



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

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

Reference:	IAR/2011/LTU/2/2	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	30/07/2012
Prepared by:	John Bedard/SRA International Inc.		
Reviewed by:	Heidi McKenna/Independent Consultant		
Approved by:	Markwin Pieters/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
John Bedard / Assessor	SRA International Inc.	Info
Heidi McKenna / Assessor Coordinator	SIAR Coordinator Consultant to the UNFCCC	Info
Justė Akmenškytė/ RSA Lithuania	Lithuanian Environmental Investment Fund GHG Department	Info

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	13/07/2012	Initial draft
0.2	16/07/2012	Reviewed draft
1.0	16/07/2012	Updated reviewed draft for Party review and consultation
1.1	30/07/2012	Updated draft incorporating party response
2.0	30/07/2012	Reviewed and approved final version of report

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Lithuania	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2011	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files provided by the Party: - [SEF] SEF_LT_2012_1_10-35-48 2-4-2012.xls - [NIR] NIR LT 2012 04 15.pdf - [REPORTS] Lithuania 2011 R2.gif - [RESPONSE 1] LT_ Consultation Form Part 1 (LT response to draft assessment).doc - [RESPONSE 2] Consultation Form Part 2 (Lithuania, 2011).doc	Files provided by the ITL Administrator: - [SEFCR] SEF_LT_2012_1_10-35-48 2-4-2012_CR.xls - [RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2011_LT_v1.xls - IAR/2011/LTU/1/2
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2011/LTU (13/04/2012)	

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No None noted
P2.1.6	Is there any recommendation that needs to be addressed by the Party?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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, public availability of information, security, data integrity, and recovery measures. 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. 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. Information reported by Party on records of any discrepancies and on any records of non-replacement were found to be consistent with information provided to the secretariat by the international transaction log (ITL). However, The SIAR identified the following as problems that will need corrective action from the Party in its national registry: discrepancy type 5101. In response to a question of the SIAR assessor on the corrective action mentioned above, the SIAR assessor concluded that the Party's records on its accounting of Kyoto Protocol units contained in its national registry are consistent with corresponding records of the ITL. 5. 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. 6. Party has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2012 annual submission. 7. The national registry has fulfilled all requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1.

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	
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.
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.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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>Discrepancy type 5101 significantly exceeding the average figures reported by all registries occurred in Party registry in [RRITL] report R-2.</p> <p>Party notes in [RESPONSE 2] that the discrepancy type 5101 occurred due to the final decision of the Enforcement Branch of the Compliance Committee No. CC-2011-3-8/Lithuania/EB dated 21 December 2011 which suspended Lithuania's right to perform external transactions. The problem that caused this suspension was related to the failure to meet some of the LULUCF and KP-LULUCF requirements, however no problem was found with the National registry. The fact that discrepancy type 5101 significantly exceeds the average figures reported by all registries is quite natural, as it is a very rare thing countries face same suspension.</p> <p>The assessor agrees with the Party's contention that the discrepancy type 5101 does not represent a problem.</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>Party notes in [RESPONSE 2] that discrepancies type 5101 were not in any way related to tCERs or ICERs.</p> <p>Both [SEF] and [SEFCR] confirm no transactions with tCERs or ICERs occurred in Party registry during reported period.</p>
P2.2.7	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(g)</p> <p>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;</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 and with information submitted in the year prior to the reported year.</p>

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
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? [x] Yes [] No	The ITL identified 3 discrepant transactions with response code 5101 during the reported period (see [RRITL], Report R-2).	
Repeat for each discrepancy type (5101)	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	Party submitted [REPORTS] Lithuania 2011 R2.gif that matches with the ITL [RRITL].
	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? [] Yes [x] No [] N/A	The ITL identifies zero occurrences prior to reported year in [RRITL], Report R-2).
	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? [x] Yes [] No [] N/A	The ITL identifies all 3 transactions as "All Terminated" in [RRITL], Report R-2).

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
P2.2.10.4	<p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv)</p> <p>Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?</p>	<p>Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>Party notes in [RESPONSE 2] that the section 12.3 of NIR was incorrect due to that fact that no R-2 report was prepared. As all the reports for this submission were done manually, the issue was solely caused by a human error. Having that in mind, the statement at section 12.3 of NIR should be corrected as follows:</p> <p>Lithuania's reports on discrepancies (R-2), CDM notifications (R-3), non-replacements (R-4) including reversal of storage and failure of certification and invalid units (R-5) have been submitted. During the reported year 2011, the Lithuanian registry had three type 5101 discrepancies which occurred as a result of the final decision of the Enforcement Branch of the Compliance Committee No. CC-2011-3-8/Lithuania/EB dated 21 December 2011. This decision has caused a suspension of external transfers in and out of Lithuania's registry and this was the reason why discrepancies type 5101 occurred on the first day (21 December 2011) of suspension. Lithuania has already implemented needed measures to reinstate its eligibility and is awaiting an expert team review and decision. When the decision to lift the suspension is taken, all the external transactions will be allowed and this for this type of discrepancies will be stopped from reoccurring.</p> <p>During the reported year 2011, no CDM notifications, no non-replacements including reversal of storage and failure of certification and no invalid units had occurred in the Lithuanian registry. Therefore the SIAR tables R-3, R-4 and R-5 are empty and no actions and changes have been taken to address discrepancies.</p>

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	Party notes in [RESPONSE 2] that the problem was not caused by the national registry. A detailed response can be seen in P2.2.10.4.

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	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(d) 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)	<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.
P2.3.5	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(e) 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	<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.
P2.3.6	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(f) 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In [NIR] section 14, the Party states that changes have been made to the security measures employed in its national registry and provides an overview of the changes including 4-eye transaction verification, additional of SSL, and other measures required by the European Commission.

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 [] No	Comment
P2.4.1.1	None identified in FCCC/ARR/2011/LTU (13/04/2012)		N/A

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	2.2.10.4	Reporting of discrepancies	Although the Assessor understands that the Party sufficiently addressed the reason behind the discrepancy and the reporting discrepancy, the Assessor notes that the Party should be prepared to submit [REPORTS] in the form of R2-R5 (specifically R-2) as specified by the then current version of the ITL Administrator in SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries in subsequent reporting years via an automated process or query instead of manual generation.