



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

Standard Independent Assessment Report
Assessment Report
Part 2 - Substance

Reference:	IAR/2009/POL/2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	03/08/2010
Prepared by:	Helena Rimsa/LEGMC (Latvia)		
Reviewed by:	Bryan Eckstein/SRA International, Inc.		
Approved by:	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
Helena Rimsa / Assessor	LEGMC / Latvia	Info
Bryan Eckstein/Assessor Coordinator	SRA International, Inc.	Info
Przemyslaw Jedrysiak / National Registry Division Manager	The National Administration of the Emission Trading Scheme / Poland	Action

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	04/06/2010	Initial Draft
0.2	13/06/2010	Review and clarifications for consistency with assessment guidance
0.3	25/06/2010	Reviewed draft
1.0	07/07/2010	Review
2.0	03/08/2010	Finalized without Party comment

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Poland	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files provided by the Party: - [SEF] SEF_PL_2010_1_13-16-42 12-4-2010.xls - [NIR] NIR 2010 POL.pdf - [NIR2] NIR 2010 POL_may2010.pdf - [REPORTS] SIAR Reports 2009-PL v.1_2010.04.13.xls - [RESPONSE1] PL_SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 1 v4.3_final.doc	Files provided by the ITL Administrator: - [SEFCR] POL_SEF_2010_1_13-16- 42+12-4-2010-CR.xls -[RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_PL_v1. 1.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2009/POL (19/01/2010)	

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.....12**
- 4. Recommendations.....15**
 - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations15**
 - 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, public availability of information, security, data integrity, and recovery measures. 2. Poland 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. Information reported by Party on records of any discrepancies was found to be consistent with information provided to the secretariat by the international transaction log (ITL). 5. Poland reported no change in its national registry compared with the previous annual submission. It was 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. 6. The national registry has 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. It is recommended that the Party report actions taken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur or any changes to the national registry to prevent a discrepancy from reoccurring in the next annual submission, in accordance with paragraph 17 of the decision 13/CMP.1. In general, Poland is encouraged to describe the actions taken in response to recommendations made in the prior annual review report in its next annual submission.

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	Poland resubmitted its annual submission as part of the SIAR process in response to the Part 1 Assessment 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.
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	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.
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	

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
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 in its [RRITL] two discrepant transactions that correspond to DES discrepant transaction codes. Poland reported in its [REPORTS] both transactions that were considered discrepant according to applicable DES response codes. The information of the discrepant transactions is included in Poland's [NIR2].	
Repeat for each discrepancy type (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	Discrepant transactions with response code 4003 were reported by the ITL in [RRITL] and Poland [REPORTS].
	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	Type 4003 discrepancy had not occurred previously for the Poland.
	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 transactions PL7705 and PL11701 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? [] Yes [x] No [] N/A	In [RESPONSE1] Poland reported that the problem is reported to ETR software developers. Poland reported in [RESPONSE1] that new functionality minimizing the occurrence of discrepancies will be implemented in the middle of 2010.

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, AAs and RMs, the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAs	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	The problem that caused discrepant transactions is not related to the capacity of the ETR to ensure accurate accounting of KP units. It is further noted that the response code results from a flaw in the DES model and should not be considered a problem with the national registry.	
Repeat for each discrepancy type (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	Discrepant transactions with response code 4010 were reported by the ITR in [RRITL] and Poland [REPORTS].
	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	Type 4010 discrepancy had not occurred previously for the Poland.
	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	The transactions PL7705 and PL11701 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	In [RESPONSE1] Poland reported that the problem is reported to ETR software developers. Poland reported in [RESPONSE1] that new functionality minimizing the occurrence of discrepancies will be implemented in the middle of 2010.

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, AAs and RMUs, the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAs	Discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting? [] Yes [x] No [] N/A	The problem that caused discrepant transactions is not related to the capacity of the ETR to ensure accurate accounting of KP units. It is further noted that the response code results from a flaw in the DES model and should not be considered a problem with the national registry.
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 [x] No [] 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 [x] No [] 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 [x] No [] 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 [x] No [] N/A	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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
P2.3.7	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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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?	Comment
P2.4.1.1	"The ERT reiterated the recommendation from the SIAR that Poland in its next annual submission need to improve its reporting on discrepancies and actions taken to correct problems that caused a discrepancy to occur and to prevent it from reoccurring, in accordance with paragraph 17 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1." [FCCC/ARR/2009/POL] (paragraph 167, page 35)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Poland reported in [RESPONSE1] that new functionality minimizing the occurrence of discrepancies will be implemented in the middle of 2010.
P2.4.1.2	"The ERT reiterated the recommendation in the SIAR that Poland enhance it userface of its registry by providing the required information mentioned above, and should report thereon, in its next annual submission." [FCCC/ARR/2009/POL] (paragraph 169, page 36)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	In [RESPONSE1] Poland gave full information of addresses were publicly available information can be found in English. The location of publicly available information is reported in Poland's [NIR2]. Information stated in Article 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 is made publicly available As reflected in P1.3.7 of the Part 1 Assessment Report, Poland reported in [NIR2] that there was no change in the reported year to the list of publicly available information. However, the information is now published.

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	P.1.2.13	Poland reported that it plans to implement a change to its national registry software minimize the occurrence of discrepant transactions in the middle of 2010. It is recommended that the Party report actions taken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur or any changes to the national registry to prevent a discrepancy from reoccurring in the next annual submission, in accordance with paragraph 17 of the decision 13/CMP.1.	It is recommended to include detailed information of the software updates into Poland's next NIR giving particular information of the implemented functionalities.
P2.4.2.2	P.1.5.1-P.1.5.2	Poland did not report on actions taken to address the recommendations of ERT in the previous Annual Review report. Poland is encouraged to describe the actions taken in response to recommendations made in the prior annual review report in its next annual submission.	It is recommended to include in Poland's next NIR the information on how the recommendations stated in previous the SIAR and Annual Review report are fulfilled.