

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

Reference:	IAR/2009/DNK/2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	26/07/2010
Prepared by:	Katrin Seuss/Umweltbundesamt		
Reviewed by:	Bryan Eckstein/SRA International, Inc.		
Approved by:	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
Katrin Seuss/ Assessor	Umweltbundesamt	Info
Bryan Eckstein/ Assessor coordinator	SRA International, Inc.	Action
Susanne Petersen/ RSA – Main Contact	Danish Energy Agency	Action

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	10/06/2010	Initial draft
1.0	15/06/2010	Review
2.0	26/07/2010	Final, Party reported no comments

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Denmark	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files provided by the Party: - [SEF] SEF_DK_2010_1_10-33-11+15-1-2010.xls - [NIR] NIR2010_submitted_15April2010.pdf - [SEFv2] SEF_DK_2010_2_14-29-40+17-5-2010.xls - [NIRv2] DK_NIR2010_27May2010_NIR.pdf - [RESPONSE1] SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 1 DNK.doc	Files provided by the ITL Administrator: - [SEFCR] SEF_DK_2010_1_10-33-11+15-1-2010-CR.xls - [RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_DK_v1.1.xls -[SEFCRv2] SEF_DK_2010_2_14-29-40+17-5-2010-CR
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2009/DNK (15/04/2010)	

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction..... 3**
 - 1.1. Overall assessment3**
 - 1.2. Summary of findings.....4**
- 2. Identification of Problems..... 5**
- 3. Identification of Significant Changes.....11**
- 4. Recommendations.....14**
 - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations14**
 - 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"> 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, security, data integrity and recovery measures. 2. Denmark 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 found 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. 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. 4. Denmark 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. 5. Denmark has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 annual submission. 6. 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. <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The SIAR reiterates the recommendation of the previous ERT that Liechtenstein should enhance, as detailed in section 4.2 of this SIAR, the availability of public information referred to in paragraph 44 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, and report, in its next annual submission, on any changes to that public information. 8. The SIAR assessor reiterates the recommendation of the previous ERT in that Denmark should put in place measures to mitigate and reduce the internal fragmentation of unit blocks.

¹ The SEF comparison report is prepared by the ITL administrator and provides information on the outcome of the comparison of data contained in the Party's SEF tables with corresponding records contained in the ITL.

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	Denmark resubmitted a SEF to correct errors in the first submission and provided additional information in a revised NIR report.
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.
P2.2.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(c) 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;	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
P2.2.4	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;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.
P2.2.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(e) 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;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The average number of discrepancies in the Party's registry for the response codes 4003 and 4010 significantly exceeds the average figures reported by all registries. However, since these discrepancies are due to a known limitation in the DES message model for external transfers it is not considered to be a problem.
P2.2.6	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(f) 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;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No discrepancies occurred for the Party and not problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to tCERs and ICERs.
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	

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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? [x] Yes [] No	The transaction log has identified discrepancies relating to transactions initiated by the Party.
Response code 4003	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? [x] Yes [] No [] N/A	The transaction log has identified the discrepancy (response code 4003).
	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? [x] Yes [] No [] N/A	The discrepancy (response code 4003) has previously occurred for the Party.
	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? [] Yes [x] No [] N/A	The final state of transactions DK531596, DK531595, DK445597, DK444999 was cancelled, which is an acceptable end state. The final state of all other transactions with response code 4003 was 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? [] Yes [] No [x] N/A	Discrepancies involving response code 4003 are due to a known limitation in the DES message model for external transfers. They are thus outside the influence of the Party.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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	Discrepancies involving response code 4003 are due to a known limitation in the DES message model for external transfers.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
Response code 4010	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	The transaction log has identified the discrepancy (response code 4010).
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The discrepancy (response code 4010) has previously occurred for the Party.
	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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The final state of transactions DK527981, DK527989, DK528092, DK445597, DK444999 was cancelled, which is an acceptable end state. The final state of all other transactions with response code 4010 was 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Discrepancies involving response code 4010 are due to a known limitation in the DES message model for external transfers. They are thus outside the influence of the Party.
	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	Discrepancies involving response code 4010 are due to a known limitation in the DES message model for external transfers.
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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.	

