



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

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

<b>Reference:</b>	IAR/2009/SVK/2/1	<b>State:</b>	Final
<b>Version number:</b>	2.0	<b>Date:</b>	14/07/2010
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Helena Rimsa/LEGMC (Latvia)		
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Bryan Eckstein/SRA International, Inc.		
<b>Approved by:</b>	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

**Circulation list**

<b>Name/Role</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Info/Action</b>
Helena Rimsa / Assessor	LEGMC / Latvia	Info
Bryan Eckstein / Assessor Coordinator	SRA International, Inc.	Info
Miroslav Hrobak/ Slovak National Registry Specialist	Dexia banka Slovensko / Slovakia	Action

**Document change record**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
0.1	04/06/2010	Initial Draft
1.0	13/06/2010	Review
1.1	09/07/2010	Updated draft with response from Party
2.0	14/07/2010	Review

## Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Slovakia	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files provided by the Party: - [SEF] SEF_SK_2010_1_11-13-46 31-3-2010.xls - [NIR] SVK_NIR_2010_15_04_v1.pdf - [REGR2] SVK-SIAR-R-2- 2009_v1.0.xls - [REGR3] SVK-SIAR-R-3- 2009_v1.0(2).xls - [REGR4] SVK-SIAR-R-4- 2009_v1.0.xls - [REGR5] SVK-SIAR-R-5- 2009_v1.0(2).xls - [RESPONSE1] SK_SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 1 v4.3_final.doc - [RESPONSE2] SVK_SIAR_Consultation_Form_Part_ 2_Responses.doc	Files provided by the ITL Administrator: - [SEFCR] SVK_SEF_2010_1_11-13- 46+31-3-2010-CR.xls -[RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_SK_v1. 1.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2009/SVK (09/12/2009)	

**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.....10**
- 4. Recommendations.....13**
  - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations .....13**
  - 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems.....14**

## 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"> <li>1. The information on Kyoto Protocol units has been reported in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and is accurate. The national registry continues to fulfill the requirements related to its reporting and accounting of information on Kyoto Protocol units, transaction procedures, conformance to the technical standards, security, data integrity and recovery measures.</li> <li>2. Slovakia 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.<sup>1</sup> The SIAR was forwarded to the ERT prior to the review, pursuant to decision 16/CP.10.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. Slovakia 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.</li> <li>5. Slovakia has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 annual submission.</li> <li>6. The national registry has not fulfilled the requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor found that Slovakia does not currently provide Article 6 project information on the public user interface of its national registry.</li> </ol> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. The SIAR reiterates the recommendation of the previous ERT that Slovakia should enhance, as detailed in section 4.2 of this SIAR, the availability of public information referred to in paragraphs 46 and 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, and report, in its next annual submission, on any changes to that public information available on the public user interface of the national registry.</li> </ol>

<sup>1</sup> 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 [SEFCR].
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 [SEFCR].
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 [SEFCR].

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? <b>[ ] Yes [x] No</b>	The ITL identified no discrepant transactions that correspond to applicable discrepant DES transaction codes proposed by Slovakia during 2009 as it is reported in [RRITL] and in [REGR2].	
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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [x] N/A</b>	No discrepancies corresponding to discrepant codes of DES occurred for the Party.
	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [x] N/A</b>	No discrepancies corresponding to discrepant codes of DES occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.10.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iii) Assess whether the transaction was completed or terminated;	Was the transaction completed or terminated? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [x] N/A</b>	No discrepancies corresponding to discrepant codes of DES occurred for the Party.
	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [x] N/A</b>	No discrepancies corresponding to discrepant codes of DES occurred for the Party.
	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [x] N/A</b>	No discrepancies corresponding to discrepant codes of DES occurred for the Party.

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? <b>[ ] Yes [ x ] No</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ x ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ x ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ x ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ x ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ x ] N/A</b>	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. In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that a software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.
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. In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that a software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.

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.  In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that a software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.
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.  In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that a software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.
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.  In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that a software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.

<b>Ref Nr</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Has the Party reported a change?</b>	<b>Problem Identified with the Change?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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.  In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that a software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.
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.  In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that a software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.

