

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: May 12, 2010

Screeners: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Nijavalli H. Ravindranath
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4229

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : Mexico

PROJECT TITLE: Fifth National Communication to the UNFCCC

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) - National Institute of Ecology (INE)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: CC-4;

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

The project aims at preparation of Fifth National Communication for Mexico to fulfill its commitment under UNFCCC Articles 4.1 and 12.1. STAP compliments Mexico for being a leader in the preparation of National Communications and one of the first countries to prepare the fifth National Communication while most countries are currently preparing their second National Communication. STAP also compliments Mexico for its decision to conduct inventory using elements of IPCC 2006 GHG inventory guidelines, one of the first of few countries to adopt the latest IPCC guidelines. STAP further compliments attempts to address issues such as development of methodology for monitoring, reporting, verification (MRV) and NAMAs. STAP provides consent to this project. The PIF is well-prepared and addresses all the elements needed for the National Communication. Below, STAP provides a few suggestions on how to strengthen the preparation of the Fifth National Communication.

1. Uncertainty assessment: Mexico should conduct uncertainty assessment using the IPCC guidelines. Uncertainty assessment is not mentioned in the PIF.
2. Key category analysis: STAP suggests Mexico conducts a key category analysis to identify the key sectors and activities.
3. Emission factors: STAP presumes that Mexico is developing its own nationally relevant emission factors for the key categories.
4. Tiers for inventory estimation: STAP presumes that Mexico would be adopting Tier 2 or Tier 3 for inventory of key categories.
5. IPCC 2006 Guidelines: Though it is desirable to adopt the elements of 2006 guidelines, it is important to recognize that reporting tables are not available for 2006 guidelines or compatible with the previous IPCC Guidelines.
6. Use of multiple GCMs and impact models: STAP suggests to use, if possible, multiple GCMs and impact models, since different GCMs provide varying rainfall and temperature projections. Even the projection of climate change impacts varies with the use of a crop response model, hydrological model, or Dynamic Global Vegetation Model.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Consent | STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement. |
| 2. Minor revision required. | STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement. |
| 3. Major revision required | STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement. |