**Feedback received from selected stakeholders on revised draft reports from International Consultants (version 02 October) targeting sectors where much improvement was required on version 03 April 2020**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SN.** | **Institution** | **Comment received** |
| 1. | Solid Waste Management Division | It is noted with great concern that none of the comments made on the previous version of the NIR and BUR reports have been taken into consideration. Amendments proposed in the text have been left unattended while major issues with the activity data used for computing the GHG emissions have not been corrected as proposed (Table 98 of NIR). Specifically, an excel sheet was prepared and submitted by the SWMD so that the consultants only have to input the activity data from the excel sheet in the IPCC software. Even this simple task has not been done. The previous comments made and the prepared excel sheets are re-submitted as attachments for the Consultants to amend the NIR and BUR reports. As it stands, it is not worth submitting the document to the Editor as several changes (text, graphs, tables) will have to be subsequently made. |
| 2. | Wastewater Management Authority | Kindly note that my previous comments already forwarded to the Climate Change Division have not been considered by the International Consultant and same were highlighted during meeting held on 30 June 2020.I am again forwarding the same comments for reports version 02 October 2020. |
| 3.  | Statistics Mauritius | 1. Solid Waste Sector

Activity data for percentage for SWDS going to landfill are incorrect. It should be 100% or a bit less. Refer to NIR 2017 Report on page 124 where the percentage is 100%. The low figures used in the software directly affect the calculation of CH4 emissions for this category. (These comments were already made during last Technical Working Group Committee and no necessary action done)Also figures for population of Island of Mauritius differ from figures used in BUR. (Table 98- BUR 2020)1. Biological treatment of waste

In the NIR 2020, at Table 97 there is mention of “Negative”. Could the Consultants be more explicit about this. What about composting which is a type of biological treatment of waste? In Mauritius we do have composting. (New comments)1. Waste Incineration

There is no mention of clinical incineration of waste in the BUR 2020. In the NIR 2017, clinical incineration was taken into consideration as per page 128. (These comments were already made during last Technical Working Group Committee)1. Biological treatment of waste

In the NIR 2020, at Table 97 there is mention of “Negative”. Could the Consultants be more explicit about this. What about composting which is a type of biological treatment of waste? In Mauritius we do have composting. (New comments)1. IPPU sector

For iron and steel production, it is not clear what types of technology is used in Mauritius. There is no mention of them in the report except that the Global Average Factor culled Table 4.1 from Volume 3, of Chapter 4 was used. In the NIR 2017, the emission factor of 1.35 for tonne CO2 per tonne of pig iron while for the NIR 2020 the factor is 1.06. (New comments)1. Livestock – enteric fermentation and manure management

The number of heads (dairy cows) of cattle used in software is different from figures in Table 84 of the NIR 2020. Since there is import of cattle to cater for Mauritian needs, no mention was made and no emission was accounted for imported cattle. (New comments)1. For poultry – manure management

The number of poultry heads (broiler, broiler parent stock, layer and layer parent stock) are lumped into one figure in the software despite that their typical mass are not the same. (New comments) |
| 4.  | Forestry Services |  **General comments for BUR and NIR**:In general, it was observed that the emission trends provided for the AFOLU sector and Forestry Sector appears to be correct. It is understood that all calculation pertaining to the Forestry Sector emission was carried out using the activity data submitted by the Forestry Service.**However, it does not appear that the calculation pertaining to the Forestry Sector emission was carried out using the IPPC software.****Comments on BUR**Pg 42 Table 17. Area of forest in 2016 for each category type – The extent of Other forest land should read as 1318 ha rather than 1366 ha and the total extent of islet national park should read as 136 rather than 134.**Comments on NIR**Pg 110 Section **Absence of a time series for GHG removals** in AFOLU sector – Only data from 2013-2016 presented. |
| 5. | National Land Transport Authority (NLTA) | It has been noted that the consultants have not taken into consideration comments submitted by this Office. It would be appreciated if needful could be done to amend the final report.Compiled comments on amended draft BUR, NIR, MRV (version 03 April 2020) – 8\_Energy&IPPU*Comment from International Consultant*:This is not completely correct. The information contained in table 35 has been calculated using two information sources, as explained in the NIR and BUR documents and as mentioned in the comment above. The activity data regarding the number of vehicles by type of fuel consumed has been obtained from NLTA, but the information regarding fuel densities, vehicle consumption by type of vehicle and distance travelled, has been obtained from the transport toolkit. The reason why these parameters have been used to estimate the GHG emissions was discussed during the last workshop carried out in Mauritius.***Reply from NLTA:***Please find attached actual official figures available at this Office and submitted to Consultants for BUR Projects.**Vehicle consumption by type of vehicle and distance travelled already available in the excel sheet provided by this Office.**But the Consultants have used data from the Transport Toolkits as mentioned in their comments but these figures are projected one and same has been used to estimate the GHG emissions. This office is maintaining that the Consultants should use the actual official figures to estimate the GHG emissions for year 2014 to 2016.The Official figures submitted by this Office should be inserted in the NIR report |