## 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>As stated in the previous annual review report [FCCC/ARR/2009/SVK] dated 9 December 2009 in Paragraph 156:</p> <p>“However, the SIAR identified the following issues: a lack of detail on information that is publicly available, including a lack of transparency on the status of joint implementation projects in the country and a lack of transparency regarding what information on holdings and transactions is confidential. In response to questions raised by the ERT during the review, Slovakia revised the information that is publicly available under its national registry, and provided access to the annual summary of the quantity of units made in the national registry according to the type of operation. The Party explained that it intends to improve the registry website by providing more information on the status of information related to activities under Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol. The ERT recommends that Slovakia further enhance access to this information and report thereon in its next annual submission.”</p> <p>And as stated in paragraph 169:</p> <p>“... the ERT noted from the SIAR that Slovakia's annual submission lacks detail on the information</p>		<p>As Slovakia notes in Chapter 14.1 of its [NIR] (page 86):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each of the points to report for public information has been provided in a separate paragraph of the [NIR].</li> <li>• The confidentiality issue is reported in Slovakia's [NIR] and on the main page of Slovakia's registry - <a href="https://co2.dexia.sk/main.aspx?SessionLost=true&amp;LANGUE=en">https://co2.dexia.sk/main.aspx?SessionLost=true&amp;LANGUE=en</a>.</li> <li>• It is stated in Slovakia's [NIR] that there is 1 JI project in Slovakia and information is available in Slovakia's Ministry of Environment website <a href="http://www.enviro.gov.sk">www.enviro.gov.sk</a></li> </ul> <p>In [RESPONSE1] Slovakia provided information of Article 6 project in country and reported that this information will be made publicly available within a month and, due to reorganization of ministries within Slovakia, amended this timeline in [RESPONSE2] to reflect an update will be provided in its next annual submission.</p>

	that is publicly available, and reiterated the recommendation made in the SIAR that Slovakia enhance access to this information and report thereon in its next annual submission.”		
--	--	--	--

## 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems

If a problem has been identified earlier in section 2 and 3 or a previous recommendation listed in section 4.1 has not been taken into account, then this section of the report lists a recommendation for each problem to be brought to the attention to the Expert Review Team.

Ref Nr	Recommendation Ref	Recommendation description	Comment
P2.4.2.1	P2.3.2 – P2.3.10	Although no changes in the national registry were reported in [NIR] with reference to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) to the annex of decision15/CMP.1, Slovakia also reported that the software was updated. In [NIR] (Chapter 14.1, page 85) it was reported that “Slovak registry software Seringas has been updated in 2009 (from version 4.06 to version 4.2). The change enabled new registry functions.” Slovakia should have clearly described the change and stated if a change to the national registry resulted in a change to any aspect covered in paragraphs 32(b)-(j) to the annex of decision15/CMP.1. In the event a change related to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) to the annex of decision15/CMP.1 in the future, Slovakia should report the change in the next annual submission and include supporting documentation of the change, or a clear statement that the change was not significant.	In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that the software update was reported in [NIR] for completeness reasons. Slovakia further stated the technical changes only affects registry operations under EU ETS and are not deemed as significant according to paragraphs 32(b)-(j) in the annex of decision 15/CMP.1.
P2.4.2.2	P1.4.2, P2.4.1.1	Slovakia does not currently provide Article 6 project information on the public user interface of its national registry as per paragraph 46 to the annex of decision 13/CMP.1 but states in [REPOSNE2] that the information will be posted and reported in its next annual submission. It is recommended to include all information in	In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia informed that the preparatory steps have been made to make the requested information publicly available. Still the work has lingered due to structural reforms of ministries in Slovakia and Slovakia will report on the task of making Article 6 project information publicly available in its next annual submission..

		Party's next annual submission, including particular address of the website containing the information, and to also make the information available in English.	
P2.4.2.3	P1.4.3. – P1.4.3.12, P2.4.1.1	<p>Holding and transaction information is reported as confidential in the annual submission and on the public user interface of the national registry.</p> <p>As part of the SIAR process, Slovakia was encouraged to evaluate what holding and transaction information referred to in paragraph 47 to the annex of decision 13/CMP.1 is considered confidential and, if permissible after such an evaluation, to make the SEF tables publicly available by publishing the SEF tables on the public user interface of the national registry or on another public website maintained by Slovakia. Slovakia responded it will review the information it deems confidential and will post SEF tables, if permissible and representative identifiers by the end of the year 2010. Slovakia is encouraged to report on this issue in its next annual submission.</p>	<p>In [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that the confidentiality issue will be evaluated and the SEF tables will be made publicly available through national website by end of the year 2010 if permissible.</p> <p>Also in [RESPONSE2] Slovakia stated that publicly available information accessible through the national registry's website will be enhanced so the representative identifiers information will be available by the end of the year 2010.</p>