United Nations
Climate Change Secretariat

Nations Unies
Secrétariat sur les changements climatiques

UNFCCC ITL Administrator

Standard Independent Assessment Report
Assessment Guidance
Part 1 - Completeness
Part 2 - Substance

Reference	IAR Procedure		
Security classification:	RSA Forum		
Version number:	V5.0	State:	Final
Prepared by:	Neil Peerman, Carla Valle, Jean-Francois Halleux; UNFCCC Bryan Eckstein, Chris Collins, John Bedard, Heidi McKenna; SIAR Consultants	Date:	02/11/2012
Reviewed by:	Jean-Francois Halleux Markwin Pieters	Date:	7/11/2012
Approved by:	Markwin Pieters	Date:	16/11/2012

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
RSA Forum	Registry System Administrators	Information
UNFCCC.int	Public	Information

Document change record

Version	Date	Description	Affected sections
v2.3	04/11/2008	Feedback from third SIAR WG meeting and review comments included; fixed headers and footers and appendices. Formatted.	All
v2.4	07/11/2008	Added paragraph 3.1.2 "Summary of findings"	3.1.2
v2.5	13/11/2008	Approved	All
v2.6	01/12/2008	Final	All
v2.7	04/03/2009	Final - layout and spelling corrections	All
v2.8	17/03/2009	Added explanation	2.1.1
v2.9	20/04/2009	Improved question to become clearer	2.1.1
v2.10	24/04/2009	Improved explanations	All
v3.2	11/05/2009	Improved explanations	All
v3.3	14/05/2009	Improved explanations	Section 4, items 2.2.10.x and 2.2.11.x
v3.4	01/07/2009	Incorporation of FAQ document and post 2009 assessment feedback	All
v3.5	22/07/2009	Incorporation of internal feedback	All
v4.0	24/09/2009	Streamlining content and format. Updated recommendation language.	All
v4.1	12/11/2009	Incorporating feedback from SIAR Working Group.	P1.2.2, P1.2.3, P1.2.6, P1.2.8, P1.3.7

v4.2	02/12/2009	Incorporating feedback from 6th meeting of the SIAR Working Group	Section 2.1, Section 2.3 - P1.2.11
v4.3	15/01/2010	Incorporating feedback from the 7th meeting of the SIAR Working Group	Section 2.3 – P1.2.11
v4.4	30/09/2010	Initial revisions following 2010 SIAR process to improve clarity. Clarified instructions on assessing public information in cases of confidentiality and non-occurrence.	P1.0.4, Section 2.4, Comment on P2.1.2, P2.1.5, 4.2 (just formatting), 4.3, P2.2.7, P2.2.10, P2.2.11.2, Section 2.5
v4.5	07/12/2010	Incorporated grammatical improvements suggested by JP after CAB 16	P.1.2.6. and P.1.3.6
v4.6	25/03/2011	Clarified SoF format, clarified guidance on response codes, Updated URLs	Section 4.1, 4.4, 2.6
v4.7	23/11/2011	Clarified proper use of SoF; updated JI project citation requirements	Section 2.5 (1.4.2)
v4.8	02/11/2012	Updated header. Updated for version consistency.	All
v5.0	12/11/2012	Version increment to 5.0	None

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

This document provides guidance to external assessors, the ITL team and the R&A team of the UNFCCC secretariat on how to assess the completeness ("Part 1") and substance ("Part 2") of the Standard Independent Assessment Report (SIAR) with regard to a national registry and the relevant information provided as part of its annual report.

2.0 Referenced Documents

[RRITL]   SIAR Reporting Requirements for ITL
[RRREG]   SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries
[PUBLICINFO] SIAR Publicly Available Information Guidance

2.1 SIAR Part 1 Assessment Guidance

As a general guidance for assessor, if an annual submission item is not reported, mark the submission item as incomplete and the overall submission as incomplete.

Guidance for Assessors regarding communication with ITL

If at any point in time you have questions, please contact the ITL Administrator for clarifications. Specifically on the item "Accounting of Information", if the information provided by the ITL Administrator is not the same as provided by the Party, you should request both sides (i.e. the ITL Administrator and the respective Party) to clarify and/or confirm their respective data provided.

Guidance for Assessors regarding communication with RSA

With regard to requesting further information from the RSA, the SIAR is based on an agreed process with opportunities for feedback on the assessment. Clarifications can be sort within the bounds of this process. The process does preclude one-to-one interaction between the assessors and the RSA.