**29 October 2020 – Views from FAREI - Livestock Sector**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **File name** | **Page**  | **Views and comments as at 08 June 2020** | **Views and comments as at 29 October 2020** |
| AFLOU \_Activity Data Emission\_NIR – 30 mar2020 (calculation folder) | I cannot find the sheet on manure management calculation  | manure management calculation still missing In my past comments, I did mention that all working should be on IPCC software | Excel sheet seen on MMSCalculation for GHG emission done on Excel software , **not** on IPCC software |
| GHG Inventory 2000-2016\_v2 (calculation Folder) | Missing value for manure management for the year 2014 to 2016 | Values for manure management for the year 2014 to 2016 are still missing | Values for manure management for the year 2014 to 2016 are seen  |
| Comments on draft BUR and NIR\_ compiled response\_30mar2020\_EnergyIPPU&AFOLU | Page 11 Figure 4 on GHG Emissions from AFOLU Sector, 2000 – 2016 (Gg CO2eq/year)  shows  a zero emission for 2000 to 2013 and call for reviewComments from consultant *Kindly cross check the database, and last NIR, also separate* ***points to be discussed*** *is attached for clarification on database. There is no data consistency from 2000.**Kindly let me know your views on the FAO default value, so that we can incorporate this assessment as cross verification and recalculations.*. | To be reviewedIs this statement address for livestock subsector or forest?If yes, we do not understand the consultant comment on data consistency from 2000. Please send FAREI one report on inconsistency might have encounter as far livestock and poultry are concerned or where you still need clarification. If apply to livestock, please send us the FAO default values for livestock  | For Figure 4 on page 11. GHG Emissions from AFOLU Sector, 2000 – 2016 (Gg CO2eq/year). Bar chart for livestock is missing from 2000 to 2013It is to be noted that the imported animals were excluded in the GHG calculations. The table 5.1.3.2 under the activity data on page 96 mentioned that imported data was annualized. **The consultant will need to review this statement**The consultant should also state the reason why there is a decrease in GHG emissions from AFOLU sector for the period 2014 – 2016 (a decrease of 11.5% in that period)Page31 Table 12. GHG emissions from enteric fermentation of Livestock and manure management, 2014 – 2016 The value for CO2eq. emission from manure management is due to methane only and that of nitrous oxide was not addition to it |
| **Points for discussion and consideration for published [NIR] and current BUR under preparation and IPCC software** | 1. In case of emission estimation from enteric fermentation of livestock, the default value for Sheep is 45 kg, however the IPCC software has 2 values: (a) 48.5 Kg and (b) 28 kg

Thus considering the conservativeness, 45 kg from IPCC 2006.1. Table 52 is stating GHG emission from Livestock, however the values in the table is CO2 removal from FOLU

13. Table 44 of NIR presents livestock population for Mauritius from the year 2006 – 2013 only, then how the GHG emission from enteric fermentation and agriculture sector has been assessed for the period 2000 to 2013 as mentioned in page no 92. How this number has been arrived and what is the basis. |  This is issue with default values . Uncertainty range from 0 to 100%. In absence of country specific emission value , what is the criteria you should consider whether to opt for 28 or 48,5Kg. conservativeness is not a criteria to decide ok we go for 45 kg. I personally I do not have the answer. Please refer to table 48 on page 93 of NIRFAREI had submitted not only livestock data for the period of 2014 to 2017 but the source and methododology used to estimate the data. Please refer to page 89 section b: activity data of the NIR. | No points of discussion forwarded by consultant |
| **Biennial Update Report Draft\_Apr 2020** | **Page45. Figure 12. Emissions from enteric fermentation of livestock and manure management, 2014 –2016****Page 53: Constraints and gaps of GHG inventory and mitigation actions for AFOLU****Page88; Mitigations actions being taken, and other climate projects being implemented for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions****Page 85- Mitigation action tables 12,13,14,15**Page 118-141 ;Summary Report for GHG Emissions Inventory, Year 2005 and 2010Year 2014,2015 and 2016Page 149: Table 46. Key Category Analysis, Approach 1 – Trend Assessment | The graph has a Spanish title which need to be removed. The values shown on figure 12 is half the emission generated from 2000 to 2013. Some explanation will be required from consultant . Only general comment. Nothing mention specifically for livestock. No mention for livestock sector . At least areas of intervention should be mention: for example manure treatment, back yard poultry rearing, biogas, organic farmingFor mitigation action table 15: methodologies and assumption missingMissing values of methane and N2O for Both Enteric fermentation (methane only) and manure management Missing values of methane and N2O for manure management onlyNo trend assessment for enteric fermentation | No remedial action taken No remedial action taken No remedial action taken No remedial action taken No remedial action taken No remedial action taken  |
| National Inventory Report\_Draft\_Apr 2020 | Page 11 Figure 4. GHG Emissions from AFOLU Sector, 2000 – 2016 (Gg CO2eq/year)Page 77; Figure 41. Share of Agriculture in the Economy in the Republic of Mauritius, 2016Page 81 ..the statement :…. Manure Management under enteric fermentationPage 86; The livestock data collection methods were reviewedPage 87: 5.2.7 Planned ImprovementsPrimary data are collected by FAREI extension services and compiled by the Biometry Division for submission to the Statistic Mauritius.Page 123 and page 128 :Table 96. Key Category Analysis using Approach 1 Trend Assessment method from IPCC 2006 Guidelines for the National Inventory for the period 2000 – 2016. | Bar chart for livestock missing for year 2000 to 2013Source missingNot agreeable. They are two separate source of GHG emission for livestock as the IPCC guidelines  No change in data sets and methodology is noted. This is actually being done. it is not a planned improvement. Data collection Method (if any) and making private institution to share data can be considered under this planned improvementTrend assessment for enteric fermentation and manure management not carried out | No remedial action taken No remedial action takenNo remedial action takenNo remedial action takenNo remedial action takenNo remedial action taken |