



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

Standard Independent Assessment Report
Assessment Report
Part 2 - Substance

Reference:	IAR/2009/FRA/2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	19/08/2010
Prepared by:	George Nicholas Nelson/Norway		
Reviewed by:	Bryan Eckstein/SRA International, Inc. Chris Collins/SRA International, Inc.		
Approved by:	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
George Nicholas Nelson/Assessor	Climate and Pollution Agency/ Norway	Action
Chris Collins/Reviewer	SRA International, Inc.	
Bryan Eckstein/Reviewer	SRA International, Inc.	
Olivier Guittet/RSA	Caisse de dépôts (CDC)	

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	18/06/2010	First draft
0.2	30/06/2010	Reviewed draft
0.3	07/07/2010	Assessor edits
1.0	07/07/2010	Version 1.0 to be sent to Party
1.1	19/08/2010	Updated assessment to include feedback in consultation form
2.0	19/08/2010	Review

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	France	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files submitted: - [SEF] SEF-FR-2010_1_9-45-12 14-4-2010.xls - [REPORTS] SIAR Reports 2009-FR v1.0.xls - [NIR-FR] FRANCE_NIR.doc - [NIR-EN] FRANCEchap12-14englishversion.doc (unofficial English translation) - EN_REGREG.xls - [RESPONSE1] SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 1 FRA. - [RESPONSE2] SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 2 FRA.	Information from the ITL Administrator: - [RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_FR_v1.1.xls - [SEFCR] FRA_SEF_2010_1_9-45-12 14-4-2010-CR.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2009/FRA (18/03/2010)	

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction..... 4**
 - 1.1. Overall assessment4**
 - 1.2. Summary of findings.....5**
- 2. Identification of Problems..... 6**
- 3. Identification of Significant Changes.....11**
- 4. Recommendations.....14**
 - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations14**
 - 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems.....16**

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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No [France did not report discrepant transactions for the entire reporting period as noted in P1.2.4]
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 the 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) France 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. 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, France did not report information on all discrepancies which occurred in the reporting period as required by paragraph 12 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor recommends that France include in its next annual submission the information required by paragraph 88 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1 on discrepant transactions for the whole reporting period and calculation of its commitment period reserve. 4) The SIAR assessor finds that the 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 Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties (CMP) to the Kyoto Protocol decisions. 5) France 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. The SIAR assessor recommends that France enhances the interface of its registry by providing the required information referred to in paragraphs 45, 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 publicly available. A clear statement should be made on its website on which components of paragraphs 45, 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 that are confidential, including those that are confidential by EU regulation for a defined time period, if applicable. 7) The SIAR assessor reiterates the recommendation of the previous ERT in that France should specifically address the recommendation contained in Paragraph 130 of the report FCCC/ARR/2009/FRA to enhance the interface of its registry by providing the required

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.

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
	information referred to in paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 publicly available. A clear statement should be made on its website on which components of paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 that are confidential, including those that are confidential by EU regulation for a defined time period, if applicable.

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.
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	No discrepancies occurred for the Party and no problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs.
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 no 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.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
P2.2.8	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(h)</p> <p>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;</p>	<p>Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness</p>	<p>The SIAR assessor notes that France provided the calculation of its commitment period reserve in [RESPONSE2]. France used the total emissions value for 2008 in its calculations. The SIAR assessor believes emissions for 2008 have not yet been reviewed – total emissions for 2007 are the most recently reviewed emissions that should have been used as the total emissions value. The ERT might consider a recommendation that the total emissions values from the most recently reviewed inventory report be used when calculating and reporting the Commitment Period Reserve (CPR) in future annual submissions as required by 15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 18.</p>
P2.2.9	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(i)</p> <p>The assigned amount is calculated to avoid double accounting in accordance with paragraph 9 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1;</p>	<p>Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness</p>	
P2.2.10	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)</p> <p>A discrepancy has been identified by the transaction log relating to transactions initiated by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall:</p>	<p>Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? [x] Yes [] No</p>	<p>The transaction log identified a number of discrepant transactions with response code 4003 – ‘Units identified in the transaction must be held by Initiating Registry’, and with response code 4010 – ‘Units identified in the transaction must not be involved in another transaction. The average number of occurrences per transaction (x 100.000) for both response codes was less than the average number of occurrences per transaction (x 100.000) for all registries.</p> <p>It is highly likely that the occurrences of discrepant transactions with these two response codes are due to a flaw in the DES message model for external transfers.</p>

