., Gong, Z. Q., Mizuochi, M. & Imamori, Y. (2002) Greenhouse gas emissions from a constructed wetland for municipal sewage treatment. *J. Environ. Sci.* **14**(1): 27-33.

- Tanner, C. C., Adams, D. D. & Downes, M. T. (1997) Methane emissions from constructed wetlands treating agricultural wastewater. *J. Environ. Qual.* **26**: 1056-1062.
- Teiter, S. & Mander, Ü. (2005) Emission of N<sub>2</sub>O, N<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and CO<sub>2</sub> from constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment and from riparian buffer zones. *Ecol. Eng.* **25**(5): 528-541.
- USEPA (1995) A handbook of constructed wetlands, Volume 1: General considerations. US Government Printing Office, Washington DC, pp. 47.
- Van de Riet, B. P., Hefting, M. M. & Verhoeven, J. T. A. (2013) Rewetting drained peat meadows: risks and benefits in terms of nutrient release and greenhouse gas exchange. *Water Air Soil Pollut.* **224**: 1440-1452.
- Van der Zaag, A. C., Gordon, R. J., Burton, D. L., Jamieson, R. C. & Stratton, G. W. (2010) Greenhouse gas emissions from surface flow and subsurface flow constructed wetlands treating dairy wastewater. *J. Environ. Qual.* **39**: 460-471.
- Vymazal, J., Brix, H., Cooper, P. F., Green, M. B. & Haberl, R. (eds) (1998) Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment in Europe. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden, The Netherlands, pp. 366.
- Vymazal, J. (2007) Removal of nutrients in various types of constructed wetlands. *Sci. Total Environ.* **380**: 48-65.
- Vymazal, J. & Kröpfelova, L. (2008) Wastewater Treatment in Constructed Wetlands with Horizontal Sub-Surface Flow. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 566.
- Vymazal, J. (2011) Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment: five decades of experience. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **45**(1): 65-69.
- Wang, Y., Inamori, R., Kong, H., Xu, K., Inamori, Y., Kondo, T. & Zhang, J. (2008) Nitrous oxide emission from polyculture constructed wetlands: Effect of plant species. *Environ. Poll.* **152**(2): 351-360.
- Wild, U., Kamp, T., Lenz, A., Heinz, S. & Pfadenhauer, J. (2001) Cultivation of *Typha* spp. in constructed wetlands for peatland restoration. *Ecol. Eng.* **17**(1): 49-54.
- Wu, J., Zhang, J., Jia, W., Xie, H. & Zhang, B. (2009) Relationships of nitrous oxide fluxes with water quality parameters in free water surface constructed wetlands. *Front. Environ. Sci. Eng. China* **3**(2): 241-247.
- Xie, Y., Kovacic, D. A., David, M. B., Centry, L. E., Mulvaney, R. L. & Lindau, C. W. (1999) In situ measurements of denitrification in constructed wetlands. *J. Environ. Qual.* **28**: 263-269.
- Yang, J., Liu, J., Hu, X., Li, X., Wang, Y. & Li, H. (2013) Effect of water table level on CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in a freshwater marsh of Northeast China. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **61**: 52-60.
- Yu, X. F., Zou, Y. C., Jiang, M., Lu, X. G. & Wang, G. P. (2011) Response of soil constituents to freeze-thaw cycles in wetland soil solution. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **43**(6): 1308-1320.

## Annex 6A.1 Estimation of default emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O in constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment

We reviewed about 150 papers published in international peer-reviewed journals indexed by the Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge from 1994 to 2013. The terms “free water surface”, “surface flow”, “constructed wetland(s)”, “artificial wetland(s)”, “treatment wetland(s)”, “subsurface flow wetland(s)”, “vertical flow” and “horizontal flow” in combination with the terms “carbon dioxide”, “CO<sub>2</sub>”, “methane”, “CH<sub>4</sub>”, “nitrous oxide” and “N<sub>2</sub>O” were searched.

We found a total of 14 publications that provided information on emissions of either CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O or both gases in surface flow (SF) constructed wetlands (CWs). These publications presented information on 17 different SF CW systems, whereas for CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O, there were 24 and 25 subsystems/measuring events respectively. Six SF CWs (Nykvarn, Lakeus, Ruka, Skjønhaug, Hässleholm, and Ibaraki) treated domestic wastewater (Johansson *et al.*, 2003, 2004; Søvik *et al.*, 2006, Ström *et al.*, 2006; Gui *et al.*, 2007; Søvik & Kløve, 2007; Liu *et al.*, 2009), six CWs (mesocosms in Xue *et al.* (1999), Donaumoos, Genarp, Görarp, Ormatorp, and Hovi) treated waters of agricultural non-point pollution (Xue *et al.*, 1999; Wild *et al.*, 2001; Stadmark and Leonardson, 2005; Søvik *et al.*, 2006), two systems (Ngatea and Truro) were used for dairy farm wastewater treatment (Tanner *et al.*, 1997; Van der Zaag *et al.*, 2010), the Komsasuo CW treated wastewater from a peat extraction area (Søvik *et al.*, 2006), the Jiaonan CW (Tai *et al.*, 2002) purified raw municipal wastewater, and synthetic wastewater is used in the Jinan laboratory mesocosms (Wu *et al.*, 2009).

For vertical subsurface flow (VSSF) CWs, there were only 4 measurement periods presented for 3 CWs from which CH<sub>4</sub> emissions data and ratios could be calculated: Kõo in Estonia (Teiter & Mander 2005; Søvik *et al.*, 2006), Ski in Norway (Søvik *et al.*, 2006), and Miho/Ibaraki, Japan (Gui *et al.*, 2007; Liu *et al.*, 2009). For N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, additional laboratory microcosm experiments with different plant species from Ibaraki, Japan (Inamori *et al.*, 2008; Wang *et al.*, 2008) were included.

For CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from horizontal subsurface flow (HSSF) CWs we used data from two system in Estonia treating domestic wastewater, Kodijärve and Kõo (Mander *et al.*, 2003, 2008; Teiter & Mander, 2005; Søvik *et al.*, 2006), four CWs treating domestic wastewater in Ski, Norway (Søvik *et al.*, 2006), Barcelona, Spain (Garcia *et al.*, 2007), Miho/Ibaraki, Japan (Gui *et al.*, 2007; Liu *et al.*, 2007) and Slavosovice, Czech Republic (Picek *et al.*, 2007), an HSSF treating wastewater from a peat extraction area in Komsasuo, Finland (Liikanen *et al.*, 2006), an HSSF treating landfill leachate in Bangkok, Thailand (Chiemchaisri *et al.*, 2009), and a dairy farm wastewater treatment HSSF in Truro, Nova Scotia, Canada (Van der Zaag *et al.*, 2010). For N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from HSSFs, a CW for dairy farm wastewater treatment in Friedelhausen, Germany (Fey *et al.*, 1998) was also included.


Tanner *et al.*, (1997) presented estimated values for inflow total organic carbon (TOC<sub>in</sub>), Xue *et al.*, (1999) for inflow total nitrogen (TN<sub>in</sub>), and Søvik *et al.*, (2006) for both TOC<sub>in</sub> and TN<sub>in</sub>. For most of the systems, TOC<sub>in</sub> and TN<sub>in</sub> values were calculated based on area, hydraulic load and inflow TOC and TN concentration data. For some systems only biological oxygen demand (BOD) values were usable, and for them the following approximation based on domestic wastewater data was used: TOC = 0.5 BOD (Garcia *et al.*, 2007). For the calculations of emission factors, we used data series from one year or at least a vegetation period.

TABLE 6A1.1 AVERAGE, STANDARD ERROR, MEDIAN, 2.5% AND 97.5% PERCENTILE VALUES OF CH <sub>4</sub> -C AND N <sub>2</sub> O-N EMISSION FACTORS (%) FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS										
Type of CWs	Emission factor CH <sub>4</sub> -C/TOC (%)					Emission factor N <sub>2</sub> O-N/TN (%)				
	Average	Standard Error	Median	2.5%	97.5%	Average	Standard Error	Median	2.5%	97.5%
SF	42.2	20.4	18	4	446	0.13	0.024	0.11	0	0.47
HSSF	12.0	7.56	4.15	0.03	79	0.79	0.38	0.34	0.04	3.01
VSSF	1.17	0.33	1.28	0.38	1.73	0.023	0.005	0.018	0.001	0.096

Table 6A1.1 presents values of emission factors calculated based on literature sources described above.

In Figure 6A1.1, correlations between the inflow TOC loading and CH<sub>4</sub>-C emissions and between the inflow TN loading and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions for SF, HSSF and VSSF CWs are presented.

**Figure 6A1.1** The relationship between inflow TOC loading and CH<sub>4</sub>-C emission (left-hand column) and between inflow TN loading and N<sub>2</sub>O-N emission (right-hand column) in SF, HSSF, and VSSF CWs. In all cases,  $p < 0.05$ .



# **CHAPTER 7**

---

## **CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND REPORTING**

### **Coordinating Lead Authors**

Riitta Pipatti (Finland) and Pantaleo Munishi (Tanzania)

### **Lead Authors**

Patrick Gonzalez (USA) and Papa Mawade Wade (Senegal)

### **Contributing Author**

Kiyoto Tanabe (IPCC TFI TSU)

### **Review Editors**

Werner Leo Kutsch (Germany) and Erda Lin (China)

## Contents

7	Cross-cutting Issues and Reporting.....	5
7.1	Introduction .....	5
7.2	Reporting and documentation.....	5
7.2.1	Changes to reporting categories in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .....	5
7.2.1.1	Drained inland organic soils .....	6
7.2.1.2	Rewetted organic soils.....	6
7.2.1.3	Coastal wetlands .....	7
7.2.1.4	Inland wetland mineral soils.....	8
7.2.1.5	Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment.....	8
7.2.2	Mapping the changes to categories in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i> .....	9
7.2.3	Documentation .....	12
7.2.4	Reporting tables .....	12
7.2.5	Worksheets .....	13
7.3	Uncertainties.....	13
7.3.1	Overview of uncertainty analysis .....	13
7.3.2	Methods for quantifying uncertainty .....	14
7.4	Impact on key categories.....	18
7.4.1	Overview of <i>key category</i> analysis .....	18
7.4.2	<i>Key category</i> analysis including the categories affected by the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i> .....	19
7.5	Completeness .....	19
7.6	Time series consistency.....	19
7.6.1	Overview of time series issues.....	19
7.6.2	Methods for producing consistent time series .....	20
7.7	Quality assurance and quality control .....	21
7.7.1	Overview of quality issues.....	21
7.7.2	Quality assurance and quality control methods.....	21
References	.....	23
Annex 7A.1	Worksheets .....	25
Annex 7A.2	Reporting tables .....	61

## Equations

Equation 7.1	Algebraic combination of uncertainties – addition and subtraction.....	14
Equation 7.2	Algebraic combination of uncertainties – multiplication.....	14
Equation 7.3	Monte Carlo analysis – general form of a variable.....	17

## Figures

Figure 7.1	Example of recalculation of a time series. ....	20
Figure 7.2	Example of validation of a model for quality control.....	21
Figure 7.3	Example of validation of remote sensing data for quality control.....	22

## Tables

Table 7.1	Mapping between the categories and guidance in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the changes to those introduced by the Wetlands Supplement.....	9
Table 7.2	Examples of wetlands and drained soils with published estimates of uncertainties of parameters used in estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals.....	16



## 7 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND REPORTING

### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

The *2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Wetlands (Wetlands Supplement)* contains updated and new methodological guidance for greenhouse gas emissions and removals from drained inland and rewetted organic soils, specific human-induced changes in coastal wetlands and inland wetland mineral soils, and Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment.

The supplementary methodological guidance introduces changes to the estimation and reporting of emissions and removals according to the *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (2006 IPCC Guidelines)* in all land-use categories (Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements, and Other Land), some sources of methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) emissions from managed land in the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) Sector, and CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from wastewater treatment (Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment) in the Waste Sector. The changes come from updated methodologies for existing categories and supplemental methodologies for categories not covered by the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The *Wetlands Supplement* maintains the approaches for estimation of emissions and removals in Volume 4 (AFOLU) of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The general guidance in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* is also applicable.

This chapter provides guidance on cross cutting issues for the methodologies provided in Chapters 2 to 6 of this *Wetlands Supplement* by addressing the following:

- reporting and documentation
- uncertainty estimation
- *key category* analysis
- completeness
- time series consistency
- quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA).

The chapter also summarises the *good practice* guidance on these cross-cutting issues found in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, to which inventory experts need to refer for detailed guidance. Cross-cutting issues specific to the categories and methodologies included in Chapters 2 to 6 of the *Wetlands Supplement* are addressed in the specific chapters. This chapter summarises and complements the category-specific information.

### 7.2 REPORTING AND DOCUMENTATION

#### 7.2.1 Changes to reporting categories in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines

Chapter 1 of the *Wetlands Supplement* gives an overview of the purpose and scope of this supplement as well as a description of its contents, including specific guidance on how to use this supplement in the context of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

This chapter complements Chapter 1 with details on the reporting aspects of the *Wetlands Supplement*. The summaries of the methodologies of the *Wetlands Supplement* and the reporting of emissions and removals, as addressed in Sections 7.2.1.1 to 7.2.1.5 in this chapter, are based on the Tier 1 methodologies in Chapters 2 to 6 of the *Wetlands Supplement*.

The AFOLU and Waste Sector reporting tables given in Annex 8A.2, Chapter 8 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are updated and complemented to incorporate the changes required by the application of the *Wetlands Supplement* (see Annex 7A.2 in this chapter). The category names and numbering referred to in the following sections are those presented in Annex 7A.2 in this chapter.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Common Reporting Framework (CRF) tables used by Annex I Parties in reporting of greenhouse gas emissions and removals under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) are not identical to the reporting tables developed by the IPCC. Reporting tables used by the Parties to the UNFCCC are produced by the UNFCCC through negotiations, although they usually build on the *IPCC Guidelines* and *good practice* guidance. The

### 7.2.1.1 DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

#### Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)

The guidance in Chapter 2 in the *Wetlands Supplement* for estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from drained inland organic soils implies changes for all land-use categories compared to the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The Tier 1 methodology in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for drained organic soils is simply a multiplication of the relevant areas with appropriate emission factors by land-use category and climate zone (boreal/temperate/tropical). The emission factors in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for peat extraction in boreal/temperate climate zones also take into account the nutrient status of the drained lands. The supplementary methodology in Chapter 2 uses the same approach as in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and provides updated CO<sub>2</sub> emission/removal factors according to land-use categories and climate zones. For some land-use categories, these are further disaggregated by the type of vegetation, nutrient-status of the organic soils (rich vs. poor) and depth of drainage (drained, shallow drained and deep drained). Nutrient status is, however, not taken into account in the default CO<sub>2</sub> emission factors for peat extraction. New guidance is provided for estimation of off-site CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from water-borne dissolved organic carbon (DOC), losses from drained organic soils, and soil CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fires on drained organic soils. Most of these methodological changes can be implemented without changes in the reporting or background tables in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. However, additional documentation would need to be provided in the national inventory report (see Section 7.2.3 and Annex 7A.2 in this chapter). Also, Background Table 3.4 (category 3C1) on burning has been modified to include emissions from the soil pool for organic soils (see Annex 7A.2 in this chapter).

#### Non-CO<sub>2</sub>

The *2006 IPCC Guidelines* did not provide a methodology for the estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions associated with drainage, whereas Chapter 2 provides a methodology to address CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from the land surface of drained organic soils and drainage ditches. The emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> from the land surface are given by land-use category and climate zone. These are further disaggregated by the type of vegetation, depth of drainage, and nutrient status of the soil. The emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> from drainage ditches are also given by land-use category and climate zone and for grasslands by drainage depth (shallow or deep). A default CH<sub>4</sub> emission factor for drainage ditches is provided separately for peat extraction. The estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils requires the area of the drained organic soils and the fraction occupied by ditches. Indicative default values are provided for these fractions. These CH<sub>4</sub> emissions would be reported in Background Table 3.9 under new categories (3C8 *CH<sub>4</sub> from Drained Organic Soils* and 3C9 *CH<sub>4</sub> from Drainage Ditches on Organic Soils*) under appropriate headings highlighting the land-use category and other relevant specifications. The category 3C8 (*Other*) in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* has been re-numbered to 3C14.

The methodology for direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from organic soils is the same as in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* but the default emissions factors are updated and more disaggregated. In accordance with the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, the direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from organic soils should be reported as aggregated to N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed soils. If data are available, the emissions can be provided by land-use category. The N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from drainage/management of organic soils are reported under category 3C4 (*Direct N<sub>2</sub>O Emissions from Managed Soils*). An exception to this are direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions on peat extraction lands, which are reported in category 3B4ai (*Peat Extraction Remaining Peat Extraction*<sup>2</sup>) or 3B4bi (*Land Converted for Peat Extraction*), depending on if the peat extraction lands remain in the category or are converted to it.

Chapter 2 in the *Wetlands Supplement* provides guidance on estimating CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO emissions from soil organic matter during fires on drained organic soils. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from these fires are addressed at higher tier levels. These emissions would be reported in the AFOLU category 3C1 (*Burning*) under relevant subcategories. Activity data and emissions by carbon pools should be provided in AFOLU Background Table 3.4, which is updated to include also emissions from soil burning (see Annex 7A.2 in this chapter).

### 7.2.1.2 REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS

Guidance on CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetting of organic soils is not included in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Chapter 3 of the *Wetlands Supplement* provides this guidance. Tier 1 methodologies are given for

---

UNFCCC CRF tables are currently being revised. A major difference in the UNFCCC CRF tables compared to the IPCC reporting tables is that the IPCC AFOLU Sector will continue to be divided into the Agriculture sector and LULUCF sector in UNFCCC reporting.

<sup>2</sup> This category has been renamed (Peatlands Remaining Peatlands in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*) to take into account the guidance related to peatlands in this *Wetlands Supplement*. The renaming is taken into account in the updated Table 3 AFOLU Sectoral Table and relevant AFOLU background tables in Annex 7A.2 in this chapter.

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from rewetted organic soils with moss and/or herbaceous vegetation, and also for dissolved organic carbon. Tier 1 guidance is also given for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted organic soils. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetted organic soils are considered negligible and assumed to be zero under Tier 1. Fires on rewetted organic soils are not likely but, in case they occur, the methods given in Chapter 2 for fires on drained organic soils can be used to estimate the emissions from the soil. When rewetted lands contain perennial woody vegetation, the guidance in Chapters 2, 4, and 5 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, should be used to estimate the emissions from the woody biomass and dead organic matter (DOM) pools.

The reporting of emissions/removals from rewetting depends on the land use after the rewetting. Rewetted grassland could remain in the same land-use category, e.g. when agricultural land with organic soil is rewetted to form a grazing marsh. The rewetting could also involve a land-use change, e.g. when a forest with organic soil is rewetted and the tree coverage declines below the threshold of the national forest definition. It is *good practice* to report emissions/removals from rewetting under relevant land-use categories (Table 3, Annex 8A.2, Chapter 8 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). Additional information on carbon stock changes on these lands should be provided in Background Tables 3.2 and 3.3, which have been modified to allow reporting of removals from organic soils. CH<sub>4</sub> should be included in Background Table 3.9 (*Non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gas emissions not included elsewhere*), under category 3C10 (*CH<sub>4</sub> from Rewetting of Organic Soils*). When N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetting of organic soils are reported using higher-tier methods, these would be included under category 3C14 (*Other*).

### 7.2.1.3 COASTAL WETLANDS

Guidance on CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed coastal wetlands is not included in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* but provided in Chapter 4 of this *Wetlands Supplement*. This guidance covers emissions/removals from mineral and organic soils vegetated by vascular plants that are covered or saturated for all or part of the year by tidal freshwater or salt water (>0.5 ppt). The guidance addresses CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from specific activities in mangroves, seagrass meadows, and tidal marshes. These activities include forest management, extraction (including excavation, aquaculture and salt production), drainage, and rewetting in coastal wetlands. New methods are presented for estimation of changes in soil carbon (Tier 1 level) whereas methods for biomass and dead organic matter follow those of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. Methods are also provided for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetting of mangroves and tidal marshes and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from aquaculture.

Coastal wetlands can occur in any of the six IPCC land-use categories but also in coastal areas that are not part of the total land area of the country. For example, a mangrove wetland with trees may be classified as Forest Land, a tidal marsh used for grazing may be classified as Grassland, and a seagrass meadow used for aquaculture may be classified as Settlements. Emissions/removals from coastal wetlands that are not part of the total land area (e.g. seagrass meadows) should be reported separately and the associated areas excluded from the total land area and from the land-use matrix<sup>3</sup>. For example, forest management activities in mangroves classified as Forest Land may need to be split between areas included in the total land area and not included in the total land area. In reporting the emissions/removals from mangrove forest management activities, emissions/removals from both areas would be reported under Forest Land, but only the land areas of the mangroves included in the total land area would be included in the total Forest Land areas and reported in the land area matrix. The classifications of coastal wetlands are country-specific, but in all cases appropriate subcategories should be used in the reporting to reflect the specific land use and management as well as to indicate whether the emissions come from areas included or excluded from the total land area of the country.

