



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

**Standard Independent Assessment Report
Reporting Requirements for International Transaction Log (ITL)**

Reference	IAR Procedure		
Security classification:	RSA Forum		
Version number:	v4.5	State:	Approved
Prepared by:	David Sturt, Jean-Francois Halleux, UNFCCC	Date:	07/12/2010
Reviewed by:	Mike Elhaddad	Date:	07/12/2010
Approved by:	Vitaly Matsarski	Date:	07/12/2010

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
RSA Forum	Registry System Administrators	Information

Document change record

Version	Date	Description	Affected sections
v2.3	29/10/2008	Feedback from third SIAR WG meeting and review comments included; fixed headers and footers and appendices; formatted	All
v2.4	07/11/2008	Updated header to v2.4	Header
v2.5	13/11/2008	Approved	All
v2.6	01/12/2008	Final	All
v2.7	04/03/2009	Final - spelling correction	R5
v2.8	11/05/2009	Text correction	R3
v4.3	20/01/2010	Updated for version consistency	None
V4.5	07/12/2010	Updated for version consistency	None

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
R-1 SEF comparison report.....	3
R-2 List of discrepant transactions.....	4
R-3 List of notifications	9
R-4 Report on reconciliation	11
R-5 Report on conversions of units.....	13

1. Introduction

This document lists the reports to be made available by the International Transaction Log (ITL) in electronic format to support the assessment made during the SIAR process. Note that Parties must make a somewhat similar set of reports available¹.

The following reports are described in this document:

- R-1: SEF comparison report
- R-2: List of discrepant transactions
- R-3: List of notifications
- R-4: Report on reconciliation
- R-5: Report on conversion of units

R-1 SEF comparison report

The SEF comparison report is not detailed in this document but is an integral part of the SIAR reporting to be made available by the ITL.

The specification of the report supports the SIAR process in meeting the requirements:

Sub-paragraphs of paragraph 88 of the annex to 22/CMP.1

(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;

(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;

(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;

(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;

The report will show a row-by-row comparison by displaying a row of the Registry SEF submitted data followed by a row of the equivalent SEF data held by the ITL. The row-by-row comparison will also clearly mark the cells where SEF comparisons do not match.

The SEF comparison should compare all the rows in the SEF tables, including all registry (names) in the table 2 so that it can be used to support paragraphs 88 (c) and (d) of the annex to 22/CMP.1 in verifying the acquisitions with the CDM registry and the transfers to national registries, also including the transactions numbers in table 6 in order to verify that the correction took place.

The SEF comparison report will have a summary section in the top of the report to indicate, the SEF submission information from the Party including date of submission, Party's submission version number and when the comparison report was generated. The summary should also have a clear indication if all the contents of the Registry SEF submission data match that of the ITL.

If there were no Party SEF submission, then the SEF comparison report can still be generated but in this case it will show empty values for the registry submission data.

¹ See the SIAR Reporting Requirements For Parties

										Party	Submission year	Reported year	Commitment Period
Table 2 (a). Annual internal transactions													
Transaction type	Additions						Subtractions						
	Unit type						Unit type						
	AAUs	ERUs	RMUs	CERs	tCERs	ICERs	AAUs	ERUs	RMUs	CERs	tCERs	ICERs	
Article 6 issuance and conversion													
Party-verified projects													
<i>Party-verified projects</i>													
Independently verified projects													
<i>Independently verified projects</i>													
Article 3.3 and 3.4 issuance or cancellation													
3.3 Afforestation and reforestation													
<i>3.3 Afforestation and reforestation</i>													
3.3 Deforestation													
<i>3.3 Deforestation</i>													
3.4 Forest management													
<i>3.4 Forest management</i>													
3.4 Cropland management													
<i>3.4 Cropland management</i>													
3.4 Grazing land management													
<i>3.4 Grazing land management</i>													
3.4 Revegetation													
<i>3.4 Revegetation</i>													
Article 12 afforestation and reforestation													
Replacement of expired tCERs													
<i>Replacement of expired tCERs</i>													
Replacement of expired ICERs													
<i>Replacement of expired ICERs</i>													
Replacement for reversal of storage													
<i>Replacement for reversal of storage</i>													
Replacement for non-submission of certification report													
<i>Replacement for non-submission of certification report</i>													
Other cancellation													
<i>Other cancellation</i>													
Sub-total													
<i>Sub-total</i>													
Retirement													
Transaction type	Unit type												
	AAUs	ERUs	RMUs	CERs	tCERs	ICERs							
Retirement													
<i>Retirement</i>													

Example SEF comparison table (empty)

The specifications for the SEF comparison report are available at the following location:
 G:\RDA\3_IIS\Registries\ETR\SEF\SEF-Comparison-Report².

