



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

**Standard Independent Assessment Report  
Assessment Report  
Part 2 - Substance**

<b>Reference:</b>	IAR/2010/LIE/2/1	<b>State:</b>	Final
<b>Version number:</b>	2.0	<b>Date:</b>	01/08/2011
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Nadezhda Uledova/Russian Federation		
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	John Bedard/SRA International		
<b>Approved by:</b>	Heidi McKenna/UNFCCC		

**Circulation list**

<b>Name/Role</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Info/Action</b>
Nadezhda Uledova/Assessor	Russian Federation	Action
John Bedard/Reviewer	SRA International Inc.	Action
Patrick Insinna/ RSA Liechtenstein	Office for Environmental Protection (OEP) Liechtenstein	Action

**Document change record**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
0.1	29/06/2011	Initial draft
1.0	12/07/2011	Approved draft 1.0
2.0	01/08/2011	Party reported no comments to draft, report finalized as drafted without changes.

## Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Liechtenstein	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2010	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files submitted: - [SEF] SEF_LI_2011_3_11-27-32+22-2-2011.xls - [NIR] NIR_LIE_Submission_2011.pdf - [REPORTS 2] SIAR_Report_R-2_2010-LI.xls - [REPORTS 3] SIAR_Report_R-3_2010-LI.xls - [REPORTS 4] SIAR_Report_R-4_2010-LI.xls - [REPORTS 5] SIAR_Report_R-5_2010-LI.xls - [RESPONSE] SIAR+Consultation+Form+on+SIA R+Assessment+Draft+Part+1_LI.doc	Information from the ITL Administrator: - [SEFCR] SEF_LI_2011_3_11-27-32+22-2-2011-CR.xls -[RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2010_LI_v1.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2010/LIE (07/12/2010)	

**Table of Contents**

- 1. Introduction..... 4**
  - 1.1. Overall assessment .....4**
  - 1.2. Summary of findings.....5**
- 2. Identification of Problems..... 6**
- 3. Identification of Significant Changes.....12**
- 4. Recommendations.....15**
  - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations .....15**
  - 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems.....15**

## 1. Introduction

The SIAR Part 2 report assesses the substance of a Party's annual submission with regard to its national registry. Each section contains questions related to the specific items to be assessed.

### 1.1. Overall assessment

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment
P2.1.1	Is the information submitted by Party, in relation to its national registry, complete?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.2	Problem found with Party's national registry?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.3	Any unresolved problem with Party's national registry?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.4	Problems identified with the significant changes to the Party's national registry?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.5	National registry related recommendations from previous annual review were fully addressed?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.6	Is there any recommendation that needs to be addressed by the Party?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

## 1.2. Summary of findings

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
P2.2.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The information on Kyoto Protocol units has been reported in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and is accurate. The national registry continues to fulfill all requirements related to its reporting and accounting of information on Kyoto Protocol units, transaction procedures, conformance to the technical standards, public availability of information, security, data integrity, and recovery measures.</li> <li>2. Party has reported information on its accounting of Kyoto Protocol units in the required SEF tables, as required by decisions 15/CMP.1 and 14/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor reviewed the findings included in the SIAR on the SEF and the SEF comparison report.1 The SIAR was forwarded to the ERT prior to the review, pursuant to decision 16/CP.10.</li> <li>3. Information on the accounting of Kyoto units has been prepared and reported in accordance with section I E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1, and reported in accordance with decision 14/CMP.1 using the SEF tables. However, the Party did not report information on any actions and the date of such actions taken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur in accordance with paragraph 17 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party include in its next annual submission the information required by paragraph 88 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1 on the cause of the discrepancy.</li> <li>4. Information reported by Party on records of any discrepancies was found to be consistent with information provided to the secretariat by the international transaction log (ITL).</li> <li>5. Party reported no change in its national registry compared with the previous annual submission. The SIAR assessor concluded that the Party's national registry continues to perform the functions set out in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1, and continues to adhere to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems in accordance with relevant CMP decisions.</li> <li>6. Party has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2010 annual submission.</li> <li>7. The national registry has not fulfilled the requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decisions 13/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor recommends that Party include the representative identifier defined as the Party identifier (the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166) and a number unique to that representative within the Party's registry as required in paragraph 45 (d) of 13/CMP.1 and the total quantity of ERUs, CERs and AAUs carried over from the previous commitment period as required in paragraph 47 (k).</li> </ol>