The emissions/removals from coastal wetlands would be reported under relevant land-use categories and subcategories of the AFOLU Sectoral Table 3. Two new subcategories 3B4aiii *Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands* and 3B4biii *Land Converted to Other Wetlands* have been added to this table to allow for complete reporting. Additional information on C stock changes on these lands should be provided in Background Tables 3.2 and 3.3. CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from coastal wetlands would be included in Background Table 3.9, under category 3C11 (*CH<sub>4</sub> Emissions from Rewetting of Mangroves and Tidal Marshes*) to category 3C12 (*N<sub>2</sub>O Emissions from Aquaculture*), and specified by land-use category. For information to be included in the inventory report, see Section 7.2.2 below.

<sup>3</sup> Documentation on consistent reporting of land areas for the six land-use categories includes the provision of a land-use matrix with data on lands remaining in the categories and conversions between them. Unmanaged land areas are also included in the matrix. The sum of the areas should match the total land area. For this reason, areas that are not part of the total land area of a country should not be included in the total areas of the land-use categories or the land-use matrix.

### 7.2.1.4 INLAND WETLAND MINERAL SOILS

In Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, general guidance for estimating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from soils, including wet mineral soils, is provided in Section 2.3.3 and complemented with land-use category-specific guidance in relevant sections of Chapters 3 to 6. Chapter 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement* complements and updates this guidance with new default values for reference soil carbon stock values for wetland mineral soils under all climate regions and carbon stock change factors for land use for long-term cultivation of cropland with inland wetland mineral soils (IWMS). New default carbon stock change factors are provided for rewetting on Cropland with IWMS. In addition, Chapter 5 provides data on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from IWMS under any land-use category that has undergone rewetting, and from mineral soils that have been inundated for the purpose of wetland creation. The chapter does not include guidance on emissions/removals from rice cultivation. That is covered in Section 5.5, Chapter 5 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

IWMS can occur in any of the six IPCC land-use categories. For example, a riverine wetland with trees may be classified as Forest Land, while a riverine wetland without trees may be classified as Wetlands. The precise details of this classification are country-specific, so it is not possible to say exactly how IWMS may be classified. Appropriate subcategories should be used in the reporting to reflect the specific land use and management as specified by a country.

The total emissions/removals from IWMS should be reported under relevant land-use categories and subcategories of the AFOLU Sector in reporting Table 3 in Volume 1, Annex 8A.2. Additional information on carbon stock changes on these lands should be provided in Background Tables 3.2 and 3.3. CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from inland wetland mineral soils should be included in Background Table 3.9, under category 3C13 (*CH<sub>4</sub> Emissions from Rewetted and Created Wetlands on Inland Wetland Mineral Soils*). For information to be included in the inventory report, see Section 5.4 in Chapter 5 in this supplement and Section 7.2.2 below.

### 7.2.1.5 CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT

Supplementary guidance on CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from wastewater treatment and discharge is provided in Chapter 6 on Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment. Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment are human-made wetlands and engineered systems that apply various technologies that use natural wetland processes, wetland hydrology, soils, microbes, and plants to assist in treating wastewater. In addition to Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment, methodologies in Chapter 6 cover natural wetland systems that have been modified for wastewater treatment (semi-natural treatment wetlands). Methodologies are based on the load of nitrogen and organic carbon into the systems. The CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are calculated based on biological or chemical oxygen demand data and emission factors related to the flows in these Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment (free water surface, vertical subsurface flow, and horizontal subsurface flow or hybrid systems). The N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are calculated based on the amount of nitrogen in the wastewater.

CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emission from Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment are reported under category 4D *Wastewater Treatment and Discharge*. The emissions should be divided into categories 4D1 (*Domestic Wastewater Treatment and Discharge*) and 4D2 (*Industrial Wastewater Treatment and Discharge*) according to source of wastewater treated.

The areas of Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment would be reported as part of areas under Settlements, Wetlands, or other land-use categories, as appropriate. If the establishment of the Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater treatment involves a land-use category conversion, the area changes should be reported under appropriate land-use categories and the notation key 'IE' should be used for the CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions under the category to which the land is converted, as these emissions are reported in the Waste sector. Any changes in carbon stocks due to the land-use conversion, e.g. due to cutting of trees or removal of other vegetation, should also be reported under the category to which the land is converted. Double-counting of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the land areas should be avoided. The areas of Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment are often small, and, if thresholds for minimum areas for reporting are not exceeded, specific reporting in the AFOLU sector is not required.

No changes to the reporting tables and background tables in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are made for the inclusion of the emissions from Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment. Section 7.2.2 below addresses the information that should be included in the inventory report.

## 7.2.2 Mapping the changes to categories in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines

Table 7.1 below shows how the supplementary guidance and new categories introduced in the *Wetlands Supplement* are linked to the guidance and categories in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines. This summarises the descriptions given in the above sections on the methodological changes introduced in Chapters 2 to 6 in this *Wetlands Supplement*.

TABLE 7.1 MAPPING BETWEEN THE CATEGORIES AND GUIDANCE IN THE 2006 IPCC GUIDELINES AND THE CHANGES TO THOSE INTRODUCED BY THE WETLANDS SUPPLEMENT.				
Source of emissions/ sink for removals	2006 IPCC Guidelines		Wetlands Supplement	
	Category	Guidance by	Category	Guidance by
<b>Drained inland organic soils</b>				
CO <sub>2</sub>	3B1 to 3B6 Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land Category 3B4ai <i>Peatlands Remaining Peatlands</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>land-use category</li> <li>climate zone</li> <li>nutrient status for peat extraction lands</li> </ul>	3B1 to 3B6 Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land  Category 3B4ai renamed as <i>Peat Extraction Remaining Peat Extraction</i> , respective change to 3B4bi  New source: off-site CO <sub>2</sub> emissions due to waterborne carbon losses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>land-use category</li> <li>climate zone</li> <li>drainage class (drained, shallow, deep)</li> <li>nutrient status</li> </ul>
CO <sub>2</sub>	Category 3C1 <i>Emissions from Biomass Burning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pool excluding the soil organic matter</li> </ul>	Category 3C1 renamed to <i>Burning</i> to take into account new guidance on CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from the soil pool from fires on drained organic soils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pools (biomass, dead organic matter, soil organic matter)</li> </ul>
CH <sub>4</sub>	-	-	New category: <i>3C8 CH<sub>4</sub> from Drained Organic Soils</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>land-use category</li> <li>climate zone</li> <li>drainage class (drained, shallow, deep)</li> <li>nutrient status</li> </ul>
CH <sub>4</sub>	-	-	New category: <i>3C9 CH<sub>4</sub> from Drainage Ditches on Organic Soils</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>land-use category</li> <li>climate zone</li> <li>drainage class (drained, shallow, deep)</li> </ul>
N <sub>2</sub> O	3C4 <i>Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Managed Soils</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>drained organic soils</li> </ul>	3C4 <i>Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Managed Soils</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>land-use category</li> <li>climate zone</li> <li>drainage class (drained, shallow, deep)</li> <li>nutrient status</li> </ul>

Rewetted organic soils				
CO <sub>2</sub> ,	-	-	<p>New sources/sinks under 3B1 to 3B6</p> <p>Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land:</p> <p>CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from rewetted soils and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to dissolved organic carbon export from rewetted organic soils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>climate zone</li> <li>nutrient status (boreal climate zone)</li> </ul>
CH <sub>4</sub>	-	-	<p>New category:</p> <p>3C10 <i>CH<sub>4</sub> from Rewetting of Organic Soils</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>climate zone</li> <li>nutrient status (boreal and temperate climate zone)</li> </ul>
N <sub>2</sub> O	-	-	<p>N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from rewetted organic soils (only when higher-tier methods available)</p> <p>To be reported under 3C14 (<i>Other</i>) (Non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHG emissions not included elsewhere)</p>	
Coastal wetlands				
CO <sub>2</sub> ,	-	-	<p>New sources/sinks under 3B1 to 3B6</p> <p>Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land</p> <p>from the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>forest management in mangroves</li> <li>extraction in mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows (including excavation, aquaculture and salt production)</li> <li>rewetting, revegetation and creation in mangroves, tidal marshes and sea grass meadows</li> <li>soil drainage in mangroves and tidal marches</li> </ul> <p>New subcategories under Wetlands need to be created to cover all potential reporting options:</p> <p>3B4aiii (<i>Other Wetlands Remaining Other</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>climate zone/region</li> <li>vegetation type</li> <li>salinity (where applicable/available)</li> <li>management activity</li> </ul>

			Wetlands), and 3B4biii ( <i>Land Converted to Other Wetlands</i> )	
			NOTE: When activities and emissions occur on areas that are not included in the total land area of the country, the reporting should be split into two parts: areas included in the total land area and areas not included in the total land area. The land-use change matrix should include only those areas that are part of the total land area.	
CH <sub>4</sub>	-	-	New category: 3C11 <i>CH<sub>4</sub> Emissions from Rewetting of Mangroves and Tidal Marshes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wetland type</li> <li>salinity</li> </ul>
N <sub>2</sub> O	-	-	New category: 3C12 <i>N<sub>2</sub>O Emissions from Aquaculture</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>fish-produced</li> </ul>
<b>Inland wetland mineral soils (IWMS)</b>				
CO <sub>2</sub>	Guidance for estimating C stock changes in soils including inland mineral soil wetlands under all land-use categories 3B1 to 3B6  Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>land-use category</li> <li>climate zone</li> </ul>	Updated default reference soil organic carbon stocks (SOC) for inland wetland mineral soils under 3B1 to 3B6  Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland, Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>climate zone/region</li> <li>management activity</li> </ul>
CO <sub>2</sub>	-	-	New stock change factors for land use for long term cultivation and rewetting of Cropland with IWMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>climate zone</li> <li>moisture regime</li> </ul>
CH <sub>4</sub>	-	-	3C13 <i>CH<sub>4</sub> from Rewetted and Created Wetlands on Inland Wetland Mineral Soils</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>climate zone</li> </ul>
<b>Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment</b>				
CH <sub>4</sub> , N <sub>2</sub> O	4D Wastewater Treatment and Discharge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wastewater type (domestic or industrial)</li> <li>BOD/COD load</li> <li>treatment and disposal type</li> </ul>	New treatment types under 4D Wastewater Treatment and Discharge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>wastewater type (domestic or industrial)</li> <li>BOD/COD load</li> <li>treatment and disposal type including constructed wetlands and semi-natural treatment wetlands</li> <li>flow type</li> </ul>

	CO <sub>2</sub>	3B4 to 3B6 Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land	No specific guidance but C stock changes from land-use change covered by the general methodologies	3B4 to 3B6 Wetlands, Settlements and Other Land	No specific guidance but C stock changes from land-use change covered by the general methodologies in the <i>2006 IPCC Guidelines</i>
--	-----------------	--	--	---	--

## 7.2.3 Documentation

Chapter 8 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provides guidance on reporting complete, consistent, and transparent national greenhouse gas inventories. Category-specific guidance on documentation relevant to the supplementary guidance provided in this *Wetlands Supplement* is provided in Chapters 2 to 6.

Reporting in accordance with the *Wetlands Supplement* involves combining guidance from both this *Wetlands Supplement* and the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. The estimation of emissions and removals requires, in some cases, a combination of methodologies which, if care is not taken, can lead to double-counting or omission of emissions or removals. The reporting of emissions and removals from specific activities, *e.g.* rewetting and drainage, is disaggregated among land-use categories and specific or generic categories for reporting of non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. National circumstances will also significantly affect reporting. In some countries, the categories will have a significant impact on total national emissions, but in others they will be insignificant.

It is *good practice* to provide the following information specific to the guidance in this *Wetlands Supplement* in the national inventory report:

- Methods for identifying activities and land areas;
- Classification of activities and land areas;
- Indication if emissions/removals are associated with areas that are not included in the total land areas.
- Disaggregated activity data and emission factors/parameters used by climate regime (temperature, precipitation), nutrient status, ecosystem type and activity/system, as relevant, and the level at which the emissions/removals are estimated.
- Information on how completeness has been assessed and double-counting avoided, *i.e.* in the following cases:
  - If the stock change method is used for a specific category/activity for estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from soils and the default emission factors are used for dissolved organic carbon, the latter emissions may be included in the stock change estimate.
  - Combining a country-specific method to estimate emissions/removals from belowground biomass, litter, or understory (vegetation such as mosses) with default emission factors for drainage and rewetting, which integrate all carbon fluxes from the soil and the above- and belowground vegetation components other than trees, could double-count the respective emissions/removals.
  - Documentation for Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment should show that total organics in wastewater includes but does not double-count the part of organics treated in these systems.
  - Documentation on country-specific methods taking into account the impact of grazing on rewetted soils in the estimation of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from these lands should show that the nitrogen input is not calculated also under category 3A2 (*Manure Management*). Livestock emissions (CH<sub>4</sub> from enteric fermentation and N<sub>2</sub>O from manure management) are, by default, not included under the land-use categories.
- When country-specific emission/removal factors or other parameters are used, documentation and references that justify their use should be provided. The documentation should show that the country-specific emission/removal factors or other parameters result in an improvement in the accuracy of the estimates.

## 7.2.4 Reporting tables

AFOLU sectoral reporting and background tables given in Annex 8A.2, Chapter 8 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* are applicable, with minor changes, for reporting of emissions/removals for methodologies in this *Wetlands Supplement*. AFOLU Sectoral Table 3 and Background Tables 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7 and 3.9, included



in Annex 8A.2, Chapter 8 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, have been updated to cover the new categories introduced in this *Wetlands Supplement* (see Annex 7A.2 in this chapter).

Guidance on reporting, including a description of the changes made to the background tables, is presented above in Sections 7.2.2 and 7.2.3 by chapter of this *Wetlands Supplement*.

## 7.2.5 Worksheets

Annex 7A.1 also provides worksheets for each subcategory for which guidance is given in the *Wetlands Supplement*. The worksheets can be used to estimate emissions based on Tier 1 methods and appropriate emission/stock change factors and activity data.

## 7.3 UNCERTAINTIES

### 7.3.1 Overview of uncertainty analysis

Uncertainty is an expression of the degree to which the value of a variable is unknown (IPCC, 2007). In greenhouse gas inventories, uncertainty derives from quantifiable errors and variation in methods and data.

For greenhouse gas inventories, quantification of uncertainty is important because it allows inventory agencies to ascertain if estimated changes in greenhouse gas emissions and removals over two or more years are larger than the uncertainty of possible estimates for an individual year. In wetlands and drained soils, the magnitude of carbon stocks is often much larger than annual emissions or removals, so large uncertainties in carbon stock estimates may make it difficult to determine if estimated annual emissions or removals are real or a result of uncertainty. Uncertainty analysis can indicate areas for future improvement of inventory methods that can reduce the uncertainties.

In greenhouse gas inventories, major quantifiable sources of uncertainty include:

- field measurement errors
- remote sensing inaccuracies
- geographic and land cover map inaccuracies
- missing or incomplete data in time series
- misreporting or misclassification
- data bias or unrepresentative sampling
- random sampling error
- spatial variation
- spatial or temporal autocorrelation, when not properly considered
- model inaccuracies

Uncertainty analysis generally proceeds through these steps:

- Identification of primary sources of uncertainty.
- Estimation of uncertainties of individual variables.
- Combination of individual variable uncertainties into total uncertainty estimates of emissions or removals for a land-use category for a geographic area.

This section summarises scientific methods for the two approaches of uncertainty analysis set forth in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. This section aims to summarise material from Chapter 3 in Volume 1 and Chapter 7 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, summarise new methods for the categories and subcategories described in Chapters 2 to 6 of this *Wetlands Supplement*, and assess methods across the wetlands and drained soil subcategories. To the extent possible, it provides published examples. Inventory compilers should consult the detailed information in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and this *Wetlands Supplement*.

## 7.3.2 Methods for quantifying uncertainty

The measure of uncertainty for national greenhouse gas inventories is the 95% confidence interval (CI). It is *good practice* to report the 95% CI for individual variables, including activity data, emissions factors, biomass densities, other parameters, and total greenhouse gas emissions or removals from any *key category* or land-use category for a geographic area.

The 2006 *IPCC Guidelines* set forth two approaches for quantifying uncertainty. Approach 1 is a basic approach that uses algebraic equations to combine individual variable uncertainties. Approach 2 is an advanced approach that uses Monte Carlo analysis.

**Approach 1** - Use the measures of uncertainty for individual variables given in the default tables in this *Wetlands Supplement* and the 2006 *IPCC Guidelines*. To combine individual variable uncertainties into total estimates of the uncertainty of emissions or removals for any *key category* or land-use category for a geographic area, use algebraic uncertainty combination methods (Mandel, 1984), identified in Chapter 3 in Volume 1 of the 2006 *IPCC Guidelines*.

Use Equation 7.1 to calculate the uncertainty of a set of added variables:

**EQUATION 7.1**  
**ALGEBRAIC COMBINATION OF UNCERTAINTIES – ADDITION AND SUBTRACTION**

$$U_{total} = \frac{\sqrt{(U_1 \times x_1)^2 + (U_2 \times x_2)^2 + \dots + (U_n \times x_n)^2}}{|x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n|}$$

Where:

$U_{total}$  = uncertainty (95% CI) of the sum of the variables

$U_i$  = uncertainty (95% CI) of a variable

$x_i$  = value of a variable.

If the sum emissions and removals<sup>4</sup> in the denominator approaches zero, Equation 7.1 may give very high uncertainty values and not reflect the true value of underlying uncertainties of the individual emissions or removals estimates. In a time series, changes in the value given by Equation 7.1 may not necessarily reflect real changes in uncertainties of individual variables. In such cases, it may be better to use absolute uncertainty values of removals in the denominator. These absolute values can be combined with absolute values of the rest of the inventory to give overall inventory uncertainty.

Use Equation 7.2 to calculate the uncertainty of a set of multiplied variables:

**EQUATION 7.2**  
**ALGEBRAIC COMBINATION OF UNCERTAINTIES – MULTIPLICATION**

$$U_{total} = \sqrt{U_1^2 + U_2^2 + \dots + U_n^2}$$

Where:

$U_{total}$  = uncertainty (95% CI) of the product of a set of variables

$U_i$  = uncertainty (95% CI) of a variable

Refer to the 2006 *IPCC Guidelines* for detailed steps of algebraic uncertainty combination, including calculation of uncertainties of temporal trends.

This *Wetlands Supplement* presents guidance to take into consideration the sources of uncertainty, either in activity data or emissions factors that are important specifically for wetlands and drained soils. The definitions of subcategories for wetlands and drained soils, and delineation of their surface areas can, by themselves, be sources of uncertainty. While the 2006 *IPCC Guidelines* generally stratify land-use categories by ecological zone (Chapter 3 in Volume 4) or climate zone, this *Wetlands Supplement* stratifies wetlands and drained soils into subcategories based on their characteristics and human activities. The following list summarises particular sources of uncertainty for the subcategories and new tables that provide inventory compilers with default uncertainty values.

<sup>4</sup> Emissions are positive and removals negative values in greenhouse gas inventories.