Assessment Templates

Assessors are provided with templates for both the completeness ("Part 1") and substance ("Part 2") assessment. This guidance document and the assessment templates use common reference numbers to refer to information being reviewed. The assessment templates provide default content for common assessment results. This default content appears in red text. For each item, the assessor must determine whether the default comment applies or whether the comment must be revised to accurately reflect the situation for the Party currently being assessed. Upon assessment of each item, change the red text back to the standard black font colour if the default text is consistent with the assessment or, if not, replace the red text with new, black text appropriate for the assessment.

2.2 Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Assessor Guidance
P1.0.1	Party name	Indicate the name of the Party as recorded in Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol and its amendment(s).
P1.0.2	Reporting period	Indicate the year for which the Party reported the information, typically the year prior to the assessment. The reporting period for the SIAR is aligned on a calendar year (i.e. from 01/01 to 31/12), covering the year preceding the submission year.
P1.0.3	Submission under review	Indicate the name of all files of the submission and the date of the submission. Expected files appear in the assessment template by default. Where possible a 'short name' should be assigned to each filename that is

Ref Nr	Description	Assessor Guidance
		used to allow for easier cross referencing to the documents submitted.
		The Parties submitted documents should be put in one cell of the table and the ITL documents that are used as supporting documents should be put in the Comments cell of the table.
P1.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	Indicate the reference to the previous annual review report, including the date of the report.
		The previous annual review report must have a published date of before the 15th April for the year in which the Party's annual submission is due. If the published date is after 15th April then the previous year's annual review report must be used (in no case should the Part 1 or Part 2 report from a previous year's SIAR process be used).
		The previous annual review recommendations can be found at the following UNFCCC web site location:
		Home > National Reports > GHG Inventories (Annex I) > Inventory Review Reports http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/5687.php

2.2.1 Overall Assessment

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P1.1.1	Submission complete?	**Yes** if:
		• The assessments P1.2.2, P1.2.4, P1.2.6, P1.2.8, P1.2.10, P1.2.12, P1.2.13, P1.2.14 report the submission is complete (value = Yes);
		And
		• The assessments P1.3.1 to P1.3.10 report the submission is complete.
		No otherwise
P1.1.2	Public Information Provided?	**Yes** if:
		• The assessments P1.4.1 to P1.4.4 report that either the information is confidential or has been provided.
		No otherwise
P1.1.3	An explanation to each previous annual review recommendation was provided?	**Yes**, if all recommendations from the previous annual review report have been addressed in the Party annual report.
		No, if at least one recommendation from the previous annual review report has not been addressed.
		NA, if there were no recommendations.
		Note that whether the recommendation has been appropriately addressed or not is subject to substantive assessment in Part 2.

2.3 Accounting of Kyoto Protocol Units

Ref Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.2.1	14/CMP.1 annex I. paragraph 3	Check whether there has been any trading so far by looking at the SEF comparison report, referred to in report R-1 of the SIAR Reporting requirements for ITL [RRITL]. • If trading has been reported by the ITL, indicate **Yes** for this item; • Otherwise indicate **No**. • If the Registry is not in full operational live mode with the ITL then mark as **No** and apply a comment to indicate this. The assessor should note that Parties that have not transferred or acquired any Kyoto Protocol units since they entered into live operation with the international transaction log (ITL) need not to provide the following sections in their submission: **2.4 Accounting of the Kyoto Protocol Units:** a. 15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 11:Standard electronic format (SEF); b. 15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 12: List of discrepant transactions; c. 15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 13 & 14: List of CDM notifications; d. 15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 15: List of non-replacements; e. 15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 16: List of invalid units; f. 15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 17: Actions and changes to address discrepancies.

Ref Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.2.2	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 11 Standard electronic format (SEF)	If the assessment to P1.2.1 is Yes (trading occurred): • Check that there has been a SEF submission by assessing SEF application completeness and consistency check results. If there has been a SEF submission and it is complete and consistent, indicate **Yes**. • Otherwise indicate **No** and add a comment (SEF submission missing, completeness check failed, consistency checks failed …). • If the information was provided, but in a different format, then it should be assessed in the usual fashion and a recommendation should be made to use the agreed format for subsequent submissions. • If the information was not provided at all, then the overall assessment in P1.1.1 will be No, and the detail sections will highlight to the Party the missing information. The draft SIAR Part 1 will be sent to the Party for comment and they will have an opportunity to resubmit R1 with the missing information included. If the assessment to P1.2.1 is No (trading did not occur): • Indicate **Yes** in any case • Add a comment if the SEF that the Party is not required to submit a SEF as they have not yet transferred or acquired any units.
P1.2.3	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 12 Discrepant transactions (ITL part)	If there are any discrepant transactions, i.e. with response code and explicitly marked as "discrepancies" identified in [RRITL], report R-2 then **Yes**, otherwise **No**. If the ITL report R-2 indicates the occurrence of a 7XXX response code is beyond control limits, they should not be investigated as these relate solely to the EU-ETS and are outside the scope of this review. If the ITL report R-2 indicates the occurrence of a 59xx response code is beyond control limits, they should not be investigated. These are given by the acquiring registry and they represent the reasons for an acquiring registry to reject a transaction. Rejection is a valid action by the acquiring registry, and the reasons for it are outside the scope of this assessment For clarification, if the ITL report R-2 displays transactions for which the transaction type is not identified, it is because the transaction proposal elicited an ITL Checked Discrepancy response with a response code below 3000. The transaction type is not available for such transactions during the preparation of reports. This is because these transactions do not form part of the formal transaction log, and hence are only recorded in audit and message logs which have limited information available for such reports.