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
	<p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>8. The SIAR assessor recommends that Party publish in the next submission explanation on how the previous recommendation was addressed.</p> <p>9. The SIAR assessor recommends the Party to provide more detailed information on discrepancies (including causes of discrepancies) if such occurred.</p> <p>10. The SIAR assessor recommends that Party include the representative identifier defined as the Party identifier (the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166) and a number unique to that representative within the Party's registry as required in paragraph 45 (d) of 13/CMP.1 and the total quantity of ERUs, CERs and AAUs carried over from the previous commitment period as required in paragraph 47 (k).</p>

## 2. Identification of Problems

The purpose of this section is to identify any problems with the national registry based on the Party's annual submission and transaction log records that may affect the performance of the functions of the national registry pursuant to paragraph 88 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(a) The information is complete and submitted in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP;	Assessed in SIAR Part 1. Kept here for completeness	
P2.2.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(b) The information relating to issuance, cancellations, retirement, transfers, acquisitions, replacement and carry-over is consistent with information contained in the national registry of the Party concerned and with the records of the transactions log;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
P2.2.3	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(c)</p> <p>The information relating to transfers and acquisitions between national registries is consistent with the information contained in the national registry of the Party concerned and with the records of the transaction log, and with information reported by the other Parties involved in the transactions;</p>	<p>Problem Identified?  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.</p>
P2.2.4	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(d) The information relating to acquisitions of CERs, tCERs, and ICERs from the CDM registry is consistent with the information contained in the national registry of the Party concerned and with the records of the transaction log, and with the clean development mechanism (CDM) registry;</p>	<p>Problem Identified?  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.</p>
P2.2.5	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(e)</p> <p>ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs have been issued, acquired, transferred, cancelled, retired, or carried over to the subsequent or from the previous commitment period in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1;</p>	<p>Problem Identified?  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The ITL identified discrepancies with transactions proposed by the Party during the reported period (see [RRITL], Report R-2). All these discrepancies were related to AAUs.  DES response codes are 4003 and 4010. All these transactions were terminated.  The average number of discrepancies per transaction is within the Control limits for the reported year.  No problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs.</p>
P2.2.6	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(f)</p> <p>tCERs and ICERs have been issued, acquired, transferred, cancelled, retired and replaced, in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1;</p>	<p>Problem Identified?  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No discrepancies occurred for the Party and no problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to tCERs and ICERS.</p>

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
P2.2.7	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(g) The information reported under paragraph 11 (a) of section I.E. in the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 on the quantities of units in accounts at the beginning of the year is consistent with information submitted the previous year, taking into account any corrections made to such information, on the quantities of units in accounts at the end of the previous year;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records and with information submitted in the year prior to the reported year.
P2.2.8	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(h) The required level of the commitment period reserve, as reported, is calculated in accordance with paragraph 6 of the annex to decision 18/CP.7;	Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness	
P2.2.9	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(i) The assigned amount is calculated to avoid double accounting in accordance with paragraph 9 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1;	Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness	
P2.2.10	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j) A discrepancy has been identified by the transaction log relating to transactions initiated by the Party,  and if so the expert review team shall:	Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The ITL identified discrepancies with transactions proposed by the Party during the reported period (see [RRITL], Report R-2). DES response codes are 4003 and 4010. All these transactions were terminated.
Repeat for each discrepancy type	P2.2.10.1	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(i) Verify that the discrepancy has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log;	Discrepancy with DES response code 4003 has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log.
	P2.2.10.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(ii) Assess whether the same type of discrepancy has occurred previously for that Party;	In [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that there were no discrepancies of the same type before.



Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
P2.2.10.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iii) Assess whether the transaction was completed or terminated;	Was the transaction completed or terminated? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	In [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that transactions were terminated.	
P2.2.10.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?	Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	There is no information in all the provided documents on any actions and/or changes that were done to address the discrepancy. It is stated in [NIR] that there were no changes on prevention of discrepancies compared to submission 2010, but there were no additional discrepancies of this type from April 2010.	
P2.2.10.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(v) Assess whether the problem that caused the discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, issuance, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERS, ICERs, AAUs and RMUs, the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAUs	Discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	There is no information on the cause of the discrepancy, but the problem that caused the discrepancy doesn't relate to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, issuance, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERS, ICERs, AAUs and RMUs, the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAUs.	
Repeat for each discrepancy type	P2.2.10.1	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(i) Verify that the discrepancy has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log;	Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Discrepancy with DES response code 4010 has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log.
	P2.2.10.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(ii) Assess whether the same type of discrepancy has occurred previously for that Party;	Has the same type of discrepancy occurred previously for that Party? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	In [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that there were no discrepancies of the same type before.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
P2.2.10.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iii) Assess whether the transaction was completed or terminated;	Was the transaction completed or terminated? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	In [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that transactions were terminated.
P2.2.10.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?	Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	There is no information in all the provided documents on any actions and/or changes that were done to address the discrepancy. It is stated in [NIR] that there were no changes on prevention of discrepancies compared to submission 2010, but there were no additional discrepancies of this type from April 2010.
P2.2.10.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(v) Assess whether the problem that caused the discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, issuance, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERS, ICERs, AAUs and RMUs, the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAUs	Discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	There is no information on the cause of the discrepancy, but the problem that caused the discrepancy doesn't relate to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, issuance, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERS, ICERs, AAUs and RMUs, the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAUs.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
P2.2.11	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k) Any record of non-replacement has been sent to the Party by the transaction log in relation to tCERs or ICERs held by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall:	Any tCERs or ICERs subject to non-replacement held by Party? <b>[ ] Yes [ X ] No</b>	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.	
Repeat for each non-replacement type (incl Type number	P2.2.11.1	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(i) Verify that the non-replacement has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log;	Has the transaction log identified the non-replacement? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(ii) Assess whether non-replacement has occurred previously for that Party;	Has this type of non-replacement previously occurred for that Party? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(iii) Assess whether the replacement was subsequently undertaken;	Was the replacement subsequently undertaken? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(iv) Examine the cause of the non-replacement and whether the Party has corrected the problem that caused the non-replacement;	Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the non-replacement? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(v) Assess whether the problem that caused the non-replacement relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation, and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs, AAUs and RMUs, and the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and if so, initiate a thorough review of the registry system in accordance with part V of these guidelines.	Non-replacement relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.

### 3. Identification of Significant Changes

The purpose of this section is to identify any **significant changes** in the national registry reported by the Party that may affect the performance of the functions contained in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and the adherence to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems in accordance with relevant COP/MOP decisions.

If a change to a Party's national registry has been identified under paragraph 22 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 then information relating to this change should be submitted by the Party in accordance with paragraph 32 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. This section assesses the submitted changes reported by Party in accordance with paragraph 32 of decision 15/CMP.1, and the further guidance elaborated in the Independent Assessment Report common operational procedure.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.1	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(a) The name and contact information of the registry administrator designated by the Party to maintain the national registry	Not a significant change, left here for completeness		
P2.3.2	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(b) The names of the other Parties with which the Party cooperates by maintaining their national registries in a consolidated system	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.
P2.3.3	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(c) A description of the database structure and capacity of the national registry.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.4	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(d)</p> <p>A description of how the national registry conforms to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems for the purpose of ensuring the accurate, transparent and efficient exchange of data between national registries, the clean development mechanism registry and the transaction log (decision 19/CP.7, paragraph 1)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>
P2.3.5	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(e)</p> <p>A description of the procedures employed in the national registry to minimize discrepancies in the issuance, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs, AAUs and/or RMUs, and replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and of the steps taken to terminate transactions where a discrepancy is notified and to correct problems in the event of a failure to terminate the transactions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>
P2.3.6	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(f)</p> <p>An overview of security measures employed in the national registry to prevent unauthorized manipulations and to prevent operator error and of how these measures are kept up to date</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>

<b>Ref Nr</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Has the Party reported a change?</b>	<b>Problem Identified with the Change?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
P2.3.7	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(g) A list of the information publicly accessible by means of the user interface to the national registry	Not a significant change, left here for completeness		
P2.3.8	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(h) The Internet address of the interface to its national registry	Not a significant change, left here for completeness		
P2.3.9	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(i) A description of measures taken to safeguard, maintain and recover data in order to ensure the integrity of data storage and the recovery of registry services in the event of a disaster	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.
P2.3.10	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(j) The results of any test procedures that might be available or developed with the aim of testing the performance, procedures and security measures of the national registry undertaken pursuant to the provisions of decision 19/CP.7 relating to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.

## 4. Recommendations

### 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations

This section assesses Party's response to the previous annual review recommendations.