- **Drained inland organic soils** – Particular uncertainties include the high spatial variability of soil organic carbon, variation of surface areas and emissions factors by drainage class, which requires estimates of the depth of the water table, the fraction of land area occupied by drainage ditches, which is the key parameter for estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, and high spatial and temporal variability of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions, which can generate large standard errors relative to mean fluxes. Particular sources of uncertainty for estimates of fire emissions include variability of fire behavior among vegetation types, variation of the fraction of fuel combusted among ecosystems, fires, years, and land management practices, partitioning of smoke among CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, and other gases, and estimates of burned area and fuels.
  - Table 2.1 - Tier 1 CO<sub>2</sub> emission/removal factors for drained organic soils in all land-use categories
  - Table 2.2 - Default DOC emission factors for drained organic soils
  - Table 2.3 - Tier 1 CH<sub>4</sub> emission/removal factors for drained organic soils (EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub>\_land</sub>) in all land-use categories
  - Table 2.4 - Default CH<sub>4</sub> emission factors for drainage ditches
  - Table 2.5 - Tier 1 Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emission/removal factors for drained organic soils in all land-use categories
  - Table 2.6 - Organic soil fuel consumption values
  - Table 2.7 - Emission factors (g kg<sup>-1</sup> dry matter burnt) for organic soil fires
- **Rewetted organic soils** – The principal uncertainty is the high spatial variability of soil organic carbon.
  - Table 3.1 - Default emission factors (EF<sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub>) and associated uncertainty, for CO<sub>2</sub>-C from rewetted organic soils (all values in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)
  - Table 3.2 - Default DOC emission factors (EF<sub>DOC\_REWETTED</sub> in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) for rewetted organic soils
  - Table 3.3 - Default emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> from rewetted organic soils (all values in kg CH<sub>4</sub>-C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)
- **Coastal wetlands** – Particular uncertainties include variation of aboveground biomass by mangrove or seagrass species, forest age, tide height, soil fertility, salinity of flood waters, and flood frequency and inter-annual variation of vegetation production.
  - Table 4.2 - Carbon fraction of above-ground biomass (tonnes C (tonnes d.m.)<sup>-1</sup>) in mangroves
  - Table 4.3 - Above-ground biomass in mangroves (tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup>)
  - Table 4.4 - Above-ground biomass growth in mangroves (tonnes d.m. ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)
  - Table 4.5 - Ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass (R) in mangroves
  - Table 4.6 - Average density (D; tonnes m<sup>-3</sup>) of mangrove wood
  - Table 4.7 - Tier 1 default values for litter and dead wood carbon stocks in mangroves
  - Table 4.8 - Summary of Tier 1 estimation of initial changes in carbon pools for extraction activities
  - Table 4.9 - Ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass (R) for tidal marshes
  - Table 4.10 - Ratio of below-ground biomass to above-ground biomass (R) for seagrass meadows
  - Table 4.11 - Soil carbon stocks for mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows for extraction activities
  - Table 4.12 - Annual emission factors associated with rewetting (EF<sub>RE</sub>) on aggregated organic and mineral soils (tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) at initiation of vegetation reestablishment
  - Table 4.13 - Annual emission factors associated with drainage (EF<sub>DR</sub>) on aggregated organic and mineral soils (tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>)
  - Table 4.14 - Emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> (EF<sub>REWET</sub>) Tier 1 estimation of rewetted land previously vegetated by tidal marshes and mangroves
  - Table 4.15 - Emission factor (EF<sub>F</sub>) for N<sub>2</sub>O emission from aquaculture use in mangroves, tidal marshes and seagrass meadows

- **Inland wet mineral soils** – Some emissions are a function of time under management.
  - Table 5.2 - Default reference soil organic carbon stocks (SOC<sub>REF</sub>) for wetland mineral soils under native vegetation (0-30 cm depth)
  - Table 5.3 - Relative stock change factors for land use (FLU) for long-term cultivation on cropland with IWMS (over 20 years) and rewetting of cropland with IWMS (over 20 years and 40 years)
  - Table 5.4 - Default emission factors for CH<sub>4</sub> from managed lands with IWMS where water table level has been raised
- **Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment** – Major sources of uncertainty include estimation of the quantity of treated wastewater, fraction of organics converted anaerobically to CH<sub>4</sub> during wastewater collection, amount of industrial organic wastewater from small or medium industries discharged into constructed wetlands, and differences in gas exchange by different plant species.
  - Table 6.2 - Influent total organic carbon (TOC) and total nitrogen (TN) values, relevant CH<sub>4</sub>-C and N<sub>2</sub>O-N emissions, and share (%) of CH<sub>4</sub>-C and N<sub>2</sub>O-N in the initial loading of TOC and TN in constructed wetlands
  - Table 6.5 - Default uncertainty ranges for domestic and industrial wastewater
  - Table 6.7 - Nitrous oxide methodology default uncertainties

It is *good practice* to use uncertainty estimates reported by or derived from the same data sources used for the emissions and removals estimates. For Tier 1 estimates, use the uncertainties given in the IPCC default tables. For Tier 2, the data sources of the country- or ecosystem-specific parameters would provide the most appropriate uncertainty estimates. In the absence of country- or ecosystem-specific uncertainty estimates, it is possible to use published uncertainty estimates for similar ecosystems or circumstances, such as listed in Table 7.2 below. These published uncertainty estimates can also provide useful data to check country- or ecosystem-specific uncertainty estimates.

TABLE 7.2 EXAMPLES OF WETLANDS AND DRAINED SOILS WITH PUBLISHED ESTIMATES OF UNCERTAINTIES OF PARAMETERS USED IN ESTIMATING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND REMOVALS			
Continent	Country	Wetland or drained soil type	Reference
Africa	Botswana	Okavango Delta	Mladenov <i>et al.</i> , 2005
	Madagascar	estuary	Ralison <i>et al.</i> , 2008
	Senegal	estuary area	Sakho <i>et al.</i> , 2011
Asia	China	constructed wetland	Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Indo-Pacific	mangroves	Donato <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Indonesia	peat swamps and oil palms	Murdiyarso <i>et al.</i> , 2010
North America	Canada	restored wetlands	Badiou <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Costa Rica	tropical inland wetlands	Bernal and Mitsch, 2008
	USA	streams and rivers	Butman and Raymond, 2011
South America	Argentina	river marsh	Vicari <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Brazil	Pantanal	Schöngart <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Peru	Amazonian peatland	Lähteenoja <i>et al.</i> , 2012
Global	Global	coastal ecosystems	McLeod <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Global	freshwater wetlands	Kayranli <i>et al.</i> , 2010
	Global	freshwater wetlands methane	Bastviken <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Global	mangroves	Breithaupt <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	Global	restored wetlands	Moreno-Mateos <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	Global	seagrass	Fourqurean <i>et al.</i> , 2012
	Global	tropical peatlands	Page <i>et al.</i> , 2011
	Global	wetlands carbon and methane	Mitsch <i>et al.</i> , 2010

**Approach 2** – For an individual variable, calculate the 95% CI from the probability density function (PDF) of measurements of the variable. Derive the PDF from a random sample. Capture the principal forms of spatial and temporal variation in the sample or calculate different PDFs for the principal spatial and temporal strata. Section 3.2.2.4, Chapter 3 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* provides methods to develop PDFs.

To combine individual variable uncertainties into total estimates of emissions or removals for a land-use category or a geographic area, use the Monte Carlo method (Metropolis and Ulam, 1949), set forth by the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* as Approach 2. The Monte Carlo method is a statistical technique that quantifies the uncertainty of a variable based on a large number of randomized realisations of the value of the variable based on its mean value and the standard error of the mean (for a PDF that follows a normal distribution) or other appropriate measure of error (for other types of PDFs).

For example, the width of a ditch is an essential variable in estimating CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils (Equation 2.6 in Chapter 2 of this supplement). In a typical field survey, a person might measure the width of a ditch once and record the measurement. If the measurement were immediately repeated, the result may be slightly different due to the exact placement of the measuring device, judgment of the level of water, which defines the width, possible errors in transcribing or transmitting the value, and other factors. Repeating the measurement 100 or 1000 times would generate a PDF that might typically take the form of a normal distribution. The 95% CI of the distribution is a measure of the uncertainty of the ditch width measurement.

Monte Carlo analysis consists of running a calculation for a statistically significant number of replications, typically 100 to 10 000, producing a probability density function of the result, and calculating the 95% CI of the PDF. For any equation, the Monte Carlo form of a variable (Equation 7.3 below) can replace each of the variables in the equation. The large number of realisations effectively combines the uncertainties of individual variables.

**EQUATION 7.3**  
**MONTE CARLO ANALYSIS – GENERAL FORM OF A VARIABLE**

$$x_i = \text{mean}_x + (\text{random}_i \times SE_x)$$

Where:

$x_i$  = value of realisation  $i$  of a variable,

$i$  = statistically significant number of realisations, typically 100 – 10 000

$\text{mean}_x$  = mean value of a variable

$\text{random}_i$  = random number for realisation  $i$ , from -1 to 1, taken from a set of random numbers that form a probability distribution function specific to the variable

$SE_x$  = standard error of the mean value of the variable

Refer to the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* for detailed steps of Monte Carlo analysis, including selection of an appropriate PDF for a variable and its random numbers. Inventory compilers and scientists have quantified uncertainty in greenhouse gas inventories in a range of cases, including the national inventories of Austria (Winiwarter and Muik, 2010), Finland (Monni *et al.*, 2007), and the Netherlands (Ramírez *et al.*, 2008) and high-biomass ecosystems in California, USA (e.g. Gonzalez *et al.*, 2010) and Canada (e.g. Kurz *et al.*, 2008).

Ways to reduce uncertainty in both Approach 1 and Approach 2 include:

- **Organic soils** – Spatially disaggregated CO<sub>2</sub> flux measurements can provide data to develop local emission factors, correcting for carbon losses through leaching of dissolved organic carbon or runoff. Quantification of impacts of land use and management on emissions can improve emissions estimates. Examples include organic matter additions to agricultural land that can increase substrate supply for methane production in ditches, short-term pulses of ditch CH<sub>4</sub> emission associated with land-use change, and nutrient-enriched soils that are a legacy of past land use.
- **Rewetted peatlands** – CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are often a function of present vegetation composition and previous land use history. So, stratification of an area by these properties can improve emissions estimates. Determination of spatial variation of peat type and depth, vegetation composition, soil temperature, mean water table depth, the provision by vegetation of substrates for CH<sub>4</sub> production, and transport by vegetation of CH<sub>4</sub> from saturated soil to the atmosphere can improve emissions estimates.
- **Coastal wetlands** – More detailed stratification of land by drainage and other management systems can improve emissions estimates. Quantification of the effects of coastal grassland management, including grazing, fire, liming, and fertilization, can improve emissions estimates.

- **Inland mineral soil wetlands** – Chapter 5 in the *Wetlands Supplement* does not identify uncertainty reduction methods.
- **Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment** – Provide separate estimates for domestic and industrial wastewater by type of constructed wetlands (surface flow (SF), horizontal subsurface flow (HSSF), and vertical subsurface flow (VSSF)).

## 7.4 IMPACT ON KEY CATEGORIES

### 7.4.1 Overview of *key category* analysis

A *key category* is a category that is prioritized within the national inventory system because its estimate has a significant influence on a country's total inventory of greenhouse gases in terms of the absolute level, the trend, or the uncertainty in emissions and removals. Whenever the term *key category* is used, it includes both source and sink categories.

Methodological choice (choice of tier) for individual source and sink categories is important in managing overall inventory uncertainty. Generally, inventory uncertainty is lower when higher-tier methods are used to estimate emissions and removals. However, higher-tier methods generally require extensive resources for data collection, so it may not be feasible to use these methods for every category. It is therefore *good practice* to identify those categories that have the greatest contribution to the total magnitude of inventory emissions, removals, and/or uncertainty, to make the most efficient use of available resources. By identifying the *key categories* in the national inventory, inventory compilers can prioritize their efforts and improve the overall estimates. The purpose, general rules, and approaches for the *key category* analysis of the whole greenhouse gas inventory are presented in Chapter 4 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

According to Section 4.2 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, the general rules for performing the *key category* analysis are:

- The analysis should be performed at the level of IPCC categories or subcategories for which IPCC methods and/or decision trees are provided.
- Each greenhouse gas emitted from each category should be considered separately, unless there are specific methodological reasons for treating gases collectively.
- Emissions and removals from a category should also be considered separately, where possible and relevant.

Table 4.1 in Section 4.2 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* gives a recommended level at which the *key category* analysis should be performed. Countries may, however, choose to perform the quantitative analysis at a more disaggregated level than suggested in the table.

*Key category* analyses are performed using two approaches. Approach 1 is based on level and trend assessments. In the level assessment under Approach 1, categories of the inventory are listed in the order of absolute values of their contribution to the sum of the absolute value of emissions and removals, and the largest categories contributing to 95% of this sum are considered *key categories*. The trend assessment under Approach 1 analyses the contribution of a category to the trend and if the trend of the category is significantly different from that of the inventory. The categories contributing most to 95% of the trend are considered *key categories*. Section 4.3.1 in Chapter 4 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* presents the details on the *key category* analysis. Approach 2 is based on similar level and trend assessments, but it also takes into account uncertainties of the categories included in the analysis (for details, see Section 4.3.2 in Chapter 4 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*).

Countries are encouraged to undertake *key category* analysis using Approaches 1 and 2, because Approach 2 can provide additional insight, e.g. on the order in which to tackle categories identified in Approach 1.

Countries are also encouraged to include qualitative criteria in the *key category* analysis (see Section 4.3.3 in Chapter 4 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). If quantitative *key category* analysis has not been carried out due to lack of completeness in the inventory, it is *good practice* to use qualitative criteria to identify *key categories*.

## 7.4.2 *Key category analysis including the categories affected by the Wetlands Supplement*

According to Table 4.1, Chapter 4 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, the appropriate aggregation level for land use CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (carbon stock changes) distinguishes the emissions or removals for lands remaining and lands converted to each of the six land-use categories. Thus, twelve categories need to be distinguished. This approach is considered appropriate, as the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from the land-use categories are generally estimated using the same or similar generic methodologies and also using the same activity data (area data).

The *Wetlands Supplement* introduces new subcategories and more detailed guidance for some categories in the AFOLU Sector. Also, the Wastewater Treatment category in the Waste Sector is complemented with an additional treatment system (constructed wetlands). Despite these changes, inventory compilers should continue to perform the *key category* analysis at the level suggested in Table 4.1, Chapter 4 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. In addition, inventory compilers should determine which pools and subcategories are significant. The significance of the categories and subcategories affected by the *Wetlands Supplement* should be assessed using the general rule that a subcategory is significant if it accounts for 25-30% of its *key category* (see decision trees in Figures 1.2 and 1.3 in Chapter 1 in Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*).

In the quantitative *key category* analysis, when emissions/removals from a specific activity, such as conversion of forest to other land uses, are estimated using the same methodology, but spread out among different land-use change categories, inventory compilers should identify and sum up the emission/removal estimates for this activity and compare its magnitude with the smallest category identified as key. If this sum is larger than the smallest category identified as key, the activity in question should be considered key. Countries should assess whether this rule would be applicable to their circumstance for categories addressed in this *Wetlands Supplement*.

## 7.5 COMPLETENESS

Complete greenhouse gas inventories include estimates of emissions and removals from the sources and sinks for which methodological guidance is provided in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and the *Wetlands Supplement* unless the specific sources and sinks do not occur on the national territory. The decision tree in Figure 1.1 and Table 1.3 in Chapter 1 of this report provide guidance on the links between guidance in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* and the *Wetlands Supplement* to help countries in ensuring complete coverage of all relevant categories in the inventory.

A country may consider that a disproportionate amount of effort would be required to collect data for a category or a gas from a specific category that would be insignificant in terms of the overall level and trend in national emissions. The *Wetlands Supplement* addresses sources and sinks for which the significance varies considerably by country. For instance, some wetland and drained soil types occur only in some regions of the world. The amount of organic soils may be very small in some countries and tidal effects on emissions would be applicable only to coastal countries. In circumstances where the supplementary guidance is not applicable to a country or emissions/removals are not reported due to their insignificance, they should use the notation keys 'NO' (not occurring) and 'NE' (not estimated) respectively. For details on the use of the notation keys, the inventory compilers should refer to Section 8.2.5 in Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. It is *good practice* to provide justification for each emission estimate for which the notation key 'NE' is used.

## 7.6 TIME SERIES CONSISTENCY

### 7.6.1 Overview of time series issues

Greenhouse gas inventory methods should be consistent for an entire time series so that each year in the time series can be compared with other years. This provides countries with information to properly assess temporal trends in greenhouse gas emissions and removals and the effectiveness of emissions reduction measures. Issues that will affect time series consistency include:

- changes and refinements to scientific methods due to research advances
- addition of new categories
- data gaps
- correction of errors

In a consistent time series, changes in emissions or removals over time are due to real phenomena in the field rather than any influence of the above set of circumstances.

This *Wetlands Supplement* includes substantial changes to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines methods for soil organic matter and refines the subcategories within all land-use categories. This will make necessary the recalculation of results from previous years to produce a consistent time series.

This section summarises material from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines, including Chapter 5 in Volume 1 and Chapter 7 in Volume 4. It also adds recent scientific information described in Chapters 2-6 of this *Wetlands Supplement*.

## 7.6.2 Methods for producing consistent time series

This section provides guidance for producing consistent time series of emissions and removals for the categories and subcategories addressed in this *Wetlands Supplement*. It presents the information by the tiers that inventory compilers already use to estimate emissions and removals.


**All tiers** - Recalculate an entire data series when changing from the *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, 2003 *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*, and 2006 IPCC Guidelines to the *Wetlands Supplement*, when methods are refined due to scientific advances, new data become available, QC finds errors in previous estimates, or a land classification changes. For data gaps, it is *good practice* to clearly report where an inventory presents measured or monitored results and where it presents model output.

**Tier 1** – Use the activity data for years available in the default sources presented in the *Wetlands Supplement* and the 2006 IPCC Guidelines or national data sources, where available, and fill gaps using appropriate methods in Section 5.3, Chapter 5 in Volume 1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

**Tiers 2 and 3** - To fill data gaps, examine available historical sources, administrative records, aerial photographs, or remote sensing and use appropriate methods in Section 5.3, Chapter 5 in Volume 1 the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Alternatively, interpolate using a function that models empirical trends or underlying processes. Identify years where the inventory presents measured or monitored results and where it presents model output. Some examples of producing consistent time series include field validation of model dead wood time series in the Netherlands national greenhouse gas inventory (van der Maas *et al.*, 2011; Figure 7.1), data gap filling of CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from Everglades National Park, USA (Barr *et al.*, 2010), and filling of night-time gaps in ecosystem respiration in Lake Victoria wetlands, Uganda (Saunders *et al.*, 2012). The case of the Netherlands is an example that illustrates recalculation of a time series to improve consistency. When field measurements of dead wood showed that modelled estimates were not accurate, the inventory agency revised the parameters in its dead wood model and recalculated the entire time series (van der Maas *et al.*, 2011; Figure 7.1). Refer to Section 5.3, Chapter 5 in Volume 1 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for detailed steps of filling historical gaps by splicing and for the use of surrogate parameters.

**Figure 7.1** Example of recalculation of a time series.



The 2011 national inventory report (NIR) for the Netherlands (van der Maas *et al.*, 2011) provided a more accurate time series of the carbon stock in dead wood than previous inventories. Measured values of dead wood stocks in the Netherlands national forest inventory (black dots) showed that national greenhouse gas inventories prior to 2011 (purple upper line) overestimated the build-up of the carbon stock. Inventory compilers found that their model underestimated the removal of dead wood from forests. Adjustment of that parameter generated a model time series (green lower line) that met the measured values.



## 7.7 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL

### 7.7.1 Overview of quality issues

Quality assurance and quality control are procedures to improve the accuracy, transparency, consistency, comparability, and completeness of inventories. Effectively implemented quality procedures can reduce uncertainties of greenhouse gas inventories. Quality control (QC) is a system of routine activities to assess, improve or maintain the quality of the inventory as it is being compiled. Quality assurance (QA) is a planned system of review procedures conducted by personnel not directly involved in the inventory and performed on a completed inventory. This section summarises material from the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*, including Volume 1, Chapter 6 and Volume 4, Chapter 7. It also adds recent scientific information described in Chapters 2-6 of this *Wetlands Supplement*.

### 7.7.2 Quality assurance and quality control methods


Provide routine and consistent checks to ensure data integrity, correctness, and completeness. Identify and address errors and omissions. Document and archive inventory material and record all QC activities. Check labelling, transcription, and other clerical issues related to data entry (See complete list in Table 6.1, Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*). Double-check outlying values against data sources. Check final results against previous years and published values. Compare inventories with results from similar ecosystems in other countries. Conduct an area-balance for land-use category areas and, when applicable, a mass-balance for greenhouse gas emissions and removals. Develop automated data control procedures. It is *good practice* to prioritize *key categories* for more extensive QA and QC.

Where default values are used, ensure that they reflect the country's conditions because inappropriate default values increase uncertainty.


Where higher tiers are used, check estimates against local sources for activity data, emissions factors, and other variables. Check scientific literature for any new scientific information.

Computer models can be validated against field measurements and resulting differences should be included in the calculation of uncertainty (Section 7.2.1). The validation measure can be a correlation of predicted and measured values (Figure 7.2; Miehle *et al.*, 2006), fractional agreement of modelled and observed data (Figure 7.3; Chadwick, 2011), or other variable. Separate the data set used for calibration of a model from the data set used for validation of the model. When more than one model is available for a particular parameter, inter-comparison of model output can provide indications of the robustness of individual models. Comparison of Tier 3 models with estimates using Tier 1 and Tier 2 methods can serve that same purpose. IPCC (2011) provides numerous specific examples of model development, calibration, and validation.

**Figure 7.2** Example of validation of a model for quality control



Values of aboveground biomass derived from field measurements of *Eucalyptus globulus* in Australia (x-axis) provide data to validate the accuracy of output from the Forest-Denitrification decomposition (DNDC) model (y-axis) (Miehle *et al.*, 2006). The correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) and significance probability (not shown) are validation measures of the model. More observed values and a wider range of carbon densities would improve the validation.