Ref Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.2.4	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 12 Discrepant transactions (National Registry part)	If the Party has reported a list of discrepant transactions as described in [RRREG] (including an empty list), and this list (in registry report R-2) matches the list of discrepancies identified in [RRITL] then tick **Yes**. If the Party has made a statement of nothing to report pursuant to the relevant decision and the ITL has not identified any discrepancy, then tick **Yes.** In all other cases, tick **No** and make a comment to that effect taking into consideration the response to P1.2.3 (Party did not state whether discrepancies occurred or not, Party did not report on one or more discrepancies…) For clarification, a discrepancy is defined as a fault in a proposed transaction sent to the international transaction log (ITL) for verification as requested by COP/MOP decisions. The detailed technical specification of the interface between registry systems details all the verification that the ITL performs. The ITL uses a common method for technical verification of transaction proposals sent by the national registries and also the verification required by decisions. The Standard Independent Assessment Report Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries has a list titled "Applicable DES response codes" that lists the specific DES response codes that are discrepancies.
P1.2.5	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 13 & 14 List of CDM notifications (ITL part)	Check ITL list of notifications as described in [RRITL], report R-3 for "*Reversal of Storage*" and if there are any, respond **Yes**, otherwise response **No**.
P1.2.6	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 13 & 14 List of CDM notifications (National Registry Part)	Check Party's list of CDM notifications described in [RRREG] report R-3 for type 4 notifications. If it matches the ITL list of type 4 notifications, respond **Yes**. If there is a Party statement of nothing to report pursuant to the relevant decision and the ITL list of type 4 notifications is empty, respond **Yes.** In all other cases, tick **No** and make a comment to that effect taking into consideration the response to P1.2.5 (Party did not state whether type 4 notifications occurred or not, Party did not report on one or more type 4 notification…).
P1.2.7	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 13 & 14 List of CDM notifications (ITL part)	Check ITL list of notifications as described in [RRITL], report R-3 for "*Non-Submission of Certification Report*" and if there are any respond **Yes**, otherwise respond **No**.

Ref Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.2.8	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 13 & 14 List of CDM notifications (National Registry part)	Check Party's list of CDM notifications described in [RRREG], report R-3 for type 5 notifications. If it matches the ITL list of type 5 notifications, respond **Yes**. If there is a Party statement of nothing to report pursuant to the relevant decision and the ITL list of type 5 notifications is empty, respond **Yes.** In all other cases, tick **No** and make a comment to that effect taking into consideration the response to P1.2.7 (Party did not state whether type 5 notifications occurred or not, Party did not report on one or more type 4 notification…).
P1.2.9	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 15 List of non-replacements (ITL part)	Check ITL list of notifications as described in [RRITL], report R-3 for lines named "*Reversal of Storage*", "*Non-Submission of Certification Report*" and *"Impending Expiry"* and column "*Number Of Units outstanding to fulfil the notification at target date*" and if there are any entries respond **Yes** to the assessment question, otherwise respond **No**.
P1.2.10	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 15 List of non-replacements (National Registry Part)	Check Party's list of non-replacements described in [RRREG], report R-4 or the Party statement of nothing to report pursuant to the relevant decision. If there are no non-replacements (either an empty list or a clear statement that there are no non-replacements) reported and the ITL has not identified non-replacements, tick **Yes**. If there are non-replacements and the list of non-replacements reported matches the ITL list of non-replacements, tick **Yes**. In all other cases (no list and no statement provided, not all non-replacements reported, tick **No** and add a comment taking into account the answer to P1.2.9 above).
P1.2.11	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 16 List of invalid units (ITL part)	Check ITL list of discrepant transactions as described in [RRITL], report R-2. If there are any with value in column "*Final State*" of "*Completed*" then respond **Yes** to the assessment question, otherwise respond **No**. Please note that in practice, there should never be a case where a discrepant transaction should have a status of "*Completed*" at the ITL as the ITL should prevent a transaction with a discrepancy. This item is included for completeness, and consistency with preceding items in which both ITL data and Registry data are reviewed.
P1.2.12	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 16 List of invalid units (National Registry Part)	If Party has provided a list of invalid units, as described in [RRREG] report R-5, then respond **Yes** to the assessment question. If the Party has made a statement of nothing to report pursuant to the relevant decision, then respond **Yes** to the assessment question. If there is no list and no statement then tick **No** and make a comment to that effect.
P1.2.13	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 17 Actions and changes to address discrepancies	Check that submission contains actions taken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur and any changes to the national registry to prevent a discrepancy from recurring.