Ref Nr	Recommendation from previous Annual Review report (with ref)	Has Party acted on recommendation? [ ] Yes [X] No	Comment
P2.4.1.1	In FCCC/ARR/2010/LIE there is recommendation in paragraph 112 (g) to ensure that the national registry addresses the requirement for publicly available information.		Explanation on how the recommendation was addressed was not found in [NIR] In [RESPONSE] there is a request to confirm that there is a need for an explicit statement of the Party that recommendation of the ERT has been addressed and improvements implemented. In paragraph 3.2.1 of the Document "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v.4.6" there is a list of requirements for the format for NIR Submission. On page 13 of the Document it is clearly stated that it is necessary to "list each recommendation relevant to registry operations from the previous annual review report and also noted Section 1.2 Summary of Findings of the SIAR Part 2 Report and provide an explanation of how each recommendation has been addressed in the current year's submission".

### 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems

If a problem has been identified earlier in section 2 and 3 or a previous recommendation listed in section 4.1 has not been taken into account, then this section of the report lists a recommendation for each problem to be brought to the attention to the Expert Review Team.

Ref Nr	Recommendation Ref	Recommendation description	Comment
P2.4.2.1	P1.4.1.4	The SIAR assessor identified that the representative identifier defined as the Party identifier (the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166) and a number unique to that	The Party provides reference to this publicly available information in [NIR] (paragraph 12.4, pages 216 – 217). But necessary information on representative identifier was not found in the reports published on the URL indicated in

		<p>representative within the Party's registry is not available on the public user interface of the national registry as required in paragraph 45 (d) of 13/CMP.1. Therefore, it is recommended that Liechtenstein should make this information available.</p>	<p>[NIR].</p> <p>It is stated in [NIR] (paragraph 12.4, pages 216 – 217) that Personalized data and some information of individual holding accounts are considered as business secrets and the disclosure may prejudice their competitiveness. Information on acquiring and transferring accounts of legal entities (companies) is therefore regarded as personal data. According to article 20 of the national Act on Data Protection (Datenschutzgesetz vom 14. März 2002, LGBl Nr.55) enacts that public authorities may disclose personal data if there is a legal basis or if there is an overriding public interest.</p> <p>Neither case is fulfilled and therefore the registry of Liechtenstein can not make the information on acquiring and / or transferring accounts publicly available. All related information is considered as confidential and therefore paragraphs 44-48 of the Annex to Decision 13/CMP.1 are not applicable.</p> <p>Representative identifier has the possibility to be considered as confidential information.</p> <p>In [RESPONSE] the Party says that "Liechtenstein does not understand the comment of ERT for this assessment. The representative identifier, consisting of the ISO 3166 code and a 8 digit number unique to the representative within the registry, is provided in the report "List of legal entities holding an account in the national registry" available under <a href="http://www.emissionshandelsregister.li/Download_of_public_reports">www.emissionshandelsregister.li/Download of public reports.</a>"</p> <p>But provided information is not the representative identifier (person identifier) but the installation ID.</p> <p>In the Document "SIAR Publicly Available Information Guidance v.4.6" there is an explanation on page 10 that "Representative identifier" is the unique identifier of the <b>person</b> in the registry, defined as the Party identifier (the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166) and a number unique to that representative within the Party's registry. If more than one representative exists, then the</p>
--	--	---	--



			Party should list the first or primary representative”. The same recommendation was in 2010.
P2.4.2.2	P1.4.3.11	The SIAR assessor identified that the total quantity of ERUs, CERs and AAUs carried over from the previous commitment period is not available on the public user interface of the national registry as required in paragraph 47 (k) of 13/CMP.1. Therefore, it is recommended that Liechtenstein should make this information available.	The Party provides reference to this publicly available information in [NIR] (paragraph 12.4, pages 216 – 217).  Information on the total quantity of ERUs, CERs and AAUs carried over from the previous commitment period was not found.
P2.4.2.3	P1.5.1; P2.4.1.1	The SIAR assessor identified that the recommendation from previous Annual Review report (FCCC/ARR/2010/LIE) was not covered in its submission. Therefore, it is recommended that Liechtenstein should make this information available in its next submission.	In FCCC/ARR/2010/LIE there is recommendation in paragraph 112 (g) to ensure that the national registry addresses the requirement for publicly available information. Explanation on how the recommendation was addressed was not found in [NIR] In [RESPONSE] there is a request to confirm that there is a need for an explicit statement of the Party that recommendation of the ERT has been addressed and improvements implemented. In paragraph 3.2.1 of the Document “SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v.4.6” there is a list of requirements for the format for NIR Submission. On page 13 of the Document it is clearly stated that it is necessary to “list each recommendation relevant to registry operations from the previous annual review report and also noted Section 1.2 Summary of Findings of the SIAR Part 2 Report and provide an explanation of how each recommendation has been addressed in the current year’s submission”.