**Figure 7.3** Example of validation of remote sensing data for quality control

The map shows wetlands cover in part of Florida, USA, derived from an Ikonos satellite image (Chadwick, 2011). The table is an error matrix that shows the fraction of pixels (%) where the Ikonos-derived wetlands cover class (columns) matches the class directly observed in the field (rows). The overall accuracy (83%) is the validation measure. The column 'omission' gives the fraction of observed pixels that the Ikonos cover classification missed. The row 'commission' gives the fraction of Ikonos-derived wetlands cover pixels that the classification incorrectly identified.

## References

- Badiou, P., McDougal, R., Pennock, D. & Clark., B. (2011) Greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration potential in restored wetlands of the Canadian prairie pothole region. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **19**: 237-256.
- Barr, J.G., Engel, V., Fuentes, J.D., Zieman, J.C., O'Halloran, T.L., Smith, T.J. & Anderson, G.H. (2010) Controls on mangrove forest-atmosphere carbon dioxide exchanges in western Everglades National Park. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **115**: G02020. doi:10.1029/2009JG001186.
- Bastviken, D., Tranvik, L.J., Downing, J.A., Crill, P.M. & Enrich-Prast, A. (2011) Freshwater methane emissions offset the continental carbon sink. *Science* **331**: 50.
- Bernal, B. & Mitsch, W.J. (2008) A comparison of soil carbon pools and profiles in wetlands in Costa Rica and Ohio. *Ecological Engineering* **34**: 311-323.
- Breithaupt, J.L., Smoak, J.M., Smith III, T.J., Sanders, C.J. & Hoare, A. (2012) Organic carbon burial rates in mangrove sediments: Strengthening the global budget. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **26**: GB3011. doi:10.1029/2012GB004375.
- Butman, D. & Raymond, P.A. (2011) Significant efflux of carbon dioxide from streams and rivers in the United States. *Nature Geoscience* **4**: 839-842.
- Chadwick, J. (2011) Integrated LiDAR and IKONOS multispectral imagery for mapping mangrove distribution and physical properties. *International Journal of Remote Sensing* **32**: 6765-6781.
- Chen, G.Q., Shao, L., Chen, Z.M., Li, Z., Zhang, B., Chen, H. & Wu, Z. (2011) Low-carbon assessment for ecological wastewater treatment by a constructed wetland in Beijing. *Ecological Engineering* **37**: 622-628.
- Donato, D.C., Kauffman, J.B., Murdiyarso, D., Kurnianto, S., Stidham, M. & Kanninen, M. (2011) Mangroves among the most carbon-rich forests in the tropics. *Nature Geoscience* **4**: 293-297.
- Fourqurean, J.W., Duarte, C.M., Kennedy, H., Marbà, N., Holmer, M., Mateo, M.A., Apostolaki, E.T., Kendrick, G.A., Krause-Jensen, D., McGlathery, K.J. & Serrano, O. (2012) Seagrass ecosystems as a globally significant carbon stock. *Nature Geoscience* **5**: 505-509.
- Gonzalez, P., Asner, G.P., Battles, J.J., Lefsky, M.A., Waring, K.M. & Palace, M. (2010) Forest carbon densities and uncertainties from Lidar, QuickBird, and field measurements in California. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **114**: 1561-1575.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (1997) *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Volumes 1, 2 and 3*. Houghton, J.T., Meira Filho, L.G., Lim, B., Tréanton, K., Mamaty, I., Bonduki, Y., Griggs, D.J. and Callander, B.A. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/OECD/IEA, Paris, France.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2003) *Good Practice Guidance for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry*. Penman, J., Gytarsky, M., Hiraishi, T., Kruger, D., Pipatti, R., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara, T., Tanabe, K. and Wagner, F. (Eds). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPCC/IGES, Hayama, Japan.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2006) *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories*, Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (Eds). Published: IGES, Japan.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2007) *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2011) *Use of Models and Facility-Level Data in Greenhouse Gas Inventories*. Report of IPCC Expert Meeting on Use of Models and Measurements in Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 9-11 August 2010, Sydney, Australia. Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Hayama, Japan.
- Kayranli, B., Scholz, M., Mustafa, A. & Hedmark, A. (2010) Carbon storage and fluxes within freshwater wetlands: A critical review. *Wetlands* **30**: 111-124.
- Kurz, W.A., Dymond, C.C., Stinson, G., Rampley, G.J., Neilson, E.T., Carroll, A.L., Ebata, T. & Safranyik, L. (2008) Mountain pine beetle and forest carbon feedback to climate change. *Nature* **452**: 987-990.
- Lähteenoja, O., Reátegui, Y.R., Räsänen, M., Torres, D.D.C., Oinonen, M. & Page, S. (2012) The large Amazonian peatland carbon sink in the subsiding Pastaza-Marañón foreland basin, Peru. *Global Change Biology* **18**: 164-178.

- Mandel, J. (1984) *The statistical analysis of experimental data*. Dover Publications, Mineola, NY, USA.
- McLeod, E., Chmura, G.L., Bouillon, S., Salm, R., Björk, M., Duarte, C.M., Lovelock, C.E., Schlesinger, W.H. & Silliman, B.R. (2011) A blueprint for blue carbon: toward an improved understanding of the role of vegetated coastal habitats in sequestering CO<sub>2</sub>. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **9**: 552-560.
- Metropolis, N. & Ulam, S. (1949) The Monte Carlo method. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **44**: 335-341.
- Miehle, P., Livesley, S.J., Feikema, P.M., Li, C. & Arndt, S.K. (2006) Assessing productivity and carbon sequestration capacity of Eucalyptus globulus plantations using the process model Forest-DNDC: Calibration and validation. *Ecological Modelling* **192**: 83-94.
- Mitsch, W.J., Nahlik, A., Wolski, P., Bernal, B., Zhang, L. & Ramberg, L. (2010) Tropical wetlands: Seasonal hydrologic pulsing, carbon sequestration, and methane emissions. *Wetlands Ecology and Management* **18**: 573-586.
- Mladenov, N., McKnight, D.M., Wolski, P. & Ramberg, L. (2005) Effects of annual flooding on dissolved organic carbon dynamics within a pristine wetland, the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Wetlands* **25**: 622-638.
- Monni, S., Peltoniemi, M., Palosuo, T., Lehtonen, A., Mäkipää, R. & Savolainen, I. (2007) Uncertainty of forest carbon stock changes – Implications to the total uncertainty of GHG inventory of Finland. *Climatic Change* **81**: 391-413.
- Moreno-Mateos, D., Power, M.E., Comín, F.A. & Yockteng, R. (2012) Structural and functional loss in restored wetland ecosystems. *PLoS Biology* **10**(1): e1001247. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001247.
- Murdiyarso, D., Hergoualc'h, K. & Verchot, L.V. (2010) Opportunities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in tropical peatlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* **107**: 19 655-19 660.
- Page, S.E., Rieley, J.O. & Banks, C.J. (2011) Global and regional importance of the tropical peatland carbon pool. *Global Change Biology*, **17**: 798-818.
- Ralison, O.H., Borges, A.V., Dehairs, F., Middelburg, J.J. & Bouillon, S. (2008) Carbon biogeochemistry of the Betsiboka estuary (north-western Madagascar). *Organic Geochemistry* **39**: 1649-1658.
- Ramírez, A., de Keizer, C., Van der Sluijs, J.P., Olivier, J. & Brandes, L. (2008) Monte Carlo analysis of uncertainties in the Netherlands greenhouse gas emission inventory for 1990–2004. *Atmospheric Environment* **42**: 8263-8272.
- Sakho, I., Mesnage, V., Deloffre, J., Lafite, R., Niang, I. & Faye, G. (2011) The influence of natural and anthropogenic factors on mangrove dynamics over 60 years: The Somone Estuary, Senegal. *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science* **94**: 93-101.
- Saunders, M.J., Kansime, F. & Jones, M.B. (2012) Agricultural encroachment: Implications for carbon sequestration in tropical African wetlands. *Global Change Biology* **18**: 1312–1321.
- Schöngart, J., Arieira, J., Fortes, C.F., de Arruda, E.C. & da Cunha, C.N. (2011) Age-related and stand-wise estimates of carbon stocks and sequestration in the aboveground coarse wood biomass of wetland forests in the northern Pantanal, Brazil. *Biogeosciences* **8**: 3407-3421.
- van der Maas, C.W.M., Coenen, P.W.H.G., Zijlema, P.J., Baas, K., van den Berghe, G., te Biesebeek, J.D., Brandt, A.T., Geilenkirchen, G., van der Hoek, K.W., te Molder, R., Dröge, R., Peek, C.J., Vonk, J. & van den Wyngaert, I. (2011) Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the Netherlands 1990-2009. *National Inventory Report 2011*. National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, Netherlands.
- Vicari, R., Kandus, P., Pratolongo, P. & Burghi, M. (2011) Carbon budget alteration due to landcover-landuse change in wetlands: the case of afforestation in the Lower Delta of the Parana River marshes (Argentina). *Water and Environment Journal* **25**: 378-386.
- Winiwarter, W. & Muik, B. (2010) Statistical dependence in input data of national greenhouse gas inventories: Effects on the overall inventory uncertainty. *Climatic Change* **103**: 19-36.

# ANNEX 7A.1

---

## WORKSHEETS

This annex provides worksheets for use in estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals based on Tier 1 methods given in the *Wetlands Supplement*. Most of the worksheets included in this annex are new ones that are not included in Annex 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. However, the following 6 worksheets update or replace the existing worksheets in Annex 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

- Worksheet for Land Remaining in a Land-use Category or Land Converted to a New Land-use Category: Annual On-site Carbon Emissions and Removals from Drained Inland Organic Soils (Page 7.26)  
This sheet replaces the existing worksheets for Annual Change in Carbon Stocks in Organic Soils for the six land-use categories (e.g. existing worksheets on pages A1.23 and A1.27, Annex 1, Volume 4) in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.
- Worksheet for Direct N<sub>2</sub>O Emissions from Managed Soils (Page 7.29)  
This sheet updates the existing worksheet for Direct N<sub>2</sub>O Emissions from Managed Soils on page A1.58, Annex 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.
- Worksheet for Cropland Remaining Cropland: Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils (Page 7.44)  
This sheet updates the existing worksheet for Annual Change in Carbon Stocks in Mineral Soils for Cropland Remaining Cropland on page A1.22, Annex 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.
- Worksheet for Land (non-Cropland) remaining in a Land-use Category: Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils (Page 7.45)  
This sheet updates the existing worksheets for Annual Change in Carbon Stocks in Mineral Soils for land remaining in the same land use category for land use category other than Cropland (e.g. existing worksheet on page A1.28, Annex 1, Volume 4) in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.
- Worksheet for Land Converted to a Cropland: Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils (Pages 7.46-7.47)  
This sheet updates the existing worksheet on Annual Change in Carbon Stocks in Mineral Soils for Land Converted to Cropland on page A1.26, Annex 1, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.
- Worksheet for Land Converted to a New Land-use Category (non-Cropland): Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils (Page 7.48)  
This sheet updates the existing worksheets for Annual Change in Carbon Stocks in Mineral Soils for land converted to a new land use category other than Cropland (e.g. existing worksheet on page A1.32, Annex 1, Volume 4) in the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

## CHAPTER 2—DRAINED INLAND ORGANIC SOILS

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>			
<b>Category</b>		<b>Land Remaining in a Land-use Category OR Land Converted to a New Land-use Category<sup>1</sup>: Annual on-site carbon emissions and removals from drained Inland organic soils</b>			
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>2</sup></b>			
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>2 of 3 (earlier was 2 of 2)</b>			
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	<b>Equation 2.3 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>		
Land-use category		Subcategories for reporting year	Land area of drained inland organic soils in a land-use category in climate domain c, nutrient status n, and drainage class d	Emission factors for drained inland organic soils, by climate domain c, nutrient status n, and drainage class d	Annual on-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions/removals from drained inland organic soils
Initial land use <sup>3</sup>	Land use during reporting year		(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
				Table 2.1 of the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>soil-onsite</sub> = A * EF</b>
			<b>A</b>	<b>EF</b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>soil-onsite</sub></b>
		(a)			
		(b)			
		(c)			
<b>Total</b>					

<sup>1</sup> Sub-totals of emissions for each land pre-conversion land-use category will have to be calculated for conversion categories.

<sup>2</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>3</sup> For conversion categories, if data by initial land use are not available, use only "non-LU" in this column.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>			
<b>Category</b>		<b>Land Remaining in a Land-use Category OR Land Converted to a New Land-use Category: Annual off-site emissions from drained inland organic soils</b>			
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>3 of 3</b>			
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.5 (<i>Wetlands Supplement</i>)</b>			
Land-use category		Subcategories for reporting year	Land area of drained inland organic soils in a land-use category in climate zone c and nutrient status n	Emission factors for annual CO <sub>2</sub> emissions due to DOC export from drained inland organic soils, by climate zone c and nutrient status n	Annual off-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions from drained inland organic soils
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year		(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
				Table 2.2 of the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i>	
			<b>A</b>	<b>EF</b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>DOC</sub> = A * EF</b>
		(a)			
		(b)			
		(c)			
<b>Total</b>					

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>					
<b>Category</b>		<b>Land Remaining in a Land-use Category OR Land Converted to a New Land-use Category<sup>1</sup>: Annual CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from drained inland organic soils</b>					
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>2</sup></b>					
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>1 of 1</b>					
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	<b>Equation 2.6 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>				
Land-use category		Subcategories for reporting year	Land area of drained inland organic soils in a land-use category in climate zone c, nutrient status n and peatland type p	Fraction of the total area of drained inland organic soil which is occupied by ditches <sup>4</sup>	Emission factors for direct CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from drained organic soils, by climate zone c and nutrient status n	Emission factors for CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from drainage ditches, by climate zone c and peatland type p	Annual CH <sub>4</sub> -C loss from drained inland organic soils
			(ha)	(dimensionless)	(tonnes CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CH <sub>4</sub> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
Initial land use <sup>3</sup>	Land use during reporting year				Table 2.3 of the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i>	Table 2.4 of the <i>Wetlands Supplement</i>	
			A	Frac <sub>ditch</sub>	EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub>_land</sub>	EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub>_ditch</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub> -C <sub>organic</sub> = A * [(1-Frac <sub>ditch</sub> )*EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub>_land</sub> + Frac <sub>ditch</sub> *EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub>_ditch</sub> ]
		(a)					
		(b)					
		(c)					
<b>Total</b>							

<sup>1</sup> Sub-totals of emissions for each land pre-conversion land-use category will have to be calculated for conversion categories.

<sup>2</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>3</sup> For conversion categories, if data by initial land use are not available, use only "non-LU" in this column.

<sup>4</sup> Table 2.4, Chapter 2 of the *Wetlands Supplement* contains indicative values of Frac<sub>ditch</sub>.



Sector		Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use						
Category		Direct N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Managed Soils						
Category code		3C4						
Sheet		2 of 2						
Equation		Equation 11.1 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines and Equation 2.7 of the Wetlands Supplement						
Anthropogenic N input type <sup>1,2</sup>		Annual area of managed/drained organic soils	Emission factor for N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from drained/managed organic soils	Annual direct N <sub>2</sub> O-N emissions produced from managed organic soils	Amount of urine and dung N deposited by grazing animals on pasture, range and paddock	Emission factor for N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals	Annual direct N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from urine and dung inputs to grazed soils	Annual direct N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from urine and dung inputs to grazed soils
		(ha)	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg N yr <sup>-1</sup> )	[kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N (kg N input) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N yr <sup>-1</sup> )
			Table 11.1 (2006 IPCC Guidelines) and Table 2.5 (Wetlands Supplement)	N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>OS</sub> = F <sub>OS</sub> * EF <sub>2</sub>		Table 11.1	N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>PRP</sub> = F <sub>PRP</sub> * EF <sub>3PRP</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>Direct-N</sub> = N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>N input</sub> + N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>OS</sub> + N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>PRP</sub>
		F <sub>OS</sub>	EF <sub>2</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>OS</sub>	F <sub>PRP</sub>	EF <sub>3PRP</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>PRP</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>Direct-N</sub>
Managed organic soils	CG, Bor							
	CG, Temp							
	CG, Trop							
	F, Bor, NR							
	F, Bor, NP							
	F, Temp, NR							
	F, Temp, NP							
	F, Trop							
Urine and dung inputs to grazed soils	CPP							
	SO							
Total								

<sup>1</sup> The area must be disaggregated by Cropland and Grassland (CG), Forest (F), Temperate (Temp), Tropical (Trop), Nutrient Rich (NR), and Nutrient Poor (NP) categories, respectively, see Equation 11.1 in Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<sup>2</sup> The amount must be disaggregated by CPP and SO, which refer to Cattle, Poultry and Pigs, and Sheep and Other animals, respectively. See Equation 11.1 in Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

Sector		Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use									
Category		Emissions from Burning of Drained Inland Organic Soils in a Land-use Category (Land Remaining in a Land-use Category OR Land Converted to a New Land-use Category)									
Category code		[To be specified by the inventory compiler] <sup>1</sup>									
Sheet		1 of 1									
Equation		Equation 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)	Equation 2.8 (Wetlands Supplement)								
Land-use category		Subcategories for reporting year <sup>3</sup>	Area burnt	Mass of fuel available for combustion <sup>4</sup>	Combustion factor <sup>4</sup>	Emission factor for each GHG		CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from fire	CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from fire	CO emissions from fire	
Initial land use <sup>2</sup>	Land use during reporting year		(ha)	(tonnes ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(-)	[g GHG (kg dm burnt) <sup>-1</sup> ]		(tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> )	(tonnes CH <sub>4</sub> )	(tonnes CO)	
				Table 2.6 of the Wetlands Supplement	Table 2.6 of the Wetlands Supplement	Table 2.7 of the Wetlands Supplement		$L_{\text{fire-CO}_2} = A * M_B * C_f * G_{\text{ef}} * 10^{-3}$	$L_{\text{fire-CH}_4} = A * M_B * C_f * G_{\text{ef}} * 10^{-3}$	$L_{\text{fire-CO}} = A * M_B * C_f * G_{\text{ef}} * 10^{-3}$	
			A	M <sub>B</sub>	C <sub>f</sub>	G <sub>ef</sub>		L <sub>fire-CO<sub>2</sub></sub>	L <sub>fire-CH<sub>4</sub></sub>	L <sub>fire-CO</sub>	
		(a)				CO <sub>2</sub>					
						CH <sub>4</sub>					
						CO					
		(b)				CO <sub>2</sub>					
						CH <sub>4</sub>					
						CO					
Total					CO <sub>2</sub>						
					CH <sub>4</sub>						
					CO						

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>2</sup> For conversion categories, similar tables should be completed separately for each initial land use, and subtotals must be added up. If data by initial land use are not available, use only "non-LU" in this column.

<sup>3</sup> For each subcategory, use separate lines for each non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gas.

<sup>4</sup> Where data for M<sub>B</sub> and C<sub>f</sub> are not available, a default value for the amount of fuel actually burnt (M<sub>B</sub> \* C<sub>f</sub>) can be used (Table 2.6 of *Wetlands Supplement*). In this case, M<sub>B</sub> takes the value taken from the table, whereas C<sub>f</sub> must be 1.