R-2 List of discrepant transactions

The ITL list of discrepant transactions serves as an input to the review of discrepancies mandated by Decision 22/CMP.1, paragraph 88 (j).

The ITL list of discrepant transaction should be provided in Microsoft Excel format respecting the layout identified in figure 1 below:

² Internal location at the UNFCCC Secretariat



Figure 1: Layout for the list of discrepant transaction

DES Response Code	Discrepancy	Average number of occurrences per transaction (X 100.000)		Average number of occurrences per transaction for all registries (X 100.000)		Within Control Limits for the Reported Year	Transaction Number	Proposal Date Time	Transaction Type	Final State
		Reported Year	Prior to Reported year	Reported Year	Prior to Reported year					
<Response Code 1>				
						
						
<Response Code 2>				
						
						



Reporting requirements

Layout and general requirements

1. The report is structured per DES response code, which should appear in ascending order.
2. All DES response codes should be reported; DES response codes considered “discrepancies” are identified with a “Yes” in the discrepancy column of the report. DES response codes considered discrepancies are listed in the document “SIAR Reporting Requirements for Registries”, under report R-2.
3. Each transaction, which resulted in a response code, must be listed under the response code column, in ascending order.
4. Each transaction finalized (completed, terminated or cancelled) during the reporting period should be considered. If a transaction was started but is not yet finalized as of 31 Dec 24:00 of the reported year, it should not be considered for the purpose of this report.
5. If a transaction results in several response codes being returned, the transaction shall appear once under each response code heading.

Column requirements

6. DES response codes shall be presented in DES format
7. Discrepancy shall be “Yes” if the DES response code is listed under report R-2 of the document “SIAR Reporting Requirements for Registries” and “No” otherwise.
8. Average number of occurrences per transaction for the reported year should be a positive real number, with a precision of 2 digits (ex: 13.07). The average number of occurrences of the response code per transaction for the reported year is equal to the total number of occurrences of the response code for the reported year (in response to transactions proposed by the registry) multiplied by 100.00 divided by the total number of transactions proposed by the registry during the reported year. The result should be rounded up.
9. Average number of occurrences per transaction prior to reported year should be a positive real number, with a precision of 2 digits (ex: 13.07). The average number of occurrences of the response code per transaction prior to the reported year is equal to the total number of occurrences of the response code prior to the reported year (year (in response to transactions proposed by the registry) multiplied by 100.00 divided by the total number of transactions proposed by the registry prior to the reported year. The result should be rounded up.
10. Average number of occurrences per transaction for all registries for the reported year should be a positive real number, with a precision of 2 digits (ex: 13.07). The average number of occurrences of the response code per transaction for the reported year is equal to the total number of occurrences of the response code for the reported year for all registries multiplied by 100.00 divided by the total number of transactions proposed by all registries during the reported year. The result should be rounded up.
11. Average number of occurrences per transaction for all registries prior to the reported year should be a positive real number, with a precision of 2 digits (ex: 13.07). The average number of occurrences of the response code per transaction prior to the reported year is equal to the total number of occurrences of the response code prior to the reported year for all registries multiplied by 100.00 divided by the total number of transactions proposed by all registries prior to the reported year. The result should be rounded up.
12. Within control limits for the reported year shall be “Yes” or “No”. The value “Yes” should be used when the of number of average number of occurrences per transaction for the registry for the reported year is within three standard deviations of the same figure for all registries (pt 8 above). The value “No” should be indicated in all other cases.
13. Transaction Number shall be presented in DES format
14. Proposal date time shall be presented in the following format: YYYY–MM–DD HH:MM:SS
15. Date and time shall refer to the date and time of the proposal by the registry and use the UTC reference time
16. Transaction type shall be one of “Issuance”, “Conversion”, “External Transfer”, “Cancellation”, “Retirement”, “Replacement”, “Carry-over”, “Expiry Date Change”, “Internal transfer”. Quotes shall be omitted.

17. Final state shall be one of “Completed”, “Terminated” “Cancelled”.

Example report

Figure 2 below contains an example report for the list of discrepant transactions.



