



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

Standard Independent Assessment Report
Assessment Report
Part 2 - Substance

Reference:	IAR/2009/ LVA /2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	21/07/2010
Prepared by:	Katalin Kobanyai / NIENW (Hungary)		
Reviewed by:	Bryan Eckstein/SRA International, Inc.		
Approved by:	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
Katalin Kobanyai / Assessor	National Inspectorate for Environment, Nature and Water Hungary	Info
Bryan Eckstein/Assessment Coordinator	SRA International, Inc.	Info
Helena Rimsa/Main RSA Contact	Latvian Environment Geology and Meteorology Agency	Info

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	25/06/2010	Assessment Part 2 Substance
1.0	01/07/2010	Review
1.1	12/07/2010	Reassessment incorporating Latvia's response to draft Part 2 report
2.0	21/07/2010	Review

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Latvia	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	<p>Files provided by the Party:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [SEF] SEF LV 2010 1 10-20-35 13-1-2010.xls - [NIR] LV_NIR_150410.pdf - [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf - [RESPONSE1] SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 1_LVv4.3.doc - [RESPONSE2] LVA-SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 2.doc <p>Supporting documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendixes 2.1 to 2.9 - LV_Readiness Questionnaire 	<p>Files provided by the ITL Administrator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [SEFCR] SEF LV 2010 1 10-20-35 13-1-2010-CR.xls - [RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_LV_v 1.1.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	<p>FCCC/ARR/2009/LVA (19/April/2010)</p> <p>(in-country review)</p> <p>http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/arr/lva.pdf</p>	

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.....15**
 - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations15**
 - 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 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
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, public availability of information, security, data integrity, and recovery measures. 2. Latvia 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 that the Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with 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. 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. However, the SIAR identified the following minor problem: the report of changes is to be enhanced by stating in a clearer way if the item was changed or not compared with information reported the previous year. The SIAR assessor recommends that Latvia, in its next annual submission, should enhance reporting of any change(s) in its national registry in accordance with section I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. 5. The SIAR assessor concluded that, taking into account the confirmed changes in the national registry, Latvia'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. 6. Latvia has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 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>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.</p> <p>However the report "R-2" of [RRITL] reflects that the Latvian national registry did exceed the average number of occurrences in other national registries of DES Response codes 1503, 7025, 7201, 7214, 7216, which are not considered discrepancies according to the document "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3."</p> <p>In [RESPONSE2], Latvia provides an explanation for the cause of the response codes above: DES Response Codes 1503, 1504, 7025 were due to "operator" user errors. Discrepancies related to DES Response Codes 7201, 7214 and 7216 were due to software bugs, which were minimized after the changing of the national registry software.</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>
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? [] Yes [X] No	No discrepancies occurred for the Party which have a DES response code that are considered to be a discrepancy.	
Repeat for each discrepancy type (include Type Number)	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? [] Yes [] No [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party which have a DES response code that are considered to be a discrepancy.
	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 [] No [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party which have a DES response code that are considered to be a discrepancy.
	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 [] No [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party which have a DES response code that are considered to be a discrepancy.
	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	No discrepancies occurred for the Party which have a DES response code that are considered to be a discrepancy.

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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party which have a DES response code that are considered to be a discrepancy.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf in chapter 14. Party states that software has been changed from GRETA to CR. In Table 14.1, the Party states that significant changes have been made to the database and capacity of its national registry. Amended Readiness Documentation is submitted and contains the information required by Appendix 7 of the document "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3."

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes [] No	[] Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf in chapter 14. Party states that software has been changed from Greta to CR. In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf submitted in 2010 in Table 14.1 Party states that presently used CR Registry system is compliant with the UN Data Exchange Standards (DES) specified for the Kyoto Protocol. Amended Readiness Documentation is submitted and contains the information required by Appendix 7 of the document "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3."
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes [] No	[] Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf Table 14.1 the Party states that a common approach has been adopted for the registry system development under the EU ETS and UN DES in order to minimize discrepancies. Amended Readiness Documentation is submitted and contains the information required by Appendix 7 of the document "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3."
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 [] No	[] Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf Table 14.1 the Party states that changes have been made to the security measures employed in its national registry. Amended Readiness Documentation is submitted and contains the information required by Appendix 7 of the document "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3."