## CHAPTER 3—REWETTED ORGANIC SOILS

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>						
<b>Category</b>		<b>Annual carbon emissions or removals in rewetted organic soils</b>						
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>1 of 2 : CO<sub>2</sub>-C</b>						
<b>Equation</b>				<b>Equation 3.4 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>		<b>Equation 3.5 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>		<b>Equation 3.3 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>
Land-use category			Area of rewetted organic soils by nutrient status and climate zone	Emission/removal factor for on-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C by nutrient status and climate zone	On-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions or removals in rewetted organic soils	Emission factor for DOC	Off-site CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions from DOC in rewetted organic soils	Annual CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions or removals by rewetted organic soils
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Subcategories for reporting year	(ha)	(tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
				Table 3. 1	= A * EF <sub>CO2</sub>	Table 3. 2	= A * EF <sub>DOC, REWETTED</sub>	= CO <sub>2</sub> -C <sub>composite</sub> + CO <sub>2</sub> -C <sub>DOC</sub>
			<b>A</b>	<b>EF<sub>CO2</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>composite</sub></b>	<b>EF<sub>DOC, REWETTED</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>DOC</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>rewetted org soil</sub></b>
		(a)						
		(b)						
		(c)						
<b>Total</b>								

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>				
<b>Category</b>		<b>Annual carbon emissions or removals in rewetted organic soils</b>				
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>2 of 2 : CH<sub>4</sub></b>				
<b>Equation</b>			<b>Equation 3.8 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>			
Land-use category		Subcategories for reporting year	Area of rewetted organic soils by nutrient status and climate zone	Emission factor for CH <sub>4</sub> -C by nutrient status and climate zone	On-site CH <sub>4</sub> -C emissions or removals in rewetted organic soils	On-site CH <sub>4</sub> emissions or removals in rewetted organic soils
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year		(ha)	(kg CH <sub>4</sub> -C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CH <sub>4</sub> -C yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes CH <sub>4</sub> )
				Table 3. 3	= A * EF <sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub> / 1000	= CH <sub>4</sub> -C <sub>soil</sub> * 16/12
			<b>A</b>	<b>EF<sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub></b>	<b>CH<sub>4</sub>-C<sub>soil</sub></b>	<b>CH<sub>4</sub> rewetted org soil</b>
		(a)				
		(b)				
		(c)				
<b>Total</b>						

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

## CHAPTER 4—COASTAL WETLANDS

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>						
<b>Category</b>		<b>Coastal wetland with woody perennial biomass or Forest Land</b>						
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>1 of 5</b>						
<b>Equation</b>			<b>Equation 2.9 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	<b>Equation 2.10 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>			<b>Equation 2.9 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	
Land-use category		Subcategories for reporting year	Area	Average annual aboveground biomass growth	Ratio of belowground biomass to aboveground biomass	Average annual biomass growth above- and belowground	Carbon fraction of dry matter	Annual increase in biomass carbon stocks due to biomass growth
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year		(ha)	(tonnes dm ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	[tonnes bg dm (tonne ag dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(tonnes dm ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	[tonnes C (tonne dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
			National statistics or international data sources	Table 4.4	Table 4.5	$G_{TOTAL} = GW * (1+R)$	Table 4.2	$\Delta C_G = A * G_{TOTAL} * CF$
			<b>A</b>	<b>G<sub>w</sub></b>	<b>R</b>	<b>G<sub>TOTAL</sub></b>	<b>CF</b>	<b>ΔC<sub>G</sub></b>
			(a)					
		(b)						
		(c)						
<b>Total</b>								

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>					
<b>Category</b>		<b>Coastal wetland with woody perennial biomass or Forest Land: Loss of carbon from wood removals</b>					
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>2 of 5</b>					
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.12 (2006 IPCC Guidelines) + Equation 4.1 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>					
Land-use category			Annual wood removal	Biomass expansion factor and wood density for conversion of removals in merchantable volume to total biomass removals (including bark)	Ratio of belowground biomass to aboveground biomass	Carbon fraction of dry matter	Annual carbon loss due to biomass removals
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Subcategories for reporting year	(m <sup>3</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	BEF * wood density = [tonnes of biomass removals (m <sup>3</sup> of removals) <sup>-1</sup> ]	[tonnes bg dm (tonne ag dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	[tonnes C (tonne dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
			National statistics or international data sources	Table 3A.1.10 (2003 GPG) and Table 4.6	Table 4.5	Table 4.2	$L_{\text{wood-removals}} = H * BCEF_R * (1+R) * CF$
			<b>H</b>	<b>BCEF</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>CF</b>	<b>L<sub>wood-removals</sub></b>
		(a)					
		(b)					
		(c)					
<b>Total</b>							

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>							
<b>Category</b>		<b>Coastal wetland with woody perennial biomass or Forest Land: Loss of carbon from fuelwood removals</b>							
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>							
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>3 of 5</b>							
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	<b>Equation 2.13 (2006 IPCC Guidelines) + Equation 4.1 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>						
Land-use category		Subcategories for reporting year	Annual volume of fuelwood removal of whole trees	Biomass expansion factor and wood density for conversion of removals in merchantable volume to total biomass removals (including bark)	Ratio of belowground biomass to aboveground biomass	Annual volume of fuelwood removal as tree parts	Basic wood density	Carbon fraction of dry matter	Annual carbon loss due to fuelwood removal
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year		(m <sup>3</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	BEF * wood density = [tonnes of biomass removals (m <sup>3</sup> of removals) <sup>-1</sup> ]	[tonnes bg dm (tonne ag dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(m <sup>3</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	tonnes m <sup>-3</sup>	[tonnes C (tonne dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
			FAO or other statistics	Table 3A.1.10 (2003 GPG) and Table 4.6	Table 4.5	FAO or other statistics	Table 4.6	Table 4.2	L <sub>fuelwood</sub> = [FG <sub>trees</sub> * BCEF <sub>R</sub> * (1+R) + FG <sub>part</sub> * D] * CF
			<b>FG<sub>trees</sub></b>	<b>BCEF</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>FG<sub>part</sub></b>	<b>D</b>	<b>CF</b>	<b>L<sub>fuelwood</sub></b>
		(a)							
		(b)							
		(c)							
<b>Total</b>									

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>						
<b>Category</b>		<b>Coastal wetland with woody perennial biomass or Forest Land: Loss of carbon from disturbance</b>						
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>4 of 5</b>						
<b>Equation</b>			<b>Equation 2.14 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>					<b>Equation 2.11 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>
Land-use category			Area affected by disturbances	Average aboveground biomass of areas affected	Ratio of belowground biomass to aboveground biomass	Carbon fraction of dry matter	Annual other losses of carbon	Annual decrease in carbon stocks due to biomass loss
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Subcategories for reporting year	(ha)	(tonnes dm ha <sup>-1</sup> )	[tonnes bg dm (tonne ag dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	[tonnes C (tonne dm) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
			National statistics or international data sources	Table 4.3	Table 4.5	Table 4.2	$L_{\text{disturbances}} = A * B_W * (1+R) * CF * fd$	$\Delta C_L = L_{\text{wood-removals}} + L_{\text{fuelwood}} + L_{\text{disturbances}}$
			<b>A<sub>disturbance</sub></b>	<b>B<sub>W</sub></b>	<b>R</b>	<b>CF</b>	<b>L<sub>disturbances</sub></b>	<b>ΔC<sub>L</sub></b>
		(a)						
		(b)						
		(c)						
<b>Total</b>								

Note: fd = fraction of biomass lost in disturbance; a stand-replacing disturbance will kill all (fd = 1) biomass while an insect disturbance may only remove a portion (e.g. fd = 0.3) of the average biomass C density.

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.



<b>Sector</b>	<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>Initial change in biomass carbon stocks due to extraction activities (excavation, construction of aquaculture ponds, construction of salt production ponds)</b>					
<b>Category code</b>	<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Sheet</b>	<b>5 of 5</b>					
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 4.4 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>				
Activity	Sub-categories for reporting year (vegetation type)	Area converted <sup>2</sup>	Biomass C stock after conversion	Biomass C stock before conversion	Carbon fraction	Initial change in carbon stocks in biomass
		(ha)	(tonnes dm ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes dm ha <sup>-1</sup> )	tonnes C (tonnes dm) <sup>-1</sup>	Gg C yr <sup>-1</sup>
			default value is zero (0) or national statistics and Table 4.5 (R)	Table 4.3 and Table 4.5 (R) or national statistics	Table 4.2 or national statistics	$\Delta C_{B-CONVERSION} = (B_{AFTER} * (1+R) - B_{BEFORE} * (1+R)) * CF * A_{CONVERTED} * 10^{-3}$
		<b>A<sub>CONVERTED</sub></b>	<b>B<sub>AFTER</sub> * (1+R)</b>	<b>B<sub>BEFORE</sub> * (1+R)</b>	<b>CF</b>	<b><math>\Delta C_{B-CONVERSION}</math></b>
Excavation	Mangrove		0			
	Tidal Marsh <sup>3</sup>		0			
	Seagrass Meadow <sup>3</sup>		0			
Construction of aquaculture ponds	Mangrove		0			
	Tidal Marsh <sup>3</sup>		0			
	Seagrass Meadow <sup>3</sup>		0			
Construction of salt production ponds	Mangrove		0			
	Tidal Marsh <sup>3</sup>		0			
	Seagrass Meadow <sup>3</sup>		0			
<b>Total</b>						

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code. Inventory compilers may choose "3C14" if this activity takes place outside the national total area.

<sup>2</sup> Report zero if activity or vegetation type does not occur.

<sup>3</sup> Tier 2 and referring to Tables 4.9 and 4.10 to for R value.

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>				
<b>Category</b>	<b>Initial change in DOM carbon stocks due to extraction activities (excavation, construction of aquaculture ponds, construction of salt production ponds)</b>				
<b>Category code</b>	<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Sheet</b>	<b>1 of 1</b>				
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 4.5 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>			
Activity	Sub-categories for reporting year (vegetation type)	Area converted <sup>2</sup>	DOM <sub>AFTER</sub>	DOM <sub>BEFORE</sub>	Initial change in carbon stocks in DOM
		(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Gg C yr <sup>-1</sup>
			default value is zero (0)	Table 4.7 or national statistics	$\Delta C_{\text{DOM-CONVERSION}} = (\text{DOM}_{\text{AFTER}} - \text{DOM}_{\text{BEFORE}}) * A_{\text{CONVERTED}} * 10^{-3}$
		<b>A<sub>CONVERTED</sub></b>	DOM <sub>AFTER</sub>	DOM <sub>BEFORE</sub>	<b>ΔC<sub>DOM-CONVERSION</sub></b>
Excavation	Mangrove		0		
Construction of aquaculture ponds	Mangrove		0		
Construction of salt production ponds	Mangrove		0		
<b>Total</b>					
<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code. Inventory compilers may choose "3C14" if this activity takes place outside the national total area. <sup>2</sup> Report zero if activity or vegetation type does not occur.					

Sector		Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use		
Category		CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetting of mangroves and tidal marshes		
Category code		3C11		
Sheet		1 of 1		
		Equation 4.9 (Wetlands Supplement)		
	Subcategories for reporting year	Area of land of rewetted soils	Emission factor for rewetted soils	Annual CH <sub>4</sub> emissions from rewetted soils
		(ha)	(kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg CH <sub>4</sub> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
			Table 4.14 (organic and mineral soils)	CH <sub>4</sub> SO-REWET = (A <sub>REWET</sub> * EF <sub>REWET</sub> )
		A <sub>REWET</sub>	EF <sub>REWET</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub> SO-REWET
	Tidal freshwater marsh			
	Tidal salt marsh and mangrove <sup>1</sup>			
Total				

<sup>1</sup> Apply same EF for tidal brackish marsh

Sector		Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use		
Category		N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from aquaculture		
Category code		3C12		
Sheet		1 of 1		
			Equation 4.10 (Wetlands Supplement)	
		Amount of fish production (F)	Emission factor for N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from fish produced (F) in aquaculture use	Annual N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from aquaculture use
		(kg fish yr <sup>-1</sup> )	[kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N (kg fish) <sup>-1</sup> ]	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N yr <sup>-1</sup> )
			Table 4.15	N <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>AQ</sub> = F * EF
		F <sub>F</sub>	EF <sub>F</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>AQ</sub>
Total				

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>				
<b>Category</b>	<b>Initial change in soil carbon stocks due to extraction activities (excavation, construction of aquaculture ponds, construction of salt production ponds)</b>				
<b>Category code</b>	<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>				
<b>Sheet</b>	<b>1 of 3</b>				
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 4.6 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>			
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Sub-categories for reporting year (vegetation type)</b>	<b>Area converted<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>SO<sub>AFTER</sub></b>	<b>SO<sub>BEFORE</sub></b>	<b>Initial change in carbon stocks in soil</b>
		<b>(ha)</b>	<b>(tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	<b>(tonnes C ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	<b>Gg C yr<sup>-1</sup></b>
			<b>default value is zero (0)</b>	<b>Table 4.11 or national statistics</b>	<b><math>\Delta C_{SO-CONVERSION} = (SO_{AFTER} - SO_{BEFORE}) * A_{CONVERTED} * 10^{-3}</math></b>
		<b>A<sub>CONVERTED</sub></b>	<b>SO<sub>AFTER</sub></b>	<b>SO<sub>BEFORE</sub></b>	<b><math>\Delta C_{SO-CONVERSION}</math></b>
<b>Excavation</b>	<b>Mangrove</b>		0		
	<b>Tidal Marsh</b>		0		
	<b>Seagrass Meadow</b>		0		
<b>Construction of aquaculture ponds</b>	<b>Mangrove</b>		0		
	<b>Tidal Marsh</b>		0		
	<b>Seagrass Meadow</b>		0		
<b>Construction of salt production ponds</b>	<b>Mangrove</b>		0		
	<b>Tidal Marsh</b>		0		
	<b>Seagrass Meadow</b>		0		
<b>Total</b>					

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code. Inventory compilers may choose "3C14" if this activity takes place outside the national total area.

<sup>2</sup> Report zero if activity or vegetation type does not occur.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>					
<b>Category</b>		<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions from rewetting, revegetation and creation</b>					
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>2 of 3</b>					
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 4.7 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>					
Land-use category			Area of land in rewetting <sup>2</sup>	Emission factors for CO <sub>2</sub> -C in rewetting	Area of land in rewetting, revegetation and creation <sup>2</sup>	Emission factors for CO <sub>2</sub> -C in rewetting, revegetation and creation	CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions from rewetting, revegetation and creation
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Subcategories for reporting year (vegetation type)	(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	Gg C yr <sup>-1</sup>
				default value is zero or national data		Table 4.12 or national data	$\text{CO}_2\text{-C}_{\text{SO-RE}} = (\text{ARE}_{\text{1}} * \text{EF}_{\text{RE}_{\text{1}}} + \text{ARE}_{\text{2}} * \text{EF}_{\text{RE}_{\text{2}}}) * 10^{-3}$
			<b>ARE<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>EF<sub>RE_1</sub></b>	<b>ARE<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>EF<sub>RE_2</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>SO-RE</sub></b>
		Mangrove					
		Tidal marsh					
		Seagrass meadow					
<b>Total</b>							

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code. Inventory compilers may choose "3C14" if this activity takes place outside the national total area.

<sup>2</sup> Depending on how the activity is applied, either rewetting or rewetting, revegetation and creation data can be applied, providing national circumstances and country's available data.

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>			
<b>Category</b>		<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C emissions from drainage in coastal wetlands</b>			
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>3 of 3</b>			
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 4.8 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>			
Land-use category			Area of land in drainage	Emission factors for CO <sub>2</sub> -C in drainage	CO <sub>2</sub> -C emissions from drainage
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Subcategories for reporting year (vegetation type)	(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	Gg C yr <sup>-1</sup>
				Table 4.13 or national data	CO <sub>2</sub> -C-SO-DR = (A <sub>DR</sub> * EF <sub>DR</sub> ) * 10 <sup>-3</sup>
			<b>A<sub>DR</sub></b>	<b>EF<sub>DR</sub></b>	<b>CO<sub>2</sub>-C-SO-DR</b>
		Tidal marsh and mangrove			
<b>Total</b>					

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code. Inventory compilers may choose "3C14" if this activity takes place outside the national total area.

## CHAPTER 5—INLAND WETLAND MINERAL SOILS

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>								
<b>Category</b>		<b>Cropland Remaining Cropland: Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils</b>								
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>								
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>1 of 4</b>								
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.25, Formulation A in Box 2.1 of Section 2.3.3.1 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>								
<b>Land-use category</b>		Area in the last year of an inventory period	Area at the beginning of an inventory period	Reference carbon stock in the last year of an inventory period	Reference carbon stock at the beginning of an inventory period	Time dependence of stock change factors (D) or number of years over a single inventory time period (T)	Stock change factor for land-use system or sub-system	Stock change factor for management regime	Stock change factor for input of organic matter	Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Sub-categories for reporting year	(ha)	(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(yr)	(-)	(-)	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
				Table 2.3 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for non-IWMS; Table 5.2 of Wetlands Supplement for IWMS <sup>2, 4</sup>	Table 2.3 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for non-IWMS; Table 5.2 of Wetlands Supplement for IWMS <sup>2, 4</sup>	(default is 20 yr; if T>D then use the value of T)	Table 5.5 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for non-IWMS; Table 5.5 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines and Table 5.3 of Wetlands Supplement for IWMS <sup>3, 4</sup>	Table 5.5 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	Table 5.5 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	$\Delta C_{\text{Mineral}}$ as in Equation 2.25 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)
			<b>A<sub>(0)</sub></b>	<b>A<sub>(0-T)</sub></b>	<b>SOC<sub>ref(0)</sub></b>	<b>SOC<sub>ref(T-0)</sub></b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F<sub>LU</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>MG</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>I</sub></b>
CL <sub>non-IWMS</sub>	CL <sub>non-IWMS</sub>	(a)				20				
		(b)				20				
		(c)				20				
		Subtotal								
CL <sub>IWMS</sub>	CL <sub>IWMS</sub>	(a)				20				
		(b)				20				
		(c)				20				
		Subtotal								
<b>Total</b>										

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>2</sup> Table 5.2, Chapter 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement* contains the revised default reference SOC stocks (SOC<sub>REF</sub>) for Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.

<sup>3</sup> Table 5.3, Chapter 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement* contains the new values of stock change factors for land-use (FLU) for Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.

<sup>4</sup> IWMS = Inland Wetland Mineral Soils



<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>									
<b>Category</b>		<b>Land (non-Cropland) remaining in a Land-use Category: Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils</b>									
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>									
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>2 of 4</b>									
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	<b>Equation 2.25, Formulation A in Box 2.1 of Section 2.3.3.1</b>								
Land-use category			Area in the last year of an inventory period	Area at the beginning of an inventory period	Reference carbon stock in the last year of an inventory period	Reference carbon stock at the beginning of an inventory period	Time dependence of stock change factors (D) or number of years over a single inventory time period (T)	Stock change factor for land-use system or sub-system	Stock change factor for management regime	Stock change factor for input of organic matter	Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Sub-categories for reporting year	(ha)	(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(yr)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
					Table 2.3 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for non-IWMS; Table 5.2 of Wetlands Supplement for IWMS <sup>2, 3</sup>	Table 2.3	(default is 20 yr; if T>D then use the value of T)	Table 5.5	Table 5.5	Table 5.5	$\Delta C_{\text{Mineral}}$ as in Equation 2.25
			<b>A<sub>(0)</sub></b>	<b>A<sub>(0-T)</sub></b>	<b>SOC<sub>ref(0)</sub></b>	<b>SOC<sub>ref(T-0)</sub></b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F<sub>LU</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>MG</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>I</sub></b>	<b><math>\Delta C_{\text{Mineral}}</math></b>
		(a)					20				
		(b)					20				
		(c)					20				
<b>Total</b>											

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>2</sup> Table 5.2, Chapter 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement* contains the revised default reference SOC stocks (SOC<sub>REF</sub>) for Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.

<sup>3</sup> IWMS = Inland Wetland Mineral Soils

Sector		Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use										
Category		Land Converted to a Cropland: Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils										
Category code		[To be specified by the inventory compiler] <sup>1</sup>										
Sheet		3 of 4										
Equation		Eq. 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)	Equation 2.25, Formulation B in Box 2.1 of Section 2.3.3.1 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)									
Land-use category		Subcategories of unique climate, soil, land-use change and management combinations	Area for land-use change by climate and soil combination	Reference carbon stock for the climate/soil combination	Time dependence of stock change factors (D) or number of years over a single inventory time period (T)	Stock change factor for land-use system in the last year of an inventory time period	Stock change factor for management regime in last year of an inventory period	Stock change factor for C input in the last year of the inventory period	Stock change factor for land- use system at the beginning of the inventory time period	Stock change factor for management regime at the beginning of the inventory time period	Stock change factor for C input at the beginning of the inventory time period	Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils
Initial land use <sup>2</sup>	Land use during reporting year		(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(yr)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
				Table 2.3; Chap 2, Sec. 2.3.3.1 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines & Table 5.2 of Wetlands Supplement for IWMS <sup>3, 5</sup>	(default is 20 yr; if T>D then use the value of T)	Table 5.5 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines & Table 5.3 of Wetlands Supplement for IWMS <sup>4, 5</sup>	Table 5.5 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	Table 5.5 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	Table 5.10 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	Table 5.10 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	Table 5.10 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	$\Delta C_{\text{Mineral}}$  as in Equation 2.25 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)
			A <sub>(0)</sub>	SOC <sub>ref</sub>	D	F <sub>LU(0)</sub>	F <sub>MG(0)</sub>	F <sub>I(0)</sub>	F <sub>LU(0-T)</sub>	F <sub>MG(0-T)</sub>	F <sub>I(0-T)</sub>	$\Delta C_{\text{Mineral}}$
FL	CL	(a)			20							
		(b)			20							
Sub-total												
GL	CL	(a)			20							
		(b)			20							
Sub-total												
WL	CL	(a)			20							
		(b)			20							

Sub-total												
SL	CL	(a)			20							
		(b)			20							
Sub-total												
OL	CL	(a)			20							
		(b)			20							
Sub-total												
Total												

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>2</sup> If data by initial land use are not available, use only "non-CL" in this column.

<sup>3</sup> Table 5.2, Chapter 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement* contains the revised default reference SOC stocks ( $SOC_{REF}$ ) for Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.

<sup>4</sup> Table 5.3, Chapter 5 of the *Wetlands Supplement* contains new values of default stock change factors for land-use ( $F_{LU}$ ) for Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.