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	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>

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
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	Paragraph 102 of the document FCCC/ARR/2009/DNK states the ERT took note of the recommendations in the SIAR that Denmark should enhance the user interface of its registry with regard to the public information on Article 6 projects referred to in paragraph 46 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. The SIAR also recommended that, if Denmark has not issued any emission reduction units, a clear statement to that effect be publicly available on its registry user interface.	[] Yes [x] No	The Party commented in [RESPONSE1] that the registry software will be corrected in the next version to specify on the public website that no Article 6 projects have been implemented in Denmark and thus no ERUs have been issued.
P2.4.1.2	Paragraph 104 of FCCC/ARR/2009/DNK states that the ERT noted the list of recommendations in the SIAR, pertaining to technical standards, that Denmark should implement in its national registry to ensure minimal operator errors and reliable interoperability with other registry systems, including the ITL, in accordance with paragraph 115 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1 and paragraph 25 of the annex to decision 24/CP.8. The SIAR, remembering that the ITL recommended implementing the following measures as soon as possible, recommended that Denmark report on progress made in implementing those measures in its next annual submission, including any relevant implementation plans, test plans and test reports following the changes applied to its registry. The ERT reiterates the recommendations in the SIAR that the Party implement:	[x] Yes [] No	In [RESPONSE1] the Party provided information on how it acted on this recommendation.

	(a) Additional or improved operational procedures to prevent users from proposing transactions to the ITL if the registry is not fully operational; (b) Automated internal validations should be performed on account type codes before messages are submitted to the ITL; (c) Automated internal validations should be performed on the acquiring and transferring registries before transactions are proposed to the ITL.		
P2.4.1.3	Paragraph 105 of FCCC/ARR/2009/DNK states that the SIAR noted that the registry of Denmark fragments unit blocks at a rapid pace and that this could hamper the registry's ability to reconcile its holding position against the records of the ITL and its capacity to propose transactions successfully in the future. The ERT reiterates the recommendations in the SIAR that Denmark should put in place measures to mitigate and reduce the internal fragmentation of unit blocks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In [RESPONSE1] the Party reported that it is awaiting the final UN solution and decision on de-fragmentation of unit-blocks before initiating any development regarding this issue.
P2.4.1.4	Paragraph 106 of FCCC/ARR/2009/DNK states that Denmark has not reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 annual submission. In response to questions raised by the ERT during the review, the Party reported that its commitment period reserve has not changed since the initial report review (249,155,060 t CO2 eq), as it is based on the assigned amount and not the most recently reviewed inventory. The ERT agrees with this figure. The ERT recommends that Denmark include information on its commitment period reserve in its next annual submission.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The Party provides the calculation of the commitment period reserve in [NIR], page 541.
P2.4.1.5	Paragraphs 103 and 116 of the document FCCC/ARR/2009/DNK states that the information presented in the submission by Denmark in response to recommendations from previous reviews was not sufficient for the ERT to determine whether they have been fully resolved. In paragraph 103 the ERT recommends that	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	In [NIR], page 540, paragraph 7 the Party states that all discrepancies have been solved by manual intervention by either the Danish registry or the CITL/ITL depending on which stage the transaction was in.

	Denmark provide, in its next annual submission, more detailed information on: steps taken to terminate transactions where a discrepancy is notified and to correct problems in the event of a failure to terminate the transaction, including information on whether there are automated processes in place to terminate discrepant transactions.		
--	---	--	--

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	P1.1.2, P2.4.1.1	The external assessor identified some minor limitation regarding the public information required in decision 13/CMP.1 Annex II. Therefore, Denmark is encouraged to clearly identify on its public website each element that has to be published according to decision 13/CMP.1 Annex II paragraph 45 and 47 that is classified as confidential including the reasons for confidentiality. In addition, it is recommended that the Party publish the commitment period with which a cancellation or retirement account is associated as required in decision 13/CMP.1 Annex II paragraph 45 (c). Furthermore, the SIAR assessor reiterates the recommendation that the Party publish the information reflecting that no Article 6 project is reported because conversion to an ERU under an Article 6 project did not occur in the specified period in order to make clear that no information has to be reported according to decision 13/CMP.1 paragraph 46.	See ITL Administrator (2010): Publicly Available Information. Reporting Guidance for National Registries. Requirements 44.9, 44.10, 45.9
P2.4.2.2	P2.4.1.3	The national registry of Denmark fragments unit blocks at a rapid pace and this could hamper	

		the registry's ability to reconcile its holding position against the records of the ITL and its capacity to propose transactions successfully in the future. The SIAR assessor reiterates the recommendation of the previous ERT in that Denmark should put in place measures to mitigate and reduce the internal fragmentation of unit blocks.	
--	--	---	--