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		In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf Table 14.1 the Party describes the present status of publicly available information. In [RESPONSE2], Latvia indicates that the list and structure of publicly available information was changed to provide the latest available information and due to a registry software change.
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		In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf Table 14.1 the Party describes the present status of the Internet address of its national registry. In [RESPONSE2], Latvia indicates that the Internet address of the national registry changed as did the webpage address of Latvian Environment, Geology and Meteorology Centre where public information is published.
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf Table 14.1 the Party describes the presently incorporated data integrity measures, and Party submitted the amended Readiness Documentation which contains the information required as of Appendix 7 of [RGREG]. In [RESPONSE2], Latvia reports that “there weren’t significant changes in data safeguard measures” and “the measures for disaster recovery integrity of data storage mainly are the same as for previous Registry software infrastructure used till October 2009.”

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.10	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(j)</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf in chapter 14. Party states that software has been changed from GRETA to CR.</p> <p>In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf Table 14.1 the Party describes the test results of completed 4 weeks of cycle testing, Annex H testing and Database migration.</p> <p>Amended Readiness Documentation is submitted and contains the information required by Appendix 7 of the document "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3."</p>

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? [X] Yes [] No	Comment
P2.4.1.1	<p>The national registry has fulfilled requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, however the SIAR noted that the public page wrongly indicates that SEF tables are prepared by the IPCC. The ERT recommends that Latvia correct this mistake for its next annual submission.</p> <p>Paragraph 152 of the previous annual review report [FCCC/ARR/2009/LVA]</p>	[X] Yes [] No	<p>In [NIR2] LV_NIR_21052010.pdf the Table 10.4 Party states: The mistaken text in LEGMC webpage was corrected immediately after the ERT objection during the in-country review.</p>
P2.4.1.2	<p>The SIAR noted that Latvia had indicated that significant changes would be made to the infrastructure, software and database of its registry in 2009. If such changes to the national registry occurred, supporting information, including details on what was changed and the relevant test plans and test reports should be provided. The SIAR therefore strongly recommended that Latvia improve its next annual submission by providing definitive statements as to whether changes to its registry have occurred or not, for each of the items under paragraphs 32(a) to 32(j) of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1.</p> <p>The ERT reiterates this recommendation</p> <p>Paragraph 157 of the previous annual review report [FCCC/ARR/2009/LVA]</p>	[X] Yes [] No	<p>The significant changes to the national registry occurred in year 2009, and supporting information, including details on what was changed and the relevant test plans and test reports was provided by the Party as it is required.</p>

P2.4.1.3	<p>The ERT concluded that, taking into account the confirmed change in the national registry as well as the findings presented in the SIAR, Latvia'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 decisions of the CMP. The ERT recommends that the Party, in its next annual submission, report any change(s) in its national registry in accordance with section I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1.</p> <p>In paragraph 158 of the previous annual review report [FCCC/ARR/2009/LVA]</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Party reported changes in its national registry in accordance with section I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1.</p> <p>However the report of changes is to be enhanced by clearly stating if the item was changed or not compared with information reported the previous year, and not to limit the report for the present status of the item to be reported.</p>
----------	---	--	--

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	P1.3.7, P1.3.8, P1.3.9, P2.3.7, P2.3.8, P2.3.9, P2.4.1.3	In its next annual submission, Latvia should enhance its reporting of changes in the national registry since the last annual submission in accordance with section I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. by clearly stating if each item was changed or not compared with information reported the previous year.	<p>However not all the changing item was clearly stated as a change, it was possible to make a conclusion based on the description, and it was possible to compare the present status with the previous year report.</p> <p>In response to the draft Part 2 Assessment Report, Latvia states in [RESPONSE2] that its reporting of changes will be improved in its next annual submission.</p>