<sup>5</sup> IWMS = Inland Wetland Mineral Soils

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use</b>										
<b>Category</b>		<b>Land Converted to a New Land-use Category (non-Cropland): Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils</b>										
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>1</sup></b>										
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>4 of 4</b>										
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Equation 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	<b>Equation 2.25, Formulation B in Box 2.1 of Section 2.3.3.1 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>									
Land-use category		Subcategories of unique climate, soil, land-use change and management combinations	Area for land-use change by climate and soil combination	Reference carbon stock for the climate and soil combination	Time dependence of stock change factors (D) or number of years over a single inventory time period (T)	Stock change factor for land-use system in the last year of an inventory time period	Stock change factor for management regime in last year of an inventory period	Stock change factor for C input in the last year of the inventory period	Stock change factor for land-use system at the beginning of inventory time period	Stock change factor for management regime at the beginning of the inventory time period	Stock change factor for C input at the beginning of the inventory time period	Annual change in carbon stocks in mineral soils
Initial land use <sup>2</sup>	Land use during reporting year		(ha)	(tonnes C ha <sup>-1</sup> )	(yr)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(tonnes C yr <sup>-1</sup> )
				Table 2.3; Chap. 2, Sec. 2.3.3.1 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines & Table 5.2 of Chapter 5 of the Wetlands Supplement for IWMS <sup>3, 6</sup>	(default is 20 yr; if T>D then use the value of T)	Table XX <sup>5</sup> of in Volume 4 of 2006 IPCC Guidelines	Table 6.2	Table 6.2	Table 5.5 and Table 5.3 of the Wetlands Supplement <sup>4</sup> (Cropland); 1 for other uses	Table 5.5 (Cropland); 1 for other uses	Table 5.5 (Cropland); 1 for other uses	$\Delta C_{\text{Mineral}}$ as in Equation 2.25
			<b>A<sub>(0)</sub></b>	<b>SOC<sub>ref</sub></b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F<sub>LU(0)</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>MG(0)</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>I(0)</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>LU(0-T)</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>MG(0-T)</sub></b>	<b>F<sub>I(0-T)</sub></b>	<b><math>\Delta C_{\text{Mineral}}</math></b>
		(a)			20							
		(b)			20							
		(c)			20							
<b>Sub-total</b>												
<b>Total</b>												

<sup>1</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>2</sup> If data by initial land use are not available, use only "non-GL" in this column.

<sup>3</sup> Table 5.2, Chapter 5 of the Wetlands Supplement contains the revised default reference SOC stocks (SOCREF) for Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.

<sup>4</sup> Table 5.3, Chapter 5 of the Wetlands Supplement contains new values of default stock change factors for land-use (FLU) for Inland Wetland Mineral Soils.

<sup>5</sup> Relevant tables from the land-use category chapters in Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<sup>6</sup> IWMS = Inland wetland mineral soils

<b>Sector</b>		<b>Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU)</b>		
<b>Category</b>		<b>Annual CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from restored and created wetlands on managed lands with IWMS<sup>1,2</sup></b>		
<b>Category code</b>		<b>[To be specified by the inventory compiler]<sup>3</sup></b>		
<b>Sheet</b>		<b>1 of 1</b>		
<b>Equation</b>		<b>Eq. 2.2 (2006 IPCC Guidelines)</b>	<b>Equation 5.1 (Wetlands Supplement)</b>	
Initial land use	Land use during reporting year	Subcategories for reporting year <sup>4</sup>	Area of managed lands with IWMS	Emission factor from managed lands with IWMS where water level has been raised in climate region
			(ha)	(kg CH <sub>4</sub> ha <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
				Table 5.4 (Wetlands Supplement)
			<b>A<sub>IWMS</sub></b>	<b>EF<sub>CH4-IWMS</sub></b>
		(a)		
		(b)		
		(c)		
<b>Total</b>				

<sup>1</sup> IWMS = Inland wetland mineral soils

<sup>2</sup> This worksheet is to be used for CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from managed lands with IWMS other than rice cultivation areas. For CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rice cultivation please use the worksheets for the category 3C7 (Rice Cultivation) in the 2006 IPCC Guidelines.

<sup>3</sup> This worksheet can be used for any category under 3B. Inventory compilers should specify an appropriate category code here. For example, when this worksheet is used to calculate emissions to be reported in the category Forest Land Remaining Forest Land, "3B1a" should be entered as category code.

<sup>4</sup> Can be stratified according to climate domains for Tier 1 methods.

## CHAPTER 6—CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT

Sector	Waste			
Category	Domestic Wastewater Treatment and Discharge			
Category Code	4D1			
Sheet	1 of 3 Estimation of Organically Degradable Material in Domestic Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands			
STEP 1				
Type of constructed wetland	A	B	C	D
	Population whose wastewater treated in constructed wetlands  (P <sub>i</sub> ) cap	Degradable organic component  (BOD) (kg BOD cap <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>1</sup>	Correction factor for industrial BOD discharged in sewers  (I) <sup>2</sup>	Organically degradable material in wastewater  (TOW <sub>i</sub> ) (kg BOD yr <sup>-1</sup> ) D = A x B x C
Surface Flow				
Vertical Subsurface Flow				
Horizontal Subsurface Flow				
Hybrid type				
Semi-natural Treatment Wetlands				
Total				
<sup>1</sup> g BOD cap <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> x 0.001 x 365 = kg BOD cap <sup>-1</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup>				
<sup>2</sup> Correction factor for additional industrial BOD discharged into sewers, (for collected the default is 1.25, for uncollected the default is 1.00) (see page 6.14).				

Sector	Waste		
Category	Domestic Wastewater Treatment and Discharge		
Category Code	4D1		
Sheet	2 of 3 Estimation of CH <sub>4</sub> Emission Factor for Domestic Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands		
STEP 2			
Type of constructed wetland	A	B	C
	Maximum methane producing capacity  (B <sub>o</sub> )  (kg CH <sub>4</sub> kg BOD <sup>-1</sup> )	Methane correction factor  (MCF <sub>i</sub> )	Emission factor  (EF <sub>i</sub> )  (kg CH <sub>4</sub> kg BOD <sup>-1</sup> )  C = A x B
Surface Flow			
Vertical Subsurface Flow			
Horizontal Subsurface Flow			
Hybrid type			
Semi-natural Treatment Wetlands			
Note: MCF for hybrid type can be estimated as area-weighted average of the MCFs of the constructed wetland types in hybrid system			

Sector	Waste		
Category	Domestic Wastewater Treatment and Discharge		
Category Code	4D1		
Sheet	3 of 3 Estimation of CH <sub>4</sub> Emissions from Domestic Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands		
STEP 3			
Type of constructed wetlands	A	B	C
	Emission factor	Organically degradable material in wastewater	Methane emissions
	(EF <sub>i</sub> )	(TOW <sub>i</sub> )	(CH <sub>4</sub> )
	(kg CH <sub>4</sub> kg BOD <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg BOD yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg CH <sub>4</sub> yr <sup>-1</sup> )
	Sheet 2 of 3	Sheet 1 of 3	C=A x B
Surface Flow			
Vertical Subsurface Flow			
Horizontal Subsurface Flow			
Hybrid type			
Semi-natural Treatment Wetlands			
Total			



<b>Sector</b>	<b>Waste</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Industrial Wastewater Treatment and Discharge</b>		
<b>Category Code</b>	<b>4D2</b>		
<b>Sheet</b>	<b>1 of 3 Total Organic Degradable Material in Industrial Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands</b>		
<b>STEP 1</b>			
Industrial Sector	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	Yearly flow rate of industrial wastewater treated by constructed wetland ( $W_{i,j}$ ) ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ )	Chemical Oxygen Demand ( $\text{COD}_i$ ) ( $\text{kg COD m}^{-3}$ )	Total organic degradable material in industrial wastewater treated in constructed wetland ( $\text{TOW}_{i,j}$ ) ( $\text{kg COD yr}^{-1}$ ) $C=A \times B$
Industrial sector 1			
Industrial sector 2			
Industrial sector 3			
add as needed			
<b>Total</b>			
Note: Emissions from collected runoff from agricultural land and landfill leachate treated in constructed wetlands should be reported in this worksheet			

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Waste</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Industrial Wastewater Treatment and Discharge</b>		
<b>Category Code</b>	<b>4D2</b>		
<b>Sheet</b>	<b>2 of 3 Estimation of CH<sub>4</sub> Emission Factor for Industrial Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands</b>		
<b>STEP 2</b>			
Type of constructed wetland	A	B	C
	Maximum methane producing capacity	Methane correction factor	Emission factor
	(Bo) (kg CH <sub>4</sub> kg COD <sup>-1</sup> )	(MCF <sub>i</sub> ) ( - )	(EF <sub>i</sub> ) (kg CH <sub>4</sub> kg COD <sup>-1</sup> )
			C = A x B
Surface Flow			
Vertical Subsurface Flow			
Horizontal Subsurface Flow			
Hybrid type			
Semi-natural Treatment Wetlands			
Note: MCF for hybrid type can be estimated as area-weighted average of the MCFs of the constructed wetland types in hybrid system			

Sector	Waste		
Category	Industrial Wastewater Treatment and Discharge		
Category Code	4D2		
Sheet	3 of 3 Estimation of CH <sub>4</sub> Emissions from Industrial Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands		
STEP 3			
Industrial Sector	A	B	C
	Emission Factor	Organically degradable material in wastewater	Methane emissions
	(EF <sub>i</sub> )* (kg CH <sub>4</sub> kg COD <sup>-1</sup> ) Sheet 2 of 3	(TOW <sub>i,j</sub> ) (kg COD yr <sup>-1</sup> ) Sheet 1 of 3	(CH <sub>4</sub> ) (kg CH <sub>4</sub> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) C=A x B
Industrial sector 1			
Industrial sector 2			
Industrial sector 3			
add as needed			
Total			
*If more than one type of CW is used in an industrial sector the EF would be TOW <sub>i,j</sub> -weighted average of EFs of the CWs used.			

Sector	Waste					
Category	Domestic Wastewater Treatment and Discharge					
Category Code	4D1					
Sheet	1 of 2 Estimation of Nitrogen in Effluent Treated in Constructed Wetlands					
STEP1						
Type of constructed wetlands	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Population whose wastewater treated in constructed wetlands	Per capita protein consumption	Fraction of nitrogen in protein	Fraction of non-consumed protein	Fraction of industrial and commercial co-discharged protein	Total nitrogen in effluent
	(P <sub>i</sub> ) (people)	(Protein) (kg/person yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(F <sub>NPR</sub> ) (kg N kg protein <sup>-1</sup> )	(F <sub>NON-CON</sub> ) (-)	(F <sub>IND-COM</sub> ) (-)	(N) (kg N yr <sup>-1</sup> ) F = A x B x C x D x E
Surface Flow						
Vertical Subsurface Flow						
Horizontal Subsurface Flow						
Hybrid type						
Semi-natural Treatment Wetlands						
Total						

Sector	Waste			
Category	Domestic Wastewater Treatment and Discharge			
Category Code	4D1			
Sheet	2 of 2 Estimation of N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Domestic Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands			
STEP 2				
Type of constructed wetlands	A	B	C	D
	Total nitrogen in effluent	Emission Factor	Conversion factor	Total N <sub>2</sub> O emissions
	(N <sub>i</sub> )	(EF <sub>i</sub> )	44/28	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O yr <sup>-1</sup> )
	(kg N yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N kg N <sup>-1</sup> )		
	Sheet 1 of 2			D= A x B x C
Surface Flow				
Vertical Subsurface Flow				
Horizontal Subsurface Flow				
Hybrid type				
Semi-natural Treatment Wetlands				
Total				
Note: EF for hybrid type can be estimated as area-weighted average of the EFs of the constructed wetland types in hybrid system				

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Waste</b>		
<b>Category</b>	<b>Industrial Wastewater Treatment and Discharge</b>		
<b>Category Code</b>	<b>4D2</b>		
<b>Sheet</b>	<b>1 of 2 Estimation of N in Effluent Treated in Constructed Wetlands</b>		
<b>STEP 1</b>			
Industrial Sector	A	B	C
	Total nitrogen concentration in industrial wastewater treated by constructed wetlands  (TN <sub>i</sub> ) (kg N m <sup>-3</sup> )	Yearly flow rate of industrial wastewater treated by constructed wetland  (W <sub>i,j</sub> ) <sup>*</sup> (m <sup>3</sup> yr <sup>-1</sup> )	Total nitrogen effluent  (N <sub>i,j</sub> ) <sup>*</sup> (kg N yr <sup>-1</sup> ) C=A x B
Industrial sector 1			
Industrial sector 2			
Industrial sector 3			
add as needed			
<b>Total</b>			
<p>Note: Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N leaching and runoff from agricultural land are considered in Chapter 11, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines and the amount of nitrogen in collected runoff from agricultural land treated in constructed wetlands must be subtracted to avoid double counting</p> <p>*If more than one type of CW is used in an industrial sector, W<sub>ij</sub> and N<sub>ij</sub> are sum of the W<sub>ij</sub> and N<sub>ij</sub> of the CWs used, respectively.</p>			

Sector	Waste			
Category	Industrial Wastewater Treatment and Discharge			
Category Code	4D2			
Sheet	2 of 2 Estimation of N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Industrial Wastewater Treated in Constructed Wetlands			
STEP 2				
Industrial sector	A	B	C	D
	Total nitrogen in effluent	Emission Factor	Conversion factor	Total N <sub>2</sub> O emissions
	(N <sub>i,j</sub> )	(EF <sub>j</sub> )*	44/28	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O/year)
	(kg N yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(kg N <sub>2</sub> O-N kg N <sup>-1</sup> )		
	Sheet 1 of 2			D= A x B x C
Industrial sector 1				
Industrial sector 2				
Industrial sector 3				
add as needed				
Total				
Note: EF for hybrid type can be estimated as area-weighted average of the EFs of the constructed wetland types in hybrid system				
*If more than one type of CW is used in an industrial sector the EF would be Ni,j-weighted average of EFs of CWs used				





## ANNEX 7A.2

---

### REPORTING TABLES

The *Wetlands Supplement* has only minor impacts on the Reporting Tables in Annex 8A.2 of Volume 1 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*. This annex includes the reporting tables, namely the Sectoral AFOLU Table 3 and Background Tables 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7 and 3.9, which have been updated to take into account the methodological guidance in the *Wetlands Supplement*. The changes are explained in Section 7.2.1.

**Table 3 AFOLU Sectoral Table (1 of 2)**

Categories	Net CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/ removals	Emissions				
		CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOCs
		(Gg)				
<b>3 AFOLU</b>						
<b>3A Livestock</b>						
<b>3A1 Enteric Fermentation</b>						
3A1a Cattle						
3A1ai Dairy Cows						
3A1aii Other Cattle						
3A1b Buffalo						
3A1c Sheep						
3A1d Goats						
3A1e Camels						
3A1f Horses						
3A1g Mules and Asses						
3A1h Swine						
3A1j Other (please specify)						
<b>3A2 Manure Management <sup>(1)</sup></b>						
3A2a Cattle						
3A2ai Dairy Cows						
3A2aii Other Cattle						
3A2b Buffalo						
3A2c Sheep						
3A2d Goats						
3A2e Camels						
3A2f Horses						
3A2g Mules and Asses						
3A2h Swine						
3A2i Poultry						
3A2j Other (please specify)						
<b>3B Land <sup>(2)</sup></b>						
<b>3B1 Forest Land</b>						
3B1a Forest Land Remaining Forest Land						
3B1b Land Converted to Forest Land						
3B1bi Cropland Converted to Forest Land						
3B1bii Grassland Converted to Forest Land						
3B1biii Wetlands Converted to Forest Land						
3B1biv Settlements Converted to Forest Land						
3B1bv Other Land Converted to Forest Land						
<b>3B2 Cropland</b>						
3B2a Cropland Remaining Cropland						
3B2b Land Converted to Cropland						
3B2bi Forest Land Converted to Cropland						
3B2bii Grassland Converted to Cropland						
3B2biii Wetlands Converted to Cropland						
3B2biv Settlements Converted to Cropland						
3B2bv Other Land Converted to Cropland						
<b>3B3 Grassland</b>						
3B3a Grassland Remaining Grassland						
3B3b Land Converted to Grassland						
3B3bi Forest Land Converted to Grassland						
3B3bii Cropland Converted to Grassland						
3B3biii Wetlands Converted to Grassland						
3B3biv Settlements Converted to Grassland						
3B3bv Other Land Converted to Grassland						

**Table 3 AFOLU Sectoral Table (2 of 2)**

Categories		Net CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/ removals	Emissions				
			CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	NMVOCs
3B4	Wetlands						
3B4a	Wetlands Remaining Wetlands						
3B4ai	Peat Extraction remaining Peat Extraction						
3B4aii	Flooded Land Remaining Flooded Land						
3B4aiii	Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands						
3B4b	Land Converted to Wetlands						
3B4bi	Land Converted for Peat Extraction						
3B4bii	Land Converted to Flooded Land						
3B4biii	Land Converted to Other Wetlands						
3B5	3B5 Settlements						
3B5a	Settlements Remaining Settlements						
3B5b	Land Converted to Settlements						
3B5bi	Forest Land Converted to Settlements						
3B5bii	Cropland Converted to Settlements						
3B5biii	Grassland Converted to Settlements						
3B5biv	Wetlands Converted to Settlements						
3B5bv	Other Land Converted to Settlements						
3B6	3B6 Other Land						
3B6a	Other Land Remaining Other Land						
3B6b	Land Converted to Other Land						
3B6bi	Forest Land Converted to Other Land						
3B6bii	Cropland Converted to Other Land						
3B6biii	Grassland Converted to Other Land						
3B6biv	Wetlands Converted to Other Land						
3B6bv	Settlements Converted to Other Land						
3C	Aggregate Sources and Non-CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Sources on Land <sup>(3)</sup>						
3C1	Burning						
3C1a	Burning in Forest Land						
3C1b	Burning in Cropland						
3C1c	Burnings in Grassland						
3C1d	Burnings in All Other Land						
3C2	Liming						
3C3	Urea Fertilization						
3C4	Direct N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Managed Soils <sup>(4)</sup>						
3C5	Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Managed Soils						
3C6	Indirect N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Manure Management						
3C7	Rice Cultivations						
3C8	CH <sub>4</sub> from Drained Organic Soils						
3C9	CH <sub>4</sub> from Drainage Ditches on Organic Soils						
3C10	CH <sub>4</sub> from Rewetting of Organic Soils						
3C11	CH <sub>4</sub> Emissions from Rewetting of Mangroves and Tidal Marshes						
3C12	N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Aquaculture						
3C13	CH <sub>4</sub> Emissions from Rewetted and Created Wetlands on Inland Wetland Mineral Soils						
3C14	Other (please specify)						
3D	Other						
3D1	Harvested Wood Products						
3D2	Other (please specify)						

(1) Indirect N<sub>2</sub>O emissions are not included here (see category 3C6).

(2) Net CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land may include emissions from coastal wetlands that are not part of the total land area of the reporting country.

(3) If CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from Biomass Burning are not already included in Table 3.2 (Carbon stock changes background table), they should be reported here.

(4) Countries may report by land categories if they have the information.

\* Cells to report emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and NMVOC have not been shaded although the physical potential for emissions is lacking for some categories.