Figure 2: Example report for the list of discrepant transactions

DES Response Code	Discrepancy	Average number of occurrences per transaction (X 100.000)		Average number of occurrences per transaction for all registries (X 100.000)		Within Control Limits for the Reported Year	Transaction Number	Proposal Date Time	Transaction Type	Final State
		Reported Year	Prior to Reported year	Reported Year	Prior to Reported year					
4004	Yes	1000	2000	500	700	No				
							ZZ1	12/10/2008 22:00:04	Conversion	Terminated
							ZZ2	13/10/2008 13:13:45	External Transfer	Terminated
4005	No	1000	1000	1000	2000	Yes				
							ZZ3	12/10/2008 22:00:04	External Transfer	Terminated



R-3 List of notifications

The list of notifications sent to a registry during the reported year is part of the ITL reports to be made available during the SIAR review. The list of notifications should be provided in Microsoft Excel format respecting the layout identified in figure 3 below:

Figure 3: List of notifications

Notification Type	Notification Number	Notification Date Time	Target Number of units	Number of units used to fulfill the notification				Number of units outstanding to fulfill the notification	
				Cancellation	Replacement	Carry-Over	Expiry Date Change	At target date	Post target date
<Notification Type>									

<Notification Type>									

This report lists the notifications sent to a registry during the reported year. It should consider all notifications.

Reporting requirements

Layout and general requirements

1. The report is structured per notification type, which should appear in ascending order and must not be repeated for the same ITL notice type.
2. Each notification number must be reported under its notification type, order by ascending notification date time.
3. Only notification where the message date of the initial notification (field “messageDate” of the ITLNotice message) is within the reported year during the reported year should be reported.
4. This report should not be produced before the first of February and should consider all cancellations, replacements, carry-over, expiry date change or acquisitions made during January for notification received during the previous year.

Column requirements

5. Notification type must be one of “Impending Expiry”, “Reversal of Storage” or “Non-Submission of Certification Report”, “Net Source Cancellation”, “Non-Compliance Cancellation”, “Excess issuance for CDM project”, “Commitment Period Reserve”, “Unit Carry-Over”, “Expiry Date Change”, “EU15 Commitment Period Reserve”.
6. Notification Number must be in DES format.
7. Notification date time must match the “messageDate” field of the initial notification and must respect the following format: YYYY-MM-DD HH:MM:SS, and fall within the reporting year.
8. Target number of units must be a positive integer corresponding to the initial target set by the notification, where applicable.
9. Number of units cancelled must be a positive integer corresponding to the number of units cancelled prior or after the target date set by the notification in order to fulfil that notification, where applicable.
10. Number of units replaced must be positive integer corresponding to the number of units replaced prior or after the target date set by the notification in order to fulfil that notification, where applicable.
11. Number of units carried-over must be a positive integer corresponding to the number of units carried-over prior or after the target date set by the notification in order to fulfil that notification.

12. Number of units subject to expiry date change must be positive integer corresponding to the number of units subject to an expiry date change prior or after the target date set by the notification in order to fulfil that notification.
13. Number of units outstanding at target date is the number of units that are outstanding in order to complete the notification target, as known by the ITL records for the notification at the target date (if applicable).
14. Number of units outstanding post target date is the number of units that are outstanding in order to complete the notification target, as known by the ITL records for the notification at the report date (if applicable).

Example report

Figure 4 below contains an example report for the list of notifications.

Figure 4: Example of list of notifications report

Notification Type	Notification Number	Notification Date Time	Target Number of units	Number of units used to fulfill the notification				Number of units outstanding to fulfill the notification	
				Cancellation	Replacement	Carry-Over	Expiry Date Change	At target date	Post target date
Impending Expiry for tCER or ICER									
	331	23/10/2008 15:56:17	1000	0	1000	0	0	0	0
	332	24/10/2008 22:56:17	2000	0	2000	0	0	500	0
	333	25/10/2008 15:36:17	3000	0	500	0	0	2500	2500
Reversal of Storage for CDM Project									
	334	23/10/2008 08:56:17	1000	300	700	0	0	0	0
	335	21/11/2008 15:56:17	2000	1500	1500	0	0	-1000	-1000

R-4 Report on reconciliation

The report on reconciliation is produced from the ITL to feed the SIAR review process with information on the frequency of reconciliation for a given registry.

The report should be made available in Microsoft Excel format and should have the layout depicted in figure 5 below:

Figure 5: Report on reconciliation

	During the reported year					Prior to the reported year				
	Number of occurrences	Percentage	Percentage for all registries	Number of occurrences per 1000 transactions (X 1000)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 transactions for all registries (X 1000)	Number of occurrences	Percentage	Percentage for all registries	Number of occurrences per 1000 transactions (X 1000)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 transactions for all registries (X 1000)
Consistent reconciliation										
Inconsistent reconciliation										
With ITL										
With STL										
Other										
Total										

Reporting requirements

Layout and general requirements

1. The report on reconciliation provides an overview of the behaviour of a registry with regard to the reconciliation process as defined by the DES.
2. The report is divided in two main parts: aggregated reconciliation information during the reported year and aggregated reconciliation information prior to the reported year.
3. The report distinguishes between consistent reconciliation, inconsistent reconciliation and reconciliation which where neither consistent nor inconsistent (due to technical reasons). For those reconciliation found inconsistent, the report identifies whether such reconciliation were found inconsistent by the ITL or the STL, if an STL was involved.