Ref Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.2.14	15/CMP.1 annex I.E paragraph 18: CPR Calculation	Check if the calculation of Party's commitment period reserve (CPR) is available in the submission.

2.4 National Registry Change

General comments regarding this section on National registry change;

- The Assessor should be aware that the SIAR Part 1 assessment does not assess whether all changes have been reported. The Party is provided guidance on what is considered as a "significant change" in Section 3.2 of the document: "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries." Only changes reported by the Party, or changes for which the assessor has evidence, should be assessed.

- If the Party does not provide information on an item of section 3, National Registry Change, please leave the column "Change Reported?" blank and fill in the column "Submission Complete?" with a "No" for each specific item. Additionally, include a comment for each item missing.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.3.1	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(a) Change of name or contact	Submission complete: - Tick **Yes** if a change is reported or it is clearly stated that no change occurred. In the comments column cross reference the location in the submission document (section/paragraph or page number) where the Party states the change or confirms that no change has occurred. - Tick **No** otherwise. Item changed during the reporting period: - Tick **Yes** if a change is reported - Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred - **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.3.2	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(b) Change of cooperation arrangement	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred. In the comments column cross reference the location in the submission document (section/paragraph or page number) where the Party confirms that no change has occurred. • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported <u>and</u> the revised readiness documentation that demonstrates the correct functioning of the registry after the change is available. In the comments column cross reference the location in the submission document (section/paragraph or page number) where the Party states the change details. • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred. In the comments column cross reference the location in the submission document (section/paragraph or page number) where the Party confirms that no change has occurred. • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.3.3	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(c) Change to database or the capacity of National Registry	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred. In the comments column cross reference the location in the submission document (section/paragraph or page number) where the Party confirms that no change has occurred. • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported, the submission contains a high-level description of change and the reasons for the change. If the change is deemed significant, check if there are attached test plans, test reports and procedures which were impacted by the change(s). Is the change significant? For a change to the database to be classified as a significant change the structure of the database must have been affected by the change. For example, if the Party has added more hard disk space to the database to provide increased capacity, this would not affect the structure of the database and as such would not be considered a significant change. It would still need some form of small change record, test plan and reports. However if the database has had structural changes that could affect the operation of the Registry software then this should have a full description of the change and the full life cycle of testing, release, operational testing and rollback plans etc. In the comments column cross reference the location in the submission document where the details of the change are defined. • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.3.4	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(d) Change of conformance to technical standards	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred. A comment containing the cross reference to the statement from the Party should be added to the comments column; • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported, the submission contains a high level description for each change, and reasons for the change. If the change is deemed significant, check if there are attached test plans and test reports where were impacted by the change(s). Is the change significant? For a change to be significant the Registry will have had to change its software, partially or completely and the new software must demonstrate that it still complies with the DES. Most changes to Registry software or other aspects of the operation that might affect the conformance to the technical standards are minor at this stage of operational use with the ITL. For minor changes to software or environment it is still important for the Registry to follow best practices and have appropriate test plans, test reports, back-out plans etc. These can be submitted as evidence of effective release and change management. The test plans should have a specific section that verifies that the change has not negatively affected the conformance to the technical standards. The important criterion for this point is that the Registry must explain exactly what changes have been made during the course of the reporting period. Then an assessment can be made. • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported; • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred; • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.3.5	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(e) Change of discrepancies procedures	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column); • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported and the submission contains a high level description for each change to remove discrepancies and reasons for the change. If the change is deemed significant, check if there are revised or new procedures attached relevant to the change(s). (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column); • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported; • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred; • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.
P1.3.6	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(f) Change of security	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column); • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported and the submission contains a high level description for each change to prevent unauthorized manipulations at the system level and at the user level, and a reason for the change. If the change is deemed significant, check if there are procedures, test plans and test results available (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column). For the user-authentication mechanism section of the security plan, check that the Party reported on one of the recommended methods (see reporting guidance) and optionally on additional improvements or provided a complete description of an alternative user-authentication method. • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported; • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred; • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.3.7	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(g) Change of list of publicly available information	Submission complete: • a) Check if submission contains the list of changes on previously public information that has become confidential or previously confidential information that has become public pursuant to part E of the annex to 13/CMP.1, paragraphs 44 to 48 inclusive. • b) Check if the submission say that part of the information became confidential and ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are public • c) Check if the submission clearly states that no change occurred to the information regarded as confidential; • d) Tick **Yes** if the assessment under a), b), or c) above is positive and the public information reported per decision 13/CMP.1, paragraphs 44 to 48 is complete (include cross reference to location of statement in comments column). • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported; • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred; • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.
P1.3.8	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(h) Change of Internet address	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if Party reported a change to the Internet address of its registry (include a cross reference to the location of statement in the comments column) • Tick **Yes** if Party clearly stated no change occurred with regard to the Internet address of its registry (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column). • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported; • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred; • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.3.9	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(i) Change of data integrity measures	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if submission contains a high level description for each change, the reason for the change and, if considered a significant change, attached procedures and evidence of its successful application are available (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column). • Tick **Yes** if Party clearly stated no change occurred with regard to its data integrity measures (include cross reference to location of statement in comments column). • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported; • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred; • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.
P1.3.10	15/CMP.1 annex II.E paragraph 32.(j) Change of test results	Submission complete: • Tick **Yes** if any additional test results are provided regarding the changes, including a high level description of the change and if the reasons for the change are supplied (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column). • Tick **Yes** if Party clearly stated no change occurred with regard to its test results (include cross reference to location of statement in the comments column). • Tick **No** in other cases, and add a comment to that effect. Item changed during the reporting period: • Tick **Yes** if a change is reported; • Tick **No** if it is clearly stated that no change occurred; • **Leave empty** if it is neither stated that no change occurred nor is a change reported – add a comment to that effect.