Documentation box:

**Table 3.2 AFOLU Background Table: 3B Carbon stock changes, emissions, and removals in AFOLU (1 of 2)**

Categories	Surface Area			Net carbon stock change and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/removals									Net CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
	Mineral soils	Organic soils <sup>(1)</sup>	Total	Biomass				Dead organic matter			Soils		
				In-crease	Decrease	Carbon emitted as CH <sub>4</sub> and CO from fires <sup>(2)</sup>	Net carbon stock change	Net carbon stock change	Carbon emitted as CH <sub>4</sub> and CO from fires <sup>(2)</sup>	Net carbon stock change	Net carbon stock change in mineral soils	Net carbon emissions/removals in organic soils <sup>(3)</sup>	
	(ha)			(Gg C)									(Gg CO <sub>2</sub> )
3B Land <sup>(4)</sup>													
3B1 Forest Land													
3B1a Forest Land Remaining Forest Land													
3B1b Land Converted to Forest Land													
3B1bi Cropland Converted to Forest Land													
3B1bii Grassland Converted to Forest Land													
3B1biii Wetlands Converted to Forest Land													
3B1biv Settlements Converted to Forest Land													
3B1bv Other Land Converted to Forest Land													
3B2 Cropland													
3B2a Cropland Remaining Cropland													
3B2b Land Converted to Cropland													
3B2bi Forest Land Converted to Cropland													
3B2bii Grassland Converted to Cropland													
3B2biii Wetlands Converted to Cropland													
3B2biv Settlements Converted to Cropland													
3B2bv Other Land Converted to Cropland													
3B3 Grassland													
3B3a Grassland Remaining Grassland													
3B3b Land Converted to Grassland													
3B3bi Forest Land Converted to Grassland													
3B3bii Cropland Converted to Grassland													
3B3biii Wetlands Converted to Grassland													
3B3biv Settlements Converted to Grassland													
3B3bv Other Land Converted to Grassland													

**Table 3.2 AFOLU Background Table: 3B Carbon stock changes, emissions, and removals in AFOLU (2 of 2)**

Categories		Surface Area			Net carbon stock change and CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/removals									Net CO <sub>2</sub> emissions
		Mineral soils	Organic soils <sup>(1)</sup>	Total	Biomass				Dead organic matter			Soils		
					In-crease	Decrease	Carbon emitted as CH <sub>4</sub> and CO from fires <sup>(2)</sup>	Net carbon stock change	Net carbon stock change	Carbon emitted as CH <sub>4</sub> and CO from fires <sup>(2)</sup>	Net carbon stock change	Net carbon stock change in mineral soils	Net carbon emissions /removals in organic soils <sup>(3)</sup>	
		(ha)			(Gg C)									
3B4	Wetlands <sup>(5)</sup>													
3B5	Settlements													
3B5a	Settlements Remaining Settlements													
3B5b	Land Converted to Settlements													
3B5bi	Forest Land Converted to Settlements													
3B5bii	Cropland Converted to Settlements													
3B5biii	Grassland Converted to Settlements													
3B5biv	Wetlands Converted to Settlements													
3B5bv	Other Land Converted to Settlements													
3B6	Other Land													
3B6a	Other Land Remaining Other Land													
3B6b	Land Converted to Other Land													
3B6bi	Forest Land Converted to Other Land													
3B6bii	Cropland Converted to Other Land													
3B6biii	Grassland Converted to Other Land													
3B6biv	Wetlands Converted to Other Land													
3B6bv	Settlements Converted to Other Land													

- (1) Areas of organic soils include drained, rewetted, and restored organic soils as well as coastal wetlands with organic soils. Details of the subdivision and related emission/removal factors should be given in the national inventory report.
- (2) Where the carbon contained in the emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> and CO is significant part of the sectoral emissions, this should be copied from the corresponding columns in the Sectoral Background Table 3.4. This amount of carbon emitted as CH<sub>4</sub> and CO is then subtracted from carbon stock change to avoid double counting (see Volume 4, Section 2.2.3).
- (3) The net loss/gain from all types of organic soils should be reported here (see also footnote 1).
- (4) Net carbon stock change and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions/removals from land may include emissions from coastal wetlands that are not part of the total land area of the reporting country. Land areas should be specified as included or not included in the total land area. The sum of the land areas for the six land-use categories included only those areas which are part of the total land area of the country.
- (5) CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Wetlands are reported in a separate background table (Table 3.3) that includes all gases emitted from Wetlands.

**Documentation box:**

**Table 3.3 AFOLU Background Table: Emissions in Wetlands (3B4)**

Categories	Activity data	Net emissions/ removals	Emissions	
	Area	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O
	(ha)	(Gg)		
<b>3B4 Wetlands</b>				
3B4a Wetlands Remaining Wetlands				
3B4ai Peat Extraction remaining Peat Extraction				
3B4aii Flooded Land Remaining Flooded Land				
3B4aiii Other Wetlands Remaining Other Wetlands <sup>(1)</sup>				
3B4b Land Converted to Wetlands				
3B4bi Land Converted for Peat Extraction				
3B4bii Land Converted to Flooded Land				
3B4biii Land Converted to Other Wetlands <sup>(1)</sup>				

(1) Detailed information on Other Wetlands should be included in the national inventory report.

**Documentation box:**

**Table 3.4 AFOLU Background Table: Burning (3C1) (1 of 2)**

Categories <sup>(1)</sup>	Activity data			Emissions												Information item: Carbon emitted as CH <sub>4</sub> and CO <sup>(5)</sup>	
	Des- crip- tion <sup>(2)</sup>	Unit	Value	CO <sub>2</sub> <sup>(3)</sup>			CO <sup>(4)</sup>			CH <sub>4</sub> <sup>(4)</sup>			NO <sub>x</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Bio- mass	DOM	
				Bio- mass	DOM	SOM <sup>(6)</sup>	Bio- mass	DOM	SOM <sup>(6)</sup>	Bio- mass	DOM	SOM <sup>(6)</sup>					
		(ha or kg d.m.)			(Gg)												(Gg C)
3C1 Burning																	
Burning in Forest Land																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in Cropland																	
Burning in Cropland Remaining Cropland																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in Forest Land Converted to Cropland																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in Non Forest Land Converted to Cropland																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in Grassland																	
Burning in Grassland Remaining Grassland																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in Forest Land Converted to Grassland																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	



**Table 3.4 AFOLU Background Table: Burning (3C1) (2 of 2)**

Categories <sup>(1)</sup>	Activity data			Emissions												Information item: Carbon emitted as CH <sub>4</sub> and CO <sup>(5)</sup>	
	Des- crip- tion <sup>(2)</sup>	Unit	Value	CO <sub>2</sub> <sup>(3)</sup>			CO <sup>(4)</sup>			CH <sub>4</sub> <sup>(4)</sup>			NO <sub>x</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	Bio- mass	DOM	
				Bio- mass	DOM	SOM <sup>(6)</sup>	Bio- mass	DOM	SOM <sup>(6)</sup>	Bio- mass	DOM	SOM <sup>(6)</sup>					
		(ha or kg d.m.)		(Gg)												(Gg C)	
Burning in Non Forest Land Converted to Grassland																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in All Other Land																	
Burning in Other Land Remaining All Other Land																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in Forest Land Converted to All Other Land																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	
Burning in Non Forest Land Converted to All Other Land																	
Controlled Burning																	
Wildfires																	

- (1) Parties should report both Controlled/Prescribed Burning and Wildfires emissions, where appropriate, in a separate manner.
- (2) For each land type data should be selected between area burned or biomass/soil carbon burned. Units for area will be hectares (ha) and, for biomass/soil carbon burned, kilograms dry matter (kg d.m.).
- (3) If CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from burning are not already included in Table 3.2 and 3.3 (Carbon stock changes background table), they should be reported here. Carbon stock changes associated with burning should not also be reported in Table 3.2 and 3.3 to avoid double-counting.
- (4) CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and CO emissions from biomass burning, DOM and SOM are reported separately.
- (5) Where the carbon contained in the emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> and CO is a significant part of the sectoral emissions, this should be transferred to the corresponding columns in the Sectoral Background Table 3.2. This amount of carbon emitted as CH<sub>4</sub> and CO is then subtracted from carbon stock change to avoid double-counting. The conversion factors to convert CH<sub>4</sub> and CO to C (as input to Table 3.2) are 12/16 for CH<sub>4</sub> and 12/28 for CO. (see Volume 4, Section 2.2.3).
- (6) Emissions from soil organic matter are occurring when organic soils and peatlands are burned but are not relevant for mineral soils.

**Documentation box:**

--

**Table 3.7 AFOLU Background Table: Direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from Managed Soils (3C4)**

Categories <sup>(1)</sup>	Activity data	Emissions
	Total amount of nitrogen applied	N <sub>2</sub> O
	(Gg N yr <sup>-1</sup> )	(Gg)
<b>3C4 Direct N<sub>2</sub>O Emissions from Managed Soils</b>		
Inorganic N fertilizer application		
Forest Land		
Cropland		
Grassland		
Wetlands		
Settlements		
Other Land		
Organic N applied as fertilizer (manure and sewage sludge)		
Forest Land		
Cropland		
Grassland		
Wetlands		
Settlements		
Other Land		
Urine and dung N deposited on pasture, range and paddock by grazing animals <sup>(2)</sup>		
N in crop residues <sup>(3)</sup>		
	Area	
	(ha)	
N mineralization/immobilization associated with loss/gain of soil organic matter resulting from change of land use or management of mineral soils		
Drainage/management of organic soils (i.e. Histosols)		

(1) Countries will report at the aggregation level if their activity data allows them within each category. If country has disaggregated data by land use, reporting is also possible using this table.

(2) Only for Grassland.

(3) Only for Cropland.

**Table 3.9 AFOLU Background Table: Non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHG emissions not included elsewhere (3C7 to 3C14)**

Categories	Activity data	Emissions	
		CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O
	(ha)	(Gg)	
3C7 Rice Cultivations <sup>(1)</sup>			
3C8 CH <sub>4</sub> from Drained Organic Soils <sup>(2)</sup>			
3C9 CH <sub>4</sub> from Drainage Ditches on Organic Soils <sup>(2)</sup>			
3C10 CH <sub>4</sub> from Rewetting of Organic Soils <sup>(2)</sup>			
3C11 CH <sub>4</sub> Emissions from Rewetting of Mangroves and Tidal Marshes <sup>(2)</sup>			
3C12 N <sub>2</sub> O Emissions from Aquaculture <sup>(2)</sup>			
3C13 CH <sub>4</sub> Emissions from Rewetted and Created Wetlands on Inland Wetland Mineral Soils <sup>(2)</sup>			
3C14 Other (please specify)			

(1) If a country wishes to report direct N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from N fertilizer application to rice field, it should be reported here. Otherwise, in Table 3.7.

(2) Use appropriate subcategories highlighting e.g. land-use category and/or other relevant specifications.

**Documentation box:**

# GLOSSARY

**Aerenchymous species**

Plant species with a tissue consisting of thin-walled cells and large intercellular spaces that allow for plant internal circulation of air, enhancing gas exchange between the root layer and the atmosphere. Aerenchymous plants are widespread in wetlands.

**Aquic**

Condition pertaining to soil layers that are virtually free of dissolved oxygen and have a reducing environment because of saturation with ground water or capillary water (adapted from Table 2.3, Chapter 2, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines).

**Aquaculture**

Organised production of aquatic animals and plants (e.g. fish, crustaceans, and seaweeds) in marine or freshwater environments. The most important aquacultural practices in coastal wetlands are fish farming and shrimp ponds.

**Autotrophic respiration**

Release of carbon dioxide by living plants from internal metabolism (growth and maintenance).

**Blanket bog**

A bog type (see *bog*) that covers the underlying undulating landscape like a blanket.

**Bog**

Peatland only fed by precipitation and consequently generally nutrient-poor and acidic (see also *fen*).

**Brackish/saline water**

Water that generally contains 0.5 or more parts per thousand (ppt) of dissolved salts.

**Brackish/saline wetland**

A wetland inundated or saturated by brackish/saline water for all or part of the year.

**CO<sub>2</sub> or CH<sub>4</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>O Flux**

Rate of flow of dissolved or gaseous CO<sub>2</sub> or CH<sub>4</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>O across a given surface or area and over a certain amount of time.

**Chamber**

Gas-tight enclosure used for measuring greenhouse gas fluxes.

**Coastal wetland**

*Wetland* at or near the coast that is influenced by *brackish/saline water* and/or astronomical tides.

**Constructed wetland for wastewater treatment**

*Wetland* designed and constructed to use natural processes to help treat wastewater.

**Created wetland**

Previously dry land converted to a *wetland* by raising the water table in inland wetlands or removing obstructions to hydrologic flow and/or raising or lowering the soil elevation to appropriate tidal elevation in coastal wetlands.

**Dam**

A barrier constructed to obstruct the flow of water.

**Denitrification**

Reduction of nitrate or nitrite to molecular nitrogen.

**Dissolved Inorganic Carbon (DIC)**

Sum of all inorganic carbon species in solution (e.g. carbonate, bicarbonate, carbonic acid, carbon dioxide).

**Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC)**

Organic carbon remaining in solution after filtering the sample, typically using a 0.45 micrometer filter.

**Ditch**

A long, narrow excavation made in the ground by digging, as for draining or irrigating land.

**Drainage/drained**

Artificial lowering of the soil water table. In this supplement, 'drainage' is used to describe the act of changing a *wet soil* into a *dry soil*. A *drained* soil is a soil that formerly has been a *wet soil* but as a result of human intervention is tending to become a *dry soil*, to which the 2006 IPCC Guidelines would apply.

**Drainage class**

A collection of water table depths sharing a common characteristic. (e.g. the class 'shallow-drained' is characterized by having a mean annual water table depth of less than 30 cm below the surface, whereas the class 'deep-drained' has a mean annual water table depth of 30 cm and deeper below the surface; Chapter 2, this supplement). The mean annual water table is the water table averaged over a period of several years.

**Eddy covariance**

Micrometeorological method that uses differences in concentration associated with turbulence in the air to quantify net vertical gas exchange.

**Eutrophic**

Nutrient-rich (see also *oligotrophic*).

**Extraction**

In this supplement, to remove soil (and associated biomass, dead wood and litter).

**Fen**

Peatland that in addition to precipitation water, also receives water that has been in contact with mineral soil or bedrock (see also *bog*).

**Fish cages or pens**

Types of enclosures at the water surface or fixed to the seabed that maintain a free exchange of water and fine particles and used to cultivate aquatic organisms for human consumption.

**Fish pond**

In this supplement, a general term covering ponds constructed in brackish or saline water, designed to retain and culture fish for commercial production (aquaculture).

**Flooded Land**

In this supplement, *Flooded Land* is defined as: *water bodies where human activities have caused changes in the amount of surface area covered by water, typically through water level regulation. Examples of Flooded Land include reservoirs for the production of hydroelectricity, irrigation, and navigation. Regulated lakes and rivers that do not have substantial changes in water area in comparison with the pre-flooded ecosystem are not considered as Flooded Lands. Some rice paddies are cultivated through flooding of land, but because of the unique characteristics of rice cultivation, rice paddies are addressed in Chapter 5 (Cropland) of the Guidelines (Chapter 7.3, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines).*

**Flooding**

Overflowing of water on land normally dry.

**Floodplain**

Land adjacent to a stream or river that experiences flooding during periods of high discharge.

**Freshwater**

Water that contains < 0.5 parts per thousand (ppt) of various dissolved salts.

**Freshwater wetland**

A *wetland* inundated or saturated by *freshwater* for all or part of the year.

**Heterotrophic respiration**

The total of physical and chemical processes in an organism by which oxygen is conveyed to tissues and cells, and the oxidation products CO<sub>2</sub> and water, are given off.

**Horizontal subsurface flow (HSSF)**

A type of constructed wetland with horizontal subsurface flow.

**Hydroperiod**

*Inundation* frequency, differentiated into permanent and intermittent.

**Immobilization**

With respect to nitrogen, the process by which inorganic N, as ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub>) is assimilated by microorganisms.

**Impoundment**

Body of water formed by containment.

**Inundated/inundation**

Covered by water; see also *Flooded Land*.

**Mangrove**

A *coastal wetland* that has trees able to live in areas that are tidally flooded by brackish/saline water.

**Marsh**

A *wetland*, typically treeless, periodically inundated and characterized by grasses, sedges, cattails, and rushes.

**Methanogen**

Microorganism that produces methane during the decomposition of organic matter.

**Methanotroph**

Microorganism that utilizes methane for metabolism.

**Mineral soil**

Every soil that does not meet the definition of *organic soil* (see Annex 3A.5, Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines).

**Mineralization**

The process of converting organic compounds to inorganic compounds.

**Minerotrophic**

(Of peatland): supplied with nutrients from other sources (groundwater, flood water) than the atmosphere (see also *ombrotrophic*).

**Nitrification**

The microbial oxidation of NH<sub>x</sub> to NO<sub>3</sub>.

**Ombrotrophic**

Only supplied with nutrients by the atmosphere (see also *minerotrophic*) and consequently often acidic and low in nutrients.

**Oligotrophic**

Poor to extremely poor in nutrients (see also *eutrophic*).

**Organic soil**

In line with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines (Annex 3A.5, Chapter 3, Volume 4), soil that satisfies the requirements 1 and 2, or 1 and 3 below:

- 1) Thickness of organic horizon greater than or equal to 10 cm. A horizon of less than 20 cm must have 12 percent or more organic carbon when mixed to a depth of 20 cm;
- 2) Soils that are never saturated with water for more than a few days must contain more than 20 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e. about 35 percent organic matter); and
- 3) Soils are subject to water saturation episodes and have either:
  - a) At least 12 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e. about 20 percent organic matter) if the soil has no clay; or
  - b) At least 18 percent organic carbon by weight (i.e. about 30 percent organic matter) if the soil has 60% or more clay; or
  - c) An intermediate proportional amount of organic carbon for intermediate amounts of clay.

Except for the 10 cm criterion mentioned under 1), the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* do not define a minimum thickness for the organic horizon to allow for country-specific definitions of organic soil.

**Paludiculture**

Agriculture and forestry on wet (undrained, rewetted) organic soil.

**Particulate Organic Carbon (POC)**

Organic carbon that is larger than 0.45 micrometer in size (see also *Dissolved Organic Carbon*).

**Peat<sup>1</sup>**

Soft, porous or compressed, sedentary deposit of which a substantial portion is partly decomposed plant material with high water content in the natural state (up to about 90 percent). Countries may define *peat* according to their national circumstances.

**Peat compaction**

Volume reduction of peat in the aerated zone above the water table, resulting in increased bulk density.

**Peat consolidation**

Volume reduction of peat in the saturated zone below the water table owing to increased loading (downward pressure) from the drained top peat (by loss of buoyancy) on the peat below. See also *peat compaction*.

**Peat decomposition**

The process by which peat is broken down into simpler forms of matter. In mineralisation, decomposition proceeds to the mineral components, including CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O.

**Peat subsidence**

The loss in peat elevation resulting from *peat compaction*, *peat consolidation* and *peat oxidation*.

**Prairie**

An extensive area of flat or rolling, predominantly treeless grassland; often considered to be part of the temperate grasslands, savannas, and shrublands biome.

**Refractory carbon**

Soil carbon that does not get broken down and released as dissolved or gaseous CO<sub>2</sub> (predominantly by microorganisms) within the time scale of the inventory.

**Rehabilitation**

The re-establishment, on formerly drained sites, of some but not necessarily all the hydrological, biogeochemical and ecological processes and functions that characterized pre-drainage conditions.

**Restoration**

The process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. In case of drained former wetlands, restoration always has to include 'rewetting'.

**Rewetted soil**

A soil that formerly has been *drained* but as a result of human intervention has once more become a *wet soil*.

**Rewetting**

The deliberate action of changing a *drained soil* into a *wet soil*, e.g. by blocking drainage ditches, disabling pumping facilities or breaching obstructions.

**Riparian**

Of, inhabiting, or situated on the bank of a river.

**Saline inland wetland**

*Wetland* that accumulates salts in its soil typically as a result of semi-arid to arid conditions.

**Salt production**

The production of salt by evaporating brackish or saline tidal water.

**Seagrass meadow**

---

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with the definition of peat found in the Energy sector of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines* (Volume 2, Chapter 1, Table 1.1)

*Coastal wetland* vegetated by seagrass species (rooted, flowering plants), permanently or tidally covered by brackish/saline water.

**Sediment**

Deposit of inorganic or organic material that has been carried and deposited by wind, water, or ice.

**Semi-natural treatment wetland**

Natural *wetland* that has been modified for wastewater treatment, e.g. by increasing the volume reserved (i.e. by dams) and constructing channels for targeting the influent and effluent.

**Surface flow (SF)**

A type of constructed wetland with surface flow.

**Swamp**

Wetlands dominated by trees or woody species.

**Tidal freshwater wetland**

*Wetland* inundated or saturated for all or part of the year by tidal freshwater. The upper boundary is recognized as the landward extent of tidal inundation.

**Tidal marsh**

*Marsh* inundated or saturated for all or part of the year by tidal freshwater or brackish/saline water. The upper boundary is recognized as the landward extent of tidal inundation.

**Total organic carbon (TOC)**

All carbon in organic matter.

**Vertical subsurface flow (VSSF)**

A type of constructed wetland with vertical subsurface flow.

**Wastewater treatment plant**

A facility designed to receive wastewater and to remove materials that damage water quality and threaten public health and safety when discharged into receiving streams or bodies of water.

**Waterborne carbon**

*DIC*, *DOC* or *POC* contained in or conveyed by water.

**Wetland**

In this supplement, the term ‘wetland’ is used to refer to land with a *wet soil*. For the IPCC land-use category Wetlands, see below.

**Wetlands**

This guidance uses the term ‘Wetlands’ (with capital ‘W’ and plural) when referring to the IPCC land-use category Wetlands. The terms ‘wetland’ or ‘wetlands’ (except in titles with lowercase ‘w’ and singular or plural) are used to refer to land with wet soil (see above).

**Wetland mineral soil**

A mineral soil that is classified as an ‘aquic soil’ or a ‘gleysol’ according to the default mineral soil classification in Annex 3A.5, Figures 3A.5.3 and 3A.5.4, Chapter 3, Volume 4 of the *2006 IPCC Guidelines*.

**Wet soil**

A soil that is inundated or saturated by water for all or part of the year to the extent that biota, adapted to anaerobic conditions, particularly soil microbes and rooted plants, control the quality and quantity of the net annual greenhouse gas emissions and removals.