Row requirements

4. Consistent reconciliation: reconciliation initiated during the reporting period (reported year or prior to the reported year) that completed successfully with no inconsistencies should be considered.
5. Inconsistent reconciliation: reconciliation initiated during the reporting period (reported year or prior to the reported year) that completed with inconsistencies should be considered. The inconsistent reconciliation row is always equal to the sum of the "With ITL" and "With STL" rows below that row.
6. "With ITL": reconciliation initiated during the reporting period (reported year or prior to the reported year) that completed with inconsistencies at the ITL stage should be considered.
7. "With STL": reconciliation initiated during the reporting period (reported year or prior to the reported year) that completed with inconsistencies at the STL stage should be considered.
8. Other: reconciliation initiated during the reporting period (reported year or prior to the reported year) that were not reported as consistent (first row) or inconsistent (second row) should be considered.
9. Total: should always be equal to the sum of row 1 ("Consistent"), row 2 ("Inconsistent") and 5 ("Other")

Column requirements

10. Number of occurrences: positive integer corresponding to the number of occurrences of each row.
11. Percentage: positive real number with a precision of 2 digits (ex: 16.28) corresponding to the number of occurrences of each row divided by the total times 100 (rounded up).
12. Percentage for all registries: the percentage (see above) computed for all registries; used for comparison purposes.
13. Number of occurrences per 1000 transactions: a positive real number with one digit precision representing the number of occurrences for the row divided by the total number of transactions proposed by the registry during the reporting period, times 1000 (rounded up).
14. Number of occurrences per 1000 transactions for all registries: a positive real number with one digit precision representing the average of (number of occurrences for the row divided by the total number of transactions proposed by a registry during the reporting period, times 1000 (rounded up)).

Example Report

Figure 6 below depicts an example an example report on reconciliation:

Figure 6: Example report on reconciliation

	During the reported year					Prior to the reported year				
	Number of occurrences	Percentage	Percentage for all registries	Number of occurrences per 1000 transactions (X 1000)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 transactions for all registries (X 1000)	Number of occurrences	Percentage	Percentage for all registries	Number of occurrences per 1000 transactions (X 1000)	Average number of occurrences per 1000 transactions for all registries (X 1000)
Consistent reconciliation	122	91.73%	90%	200	150	122	91.73%	90%	200	150
Inconsistent reconciliation	10	7.52%	8%	30	20	10	7.52%	8%	30	20
With ITL	5	3.76%	4%	16	10	5	3.76%	4%	16	10
With STL	5	3.76%	4%	14	10	5	3.76%	4%	14	10
Other	1	0.75%	2%	2	3	1	0.75%	2%	2	3
Total	133	100.00%	100.00%	232	173	133	100.00%	100.00%	232	173

R-5 Report on conversions of units

The report on conversion of units provides a basis for determining whether or not a Party needs to provide Article 6 (JI) project information to meeting paragraph 46 of the annex to Decision 13/CMP.1

The layout of the report of conversion of units is depicted in figure 7 below:

Figure 7: Report on conversion of units

Project Number	Track	LULUCF Activity	Units converted		
			During the reported year	Prior to the reported year	Total

Reporting requirements

Layout and general requirements

1. The report on conversion of units list, for each JI project, its track, its LULUCF activity if applicable, the number of units converted during the reporting period and prior to the reporting period and the total number of units converted for the project.
2. Each project shall be listed in ascending order.

Column requirements

3. Project Number shall be reported in DES format
4. Track shall be either "1" or "2"
5. LULUCF Activity shall be "Yes" or "No", depending on whether the JI project is RMU backed or not
6. Units converted during the reported year shall be equal to the number of AAUs or RMUs converted during the reported year for the project. All conversion transactions completed during the year should be considered.
7. Units converted prior to the reported year shall be equal to the number of AAUs or RMUs converted prior to the reported year for the project. All conversion transactions completed prior to the reported year should be considered.
8. Units converted – total shall be equal to the number of units converted during the reported year added to the number of units converted prior to the reported year.

Example Report

Figure 8 below depicts an example report on conversion of units

Figure 8: Report on conversion of units

Project Number	Track	LULUCF Activity	Units converted		
			During the reported year	Prior to the reported year	Total
221	1	Yes	1000	500	1500
345	2	No	200	40	240
456	1	No	300	500	800