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
Discrepancy type 4003 and 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 identifies the same discrepancies.
	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	There is no indication that the same discrepancies have 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	All discrepant 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	Party has provided information in the submitted report that preventive and corrective actions have been implemented to address the issue of discrepant transactions.
	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	Response codes 4003 and 4010 do not indicate a problem related to the capacity of the registry to ensure accurate accounting.

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? [] Yes [x] No	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? [] Yes [] No [x] 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? [] Yes [] No [x] 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? [] Yes [] No [x] 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? [] Yes [] No [x] 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? [] Yes [] No [x] 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party have provided documentation which shows that planning and testing of version 5.0 of the Seringas registry software progressed smoothly in the reported period. Party informs that further testing with the European Commission were to be conducted early 2010.

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 (FCCC/ARR/2009/FRA)	Has Party acted on recommendation?	Comment
P2.4.1.1	<p>Paragraph 130: "The ERT noted from the SIAR that France should improve, in its next annual submission, its reporting of registry related issues and that France has not made the required information referred to in paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 publicly available. The ERT also noted that France had identified the public information pursuant to paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 as confidential. The ERT reiterated the recommendation in the SIAR that France enhance the interface of its registry by providing the required information mentioned above, and any changes relating to public information, in its next submission in its next annual submission. The ERT also recommends that the Party make clear on its website which components of this information are confidential."</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Party should make a clear statement on its website which components of paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 that are confidential, including those that are confidential by EU regulation for a defined time period.</p> <p>The Party informs in [RESPONSE2] that some information will only be displayed from the 15th of January onwards of the year X+5, as stated in the modified European legislation 2216/2004/EC. The Party informs that a clearer mention of this legislation and of the confidential policy regulating those data will be added.</p>
P2.4.1.2	<p>Paragraph 131: "The ERT further recommends that France, in its next annual submission; (a) Report on changes to the consolidation of its national registry and the related cooperation arrangements, in accordance with paragraph 32(b) of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1; (b) Improve its reporting on changes to test results and test plans developed with the aim of testing the registry's performance and security procedures, in accordance with paragraph 32(j) of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1"</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The information contained in [NIR-EN] covers these two recommendations.</p>

P2.4.1.3	<p>Paragraph 132: “The ERT noted the recommendation in the SIAR that France improve the annex to its NIR which relates to the national registry. During the centralized review, France informed the ERT that it intends to incorporate this annex into the main part of the NIR. The ERT welcomes this decision and recommends that France follow the annotated outline of the NIR provided by the UNFCCC secretariat in its next annual submission.”</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>Information on the national registry was reported in accordance with the annotated outline of the NIR.</p>
P2.4.1.4	<p>Paragraph 133: “The ERT recommends that France improve the measures put in place in its registry with a view to minimizing operator error and ensuring efficient exchange of data with other registries and the ITL, in accordance with paragraphs 115(b) and 115(e) of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1.”</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The Party has reported the measures which have been put in place to address the recommendation.</p>
P2.4.1.5	<p>Paragraph 134: “The ERT recommends also that the following measures be put in place by the end of 2009 at the latest and that France report in its next annual submission on the changes made to its registry following the successful implementation and testing of these measures, including any relevant test plans and test reports:</p> <p>(a) Automated internal validations should be performed on account type codes before messages are submitted to the ITL; (b) Mitigation strategies should be implemented to minimise the reuse of recently used transaction unit blocks; (c) Automated internal validations should be performed to prevent users from proposing units involved in an inconsistency with the ITL; (d) A review by the Party of the design and implementation of France’s registry should take place to prevent inconsistencies from occurring, in accordance with paragraph 25(e) of annex to decision 24/CP.8; (e) Measures to mitigate and reduce the internal fragmentation of unit blocks should be introduced;</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The Party has reported the measures which have been put in place to address these recommendations</p>

	(f) Measures should be brought in to minimise user error with regard to voluntary cancellations.		
P2.4.1.6	Paragraph 137: “The ERT recommends that France include a statement in its next NIR listing the changes in the national registry or, when no changes occur, state this explicitly in the NIR”	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The Party has stated that it uses version 4.3 and that it intends upgrade to version 5.0 in 2010.