# **LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS**

---

## **AUTHORS, REVIEW EDITORS AND REVIEWERS**

# Authors and Review Editors<sup>1</sup>

## Overview

### Lead Authors

Dominique Blain	Science and Technology Branch, Environment Canada	Canada
Rizaldi Boer	Centre for Climate Risk and Opportunity Management in Southeast Asia and Pacific (CCROM SEAP) - IPB	Indonesia
Simon Eggleston	Global Forest Observation Initiative	IPCC TFI TSU
Sergio Gonzalez		Chile
Taka Hiraishi	c/o Institute for Global Environmental Strategies	Japan
William Irving	Climate Change Division, OAR, US Environmental Protection Agency	USA
Thelma Krug	INPE – Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais	Brazil
Alex Vladimir Krusche	University of Sao Paulo – CENA	Brazil
Emmanuel Jonathan Mpeti	Tanzania Meteorological Agency	Tanzania
Jim Penman	Environment Institute, University College London	UK
Riitta Pipatti	Statistics Finland	Finland
Robert Sturgiss	Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency	Australia
Kiyoto Tanabe	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI TSU)	IPCC TFI TSU
Sirintomthep Towprayoon	Joint Graduate School of Energy and Environment, Center of Excellence of Energy Technology and Environment, King Mongkut's University of Technology, Thonburi	Thailand

### Review Editors

Steen Gyldenkerne	Aarhus University	Denmark
Erda Lin	Agro-environment and Sustainable Development Institute, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences	China

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### Coordinating Lead Authors

Tom Wirth	US Environmental Protection Agency	USA
Chengyi Zhang	National Climate Center, China Meteorological Administration	China

### Lead Authors

Gusti Zakaria Anshari	Centre for Wetlands People and Biodiversity (CWPB), Universitas Tanjungpura (UNTAN)	Indonesia
Kenneth Byrne	University of Limerick	Ireland
Elke Hodson	U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Climate Change Policy and Technology	Switzerland / USA
Hans Joosten	Institute of Botany and Landscape Ecology, Greifswald University	EC / WI / FAO
J. Boone Kauffman	Oregon State University / Center for International Forest Research	IUCN / UNESCO
Leif K.I. Klemetsson	Department of Earth Sciences, University of Gothenburg	Sweden
Tuija Elina Lapveteläinen	Statistics Finland	Finland
Christoph Muller	Justus-Liebig-University Giessen	Germany
Phillip O'Brien	Environmental Protection Agency, Ireland	Ireland
Mitsuru Osaki	Research Faculty of Agriculture, Hokkaido University	Japan

### Contributing Authors

Tonya Del Sontro	Institute of Biogeochemistry and Pollutant Dynamics	Switzerland
Mark Flugge	ICF International	USA
Stephen Ogle	Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State	USA

<sup>1</sup> The names shown in the third column are of the entities that nominated the experts, unless requested otherwise by the experts themselves.

Riitta Pipatti	University Statistics Finland	Finland
Rachel Steele	ICF International	USA
Victoria Thompson	ICF International	USA
Kiyoto Tanabe	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	IPCC TFI TSU

**Review Editors**

Fatih Evrendilek	Abant Izzet Baysal University	Turkey
Steen Gyldenkerne	Aarhus University	Denmark

**Chapter 2: Drained Inland Organic Soils****Coordinating Lead Authors**

Matthias Drösler	HSWT - Weihenstephan University of Applied Sciences	Germany
Annette Freibauer	Thünen-Institute of Climate-Smart Agriculture	Germany
Genxing Pan	Nanjing Agricultural University	China
Louis V. Verchot	CIFOR	USA

**Lead Authors**

Fahmuddin Agus	Indonesian Soil Research Institute (ISRI, IAARD)	Indonesia
Jukka P. Alm	Finnish Forest Research Institute	Finland
Richard A. Bourbonniere	Environment Canada	Canada
John Couwenberg	University of Greifswald	EC / WI / Germany / Netherlands
Christopher David Evans	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology	UK
Kristell Hergoualc'h	CIFOR	France
Jyrki Jauhainen	Department of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki	Finland
Susan Elizabeth Page	Department of Geography, University of Leicester	UK
Supiandi Sabiham	Faculty of Agriculture, Bogor Agricultural University (IPB)	Indonesia
Changke Wang	National Climate Center, China Meteorological Administration	China

**Contributing Authors**

Laura Borgeau-Chavez	Michigan Technological University	USA
Nancy H.F. French	Michigan Technological University	USA
Aljosja Hooijer	Deltares	Netherlands
Narasimhan Larkin	U.S. Forest Service	USA
Robert Mickler	Alion Science and Technology	USA
Kari Minkkinen	University of Helsinki	Finland
Andrey Sirin	Institute of Forest Science Russian Academy of Sciences	Russian Federation
Nalin Srivastava	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	IPCC TFI TSU
Tara Strand	New Zealand Forest Crown Research Institute	USA / New Zealand
Kevin Tansey	University of Leicester	UK

**Review Editors**

David Pare	Canadian Forest Service - Natural Resources Canada	Canada
Iman Rusmana	Bogor Agricultural University	Indonesia
Bernard Siska	Slovak University of Agriculture	Slovakia

**Chapter 3: Rewetted Organic Soils****Coordinating Lead Authors**

Dominique Blain	Science and Technology Branch, Environment Canada	Canada
Daniel Murdiyarso	CIFOR	CIFOR

**Lead Authors**

John Couwenberg	University of Greifswald	EC / WI / Germany / Netherlands
Osamu Nagata	NARO Hokkaido Agricultural Research Center (NARO/HARC)	Japan
Andrey Sirin	Institute of Forest Science Russian Academy of Sciences	Russian Federation
Maria Strack	University of Calgary	Canada

Eeva-Stiina Tuittila	University of Eastern Finland	Finland
David Wilson	Earthy Matters Environmental Consultants	Ireland
Florence Renou-Wilson	University College Dublin	Ireland
<b><i>Contributing Authors</i></b>		
Christopher David Evans	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology	UK
Maya Fukuda	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	IPCC TFI TSU
Faizal Parish		Malaysia
<b><i>Review Editors</i></b>		
Jens Leifeld	Agroscope Research Station Reckenholz - Tanikon ART	Switzerland
Maria Jose Sanz Sanchez	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	FAO

## **Chapter 4: Coastal Wetlands**

### ***Coordinating Lead Authors***

Daniel Michael Alongi	Australian Institute of Marine Science	Australia
Ansarul Karim	National Task Force on Climate Change Negotiation	Bangladesh
Hilary Anne Kennedy	Bangor University	UK

### ***Lead Authors***

Guangcheng Chen	Third Institute of Oceanography, State Oceanic Administration, P. R. China	China
Gail L. Chmura	McGill University	Canada
Stephen Crooks	ESA PWA	USA
James G. Kairo	Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute	Kenya
Baowen Liao	Research Institute of Tropical Forestry, Chinese Academy of Forestry	China
George Guanghui Lin	Tsinghua University	China

### ***Contributing Authors***

Tiffany G. Troxler	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	IPCC TFI TSU
--------------------	--	--------------

### ***Review Editors***

Nuria Marba Bordalba	Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas	Spain
Georgi Karl Hiebaum	Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research – BAS	Bulgaria

## **Chapter 5: Inland Wetland Mineral Soils**

### ***Coordinating Lead Authors***

Alex V. Krusche	University of Sao Paulo – CENA	Brazil
Kimberly P. Wickland	United States Geological Survey	USA

### ***Lead Authors***

Rodney A. Chimner	School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science, Michigan Technological University	USA
Ayaka W. Kishimoto-Mo	National Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences	Japan
Randall K. Kolka	USDA Forest Service Northern Research Station	USA
Yusuf Serengil	Istanbul University	Turkey

### ***Contributing Authors***

Stephen Ogle	Colorado State University	USA
Nalin Srivastava	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	IPCC TFI TSU

### ***Review Editors***

Irineu Junior Bianchini	Federal University of Sao Carlos	Brazil
Michelle Garneau	L'Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	Canada

## Chapter 6: Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment

### *Coordinating Lead Authors*

Yoshitaka Ebie	National Institute for Environmental Studies	Japan
Sirintomthep Towprayoon	Joint Graduate School of Energy and Environment, Center of Excellence of Energy Technology and Environment, King Mongkut's University of Technology, Thonburi	Thailand

### *Lead Authors*

Chart Chiemchaisri	Kasetsart University	Thailand
Ülo Mander	Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, University of Tartu	Estonia
Sandra Furlan Nogueira	Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA)	Brazil

### *Contributing Authors*

Baasansuren Jamsranjav	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	IPCC TFI TSU
------------------------	--	--------------

### *Review Editors*

Christopher Gordon	Institute for Environment and Sanitation Studies (IESS)	Ghana
Detelina Rumyanova Petrova	Executive Environment Agency	Bulgaria

## Chapter 7: Cross-cutting Issues and Reporting

### *Coordinating Lead Authors*

Pantaleo Munishi	Sokoine University of Agriculture, Department of Forest Biology	Tanzania
Riitta Pipatti	Statistics Finland	Finland

### *Lead Authors*

Patrick Gonzalez	U.S. National Park Service	USA
Papa Mawade Wade	Wetlands International Africa	Senegal

### *Contributing Authors*

Kiyoto Tanabe	Technical Support Unit, Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)	IPCC TFI TSU
---------------	--	--------------

### *Review Editors*

Werner Leo Kutsch	Johann Heinrich von Thunen Institute	Germany
Erda Lin	Agro-environment and Sustainable Development Institute, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences	China

## Reviewers

All expert reviewers listed below submitted their review comments for the Expert Review of the First Order Draft and/or for the Government and Expert Review of the Second Order Draft. Affiliations of expert reviewers presented in the list are as provided by them at the time of registration.

### Argentina

Ana Faggi Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales  
Hector Ginzo Instituto del Clima, Academia Argentina de Ciencia del Ambiente

### Australia

Catherine Ellen Lovelock The University of Queensland  
Zoe Ryan Fauna & Flora International  
Neil Saintilan Office of Environment and Heritage

### Austria

Klaus Radunsky Umweltbundesamt Wien

### Belgium

James Ogilvie EPAGMA

### Benin

Bamikole Jacques Kouazounde University of Abomey Calavi  
Guendehou G.H. Sabin Benin Centre for Scientific and Technical Research

### Bolivia

Emilio Garcia-Apaza Instituto de Investigaciones Agronómicas, Ambientales y del Cambio Climático "IIAAC", Faculty of Agronomy - San Andres Major University

### Brazil

Marco Aurélio dos Santos Energy Planning Program/COPPE/UFRJ  
Ivan Bergier Embrapa Pantanal  
Irineu Bianchini Junior Federal University of São Carlos  
Viviane Fernandez Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro  
Jean Pierre Ometto National Institute for Space Research  
Newton Paciornik  
Giselle Parno Guimarães RedeClima / Ministério da Ciência e Tecnologia e Inovação  
Jose Ricardo da Rocha Campos Escola Superior de Agricultura Luiz de Queiroz  
Elizabeth Sikar Construmaq São Carlos

### Cameroon

Denis Jean Sonwa CIFOR (Center for International Forestry Research)

### Canada

Angela Bedard-Haughn University of Saskatchewan  
Ana Blondel Environment Canada  
Stéphanie Boudreau Canadian Sphagnum Peat Moss Association (CSPMA)  
Shari Hayne Environment Canada  
Nicole J.Fenton Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue  
James Douglas MacDonald Environment Canada  
Rock Ouimet Le Ministère des Ressources Naturelles et de la Faune du Québec  
Maria Strack University of Calgary

### China

Zucong Cai School of Geographical Sciences, Nanjing Normal University  
Jianhua Cao Institute of Karst Geology, the Chinese Academy of Geological Sciences  
Guangcheng Chen Third Institute of Oceanography, State Oceanic Administration  
Weixin Ding Institute of Soil Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences  
Du Rui Graduate University, Chinese Academy of Science  
Qingxian Gao Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences (CRAES)  
Amos Tierayangn Kabo-bah Green WaterHut  
Fadong Li Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences  
Junsheng Li Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences (CRAES)  
Qian Li LAGEO, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences  
Xianguo Lu Northeast Institute of Geography & Agroecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences  
Chun Ma The College of Environmental Science and Engineering, Nankai University  
Zhanyun Ma Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences  
Xianmin Meng Institute for Peat and Mire Research, Northeast Normal University

Chiyuan Miao	College of Global Change and Earth System Science, Beijing Normal University
Zhijian Mu	College of Resources and Environment, Southwest University
Xubin Pan	Institute of Plant Quarantine, Chinese Academy of Inspection and Quarantine
Bing Qiao	China Waterborne Transport Research Institute
Changchun Song	Northeast Institute of Geography and Agroecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Aijun Wang	Third Institute of Oceanography, State Oceanic Administration of China
Baodong Wang	The First Institute of Oceanography, State Oceanic Administration
Changyong Wang	Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences, Ministry of Environmental Protection of the People's Republic of China
Changke Wang	National Climate Center
Chunfeng Wang	State Forestry Administration
Hanjie Wang	Guojie Senior Professors Science and Technology Consultation and Development Academy
Xiaowen Wang	Chinese Academy of Forestry
Xia Hui Wang	Environmental Science Academic Society of China
Shaohong Wu	Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Yonghong Xie	Institute of Subtropical Agriculture, the Chinese Academy of Sciences
Xiaofeng Xu	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Siyuan Ye	Qingdao Institute of Marine Geology, China Geological Survey
Guangyu Zhang	Tianjin Research Institute for Water Transport Engineering, Ministry of Transport
Guobin Zhang	Forestry Carbon Sequestration Accounting and Monitoring Center of the State Forestry Administration, P.R. China
Xiaochun Zhang	Research Center for Eco-Environmental Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Xiuyu Zhang	South China Institute of Environmental Sciences. MEP
Xunhua Zheng	Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences
<b>Colombia</b>	
Natalia Gutierrez Beltrán	Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology and Environmental Studies - IDEAM
Maria Cecilia Cardona Ruiz	IDEAM
Diego Alejandro Navarrete Encinales	Carbon Decisions International
Diana Lugo	IDEAM
Javier Otero Garcia	IDEAM
Reinaldo Sanchez Lopez	IDEAM
Adriana Patricia Yepes Quintero	Private
<b>Denmark</b>	
Thomas Friberg	University of Copenhagen
Steen Gyldenkaerne	Institute of Environmental Sciences, Aarhus University
Erik Kristensen	Syddansk Universitet
Ole-Kenneth Nielsen	Aarhus University
<b>Egypt</b>	
Ayman Batisha	Arab Sustainability Academy
<b>Finland</b>	
Teija Hakalahti-Sirén	Vapo Oy
Jyrki Jauhiainen	University of Helsinki
Tuija Lapveteläinen	Statistics Finland
Annalea Lohila	Finnish Meteorological Institute
Kari Mutka	Biodiili Ltd (consultant)
Riitta Pipatti	Statistics Finland
Ilkka Savolainen	VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland
Tarja Tuomainen	Finnish Forest Institute
<b>Germany</b>	
John Couwenberg	University of Greifswald
Annette Freibauer	Thuenen-Institute of Agricultural Climate Research
Stephan Glatzel	University of Rostock
Mathias Herbst	Department of Bioclimatology, Göttingen University
Joachim Rock	Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institut, Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Institute of Forest Ecology and Forest Inventory

Gerald Schmilewski Baerbel Tiemeyer	International Peat Society, Chair Commission II Thünen Institute for Climate-Smart Agriculture
<b>Hungary</b> Zoltan Somogyi	Hungarian Forest Research Institute
<b>Iceland</b> Jón Guðmundsson	Agricultural University of Iceland
<b>India</b> Tapan Kumar Adhya Malini Nair Chhemendra Sharma	Indian Nitrogen Group (ING-SCON) Center for Sustainable Technologies, Indian Institute of Science Principal Scientist, National Physical Laboratory, New Delhi
<b>Indonesia</b> Kristell Hergoualc'h Mahmud Raimadoya Louis Verchot	CIFOR Bogor Agricultural University (IPB) CIFOR
<b>Ireland</b> Florence Renou-Wilson David Wilson	University College Dublin Earthy Matters Environmental Consultants
<b>Italy</b> Sandro Federici Marina Vitullo	Republic of San Marino Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA)
<b>Japan</b> Hiroko Akiyama Yukio Haruyama Ryusuke Hatano Mitsuru Hirota Shigehiro Ishizuka Ayaka W. Mo Kishimoto Yoshiyuki Kiyono Takayuki Nakatsubo Ake Rosenqvist Atsushi Sato Hiroyuki Ueda Masato Yamada Masato Yano	National Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences Remote Sensing Technology Center of Japan Hokkaido University University of Tsukuba Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute National Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute Hiroshima University Solo Earth Observation Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd. Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd. National Institute for Environmental Studies Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd.
<b>Korea, Republic of</b> Raehyun Kim	Korea Forest Research Institute
<b>Malaysia</b> Faizal Parish Elizabeth Philip	Global Environment Centre Forest Research Institute Malaysia/Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
<b>Mauritius</b> Prithiviraj Booneeady Anand Sookun	Mauritius Meteorological Services Statistics Mauritius
<b>Mexico</b> Tomas Hernandez-Tejeda	INIFAP-SAGARPA
<b>Netherlands</b> Gert Jan van den Born Aljosja Hooijer Ko van Huissteden Jan Vermaat	PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency Senior Researcher, Deltares Faculty of Earth and Life Sciences, VU University Faculty of Earth and Life Sciences, VU University
<b>New Zealand</b> Andrea Brandon Luitgard Schwendenmann	New Zealand Ministry for the Environment The University of Auckland
<b>Norway</b> Caroline Roelandt	University of Bergen



<b>Peru</b> Peter Schlesinger	PSForestry
<b>Philippines</b> Leandro Buendia	Project Coordinator, SEA GHG Project
<b>Russian Federation</b> Romanovskaya Anna	Institute of Global Climate and Ecology
<b>Spain</b> Government of Spain Cristina Garcia-Diaz	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment
<b>Sri Lanka</b> B.V.R. Punyawardena	Climatologist
<b>Sweden</b> Olof Andrén Åsa Kasimir Klemedtsson Lars Lundin Mats Olsson	Consultant, former Professor at Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences University of Gothenburg Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences SLU Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences SLU
<b>Switzerland</b> Simon Eggleston Jens Leifeld	Global Forest Observation Initiative Agroscope
<b>Tanzania</b> Gerald Jones Kamwenda	Tanzania Forest Service
<b>Thailand</b> Sansanee Choowaew Suwasa Kantawanichkul	Mahidol University Chiang Mai University
<b>Turkey</b> Fatih Evrendilek	Abant Izzet Baysal University
<b>United Kingdom</b> Rebekka Artz Heiko Balzter Sandra Brown Simon Koenig Richard Lucas Harriet Orr Susan Elizabeth Page Jim Penman Jack Rieley Keith A Smith Judith Stuart Amanda Thomson Mike Wiseman	James Hutton Institute University of Leicester Winrock International Permian Global Aberystwyth University Environment Agency of England and Wales University of Leicester University College London International Peat Society School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs NERC Centre for Ecology & Hydrology University of the Third Age (U3A) Climate Change Coordinator
<b>USA</b> John F. Bratton Lynette Brown Christopher Bruce Craft Carmen Burghlelea Daniel Childers Robert Raymond Christian Marlen D Eve Stephen E. Davis, III Stephen K. Hamilton Jaclyn Hatala Kristine N. Hopfensperger Patrick Hunt Randy Kolka Charles Lane Erik A. Lilleskov H. Gyde Lund Erika Podest Katherine Segarra	NOAA-Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory Breedlove, Dennis & Associates, Inc. Indiana University, Bloomington University of Arizona Arizona State University East Carolina University USDA Climate Change Program Office Everglades Foundation Michigan State University University of California, Berkeley Northern Kentucky University USDA-ARS USDA Forest Service US Environmental Protection Agency USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station Forest Information Services Jet Propulsion Laboratory University of Georgia, Department of Marine Sciences

Karamat R. Sistani	USDA, Agricultural Research Service
Newman J Smith	Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP
Mark Sperow	West Virginia University
Michael J. Stenhouse	INTERA Incorporated
Victoria M. Thompson	ICF International
Ralph Tiner	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Wirth	US Environmental Protection Agency
Christopher William Woodall	US Department of Agriculture
Kewei Yu	Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Troy University
Dragos G. Zaharescu	University of Arizona, Biosphere-2

**Venezuela**

Alicia Villamizar	Universidad Simón Bolívar. Departamento de Estudios Ambientales
-------------------	---

**IGO**

**European Commission**

Raul Abad Viñas	Joint Research Center
Viorel Blujdea	Joint Research Center
Roland Heiderer	Joint Research Center
Roxana Petrescu	Joint Research Center

**Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)**

Rocio Danica Condor Golec

**International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA)**

Fabian Wagner

**International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)**

Wu Ning

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

Kimberly Todd  
Maxim Vergeichik

**Wetlands International**

Kelin Chen  
Ritesh Kumar  
Arina Schrier-Uijl  
Marcel Silvius