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	P2.4.1.1	The SIAR assessor reiterates the recommendation of the previous ERT in that the Party specifically addresses the recommendation contained in Paragraph 130 of the report FCCC/ARR/2009/FRA and enhances the interface of its registry by providing the required information referred to in paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 publicly available and to report on the changes in the next annual submission.	<p>A clear statement should be made on its website on which components of paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 that are confidential, including those that are confidential by EU regulation for a defined time period.</p> <p>The Party informs in [RESPONSE2] that some information will only be displayed from the 15th of January onwards of the year X+5, as stated in the modified European legislation 2216/2004/EC. The Party informs that a clearer mention of this legislation and of the confidential policy regulating those data will be added to the interface of its registry.</p> <p>The Party reiterates in [RESPONSE2] that the requirements contained in paragraphs 45 (b), 45 (c) and 45 (d) in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 soon will be fulfilled when the report « List of accounts opened in the national registry » will again be available to the public.</p> <p>The Party informs in [RESPONSE2] that a clearer mention of the purpose of the cancellations in the registry will be added in order to address the requirement in paragraphs</p>

			<p>47 (g), 47 (h) and 47 (i) in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. Also, in order to fulfill paragraph 47 (k) in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, a clearer mention will be made detailing the fact that no data is available because the underlying business event has not yet occurred.</p> <p>The Party argues in [RESPONSE2] that the UNFCCC JI website related to JI projects in France satisfies the requirement of paragraph 46 in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. The Party notes that only the French DFP can modify that webpage, and although this webpage is not controlled by a French governmental entity, it may be considered as an own website over which the French DFP has control. The Party also refers to the website of the French Ministry for Environment, Energy, Sustainable Development and the Sea (MEEDDM) which contains information on French JI projects (www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/Liste-des-methodes-referencées-et.html). This website is only available in French language.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor refers to requirement ID 44.2 in the SIAR Publicly Available Information Guidance v4.3 document. The requirement clearly states that the required public information should be accessible directly on the website of the national registry or via a link from the registry website to another website controlled by the Party. For clarity, the Party should not simply reference data published by a third-party, such as reports published on the UNFCCC website. Even though the French DFP can modify the UNFCCC JI website related to JI projects in France, this website is not controlled by the Party. There is a link from the registry website to the website of MEEDDM, but information on this website is not accessible for parts of the public that do not understand French.</p>
2.4.2.2		<p><i>In issuing version 2.0 of this Part 2 assessment report, the SIAR assessor withdraws this recommendation as noted in the comments; it is retained here for completeness.</i></p>	<p>The Party comments in [RESPONSE2] that France did not have such message in its log. To better understand this recommendation, France would like to know if it is possible to provide details to the party of the message received by</p>

		<p>The SIAR assessor notes that the international transaction log has recorded response codes in the range 3000 to 3999. This range of response codes, documented in Annex E of the Data Exchange Standards for Registry Systems under the Kyoto Protocol Technical Specifications (DES), indicate that the national registry has sent a significant number of messages to the international transaction log that do not strictly comply to the message sequences mandated in the DES.</p>	<p>ITL with such response codes from FR registry, together with their transaction ID and response code.</p> <p>According to report R2 of [RRITL], submitted to the Party on 15 April 2010, the Party initiated nine transactions in the period from 8 January 2009 to 13 February 2009 which resulted in a DES response code 3019. This number exceeds the control limits for the reported year. Response code 3019 states that "A transaction involving an STL registry cannot be completed if it was not approved by the STL". However, since the release of Annex E version 1.1.5 of the DES, response code 3019 is now obsolete and is no longer applicable, so the SIAR assessor regards it as not necessary for France to take any action.</p>
--	--	--	--