2.5 Public Information

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.1	13/CMP.1 Annex II paragraph 45 Account information provided?	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access account information and if this information can be viewed. • Tick **No** otherwise. If the Party has provided a public URL but the specific information required by paragraph 45 is not available, or the assessor could not find the information, then tick **No**. Insert a comment stating that the information was not accessible at the time of the assessment and ask the Party to provide more information. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are public Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.1.1	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 45 (a) Account name: the holder of the account	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential, ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.1.2	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 45 (b) Account type: the type of account (holding, cancellation or retirement)	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.1.3	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 45 (c) Commitment period: the commitment period with which a cancellation or retirement account is associated	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.1.4	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 45 (d) Representative identifier: the representative of the account holder, using the Party identifier (the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166) and a number unique to that representative within the Party's registry	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.1.5	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 45 (e) Representative name and contact information; the full name, mailing address, telephone number, facsimile number and email address of the representative of the account holder	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.2	13/CMP.1 Annex II paragraph 46 Article 6 project information provided?	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access Article 6 project information and if this information can be viewed. • Tick **No** otherwise. If the Party has provided a public URL but the specific information required by paragraph 46 is not available, or the assessor could not find the information, then tick **No** and insert a comment stating that the information was not accessible at the time of the assessment and ask the Party to provide more information. It is permissible for the party to provide links on their public website to project information maintained by the UNFCCC at ji.unfccc.int Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.2.1	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 46 (a) Project name: a unique name for the project	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.2.2	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 46 (b) Project location; the Party and town or region in which the project is located	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. It is permissible for the party to provide links on their public website to project information maintained by the UNFCCC at ji.unfccc.int. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.2.3	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 46 (c) Years of ERU issuance; the years in which ERU's have been issued as a result of the Article 6 project	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. It is permissible for the party to provide links on their public website to project information maintained by the UNFCCC at ji.unfccc.int. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.2.4	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 46 (d) Reports; downloadable electronic version of all publicly available documentation relating to the project, including proposals, monitoring, verification and issuance of ERU's, where relevant, subject to the confidentiality provisions in decision 9/CMP.1	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. It is permissible for the party to provide links on their public website to project information maintained by the UNFCCC at ji.unfccc.int. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.3	13/CMP.1 Annex II paragraph 47 Holding and transaction information provided?	Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise Is public information provided? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided public URL to access holding and transaction information and if this information can be viewed. • Tick **No** otherwise. • If the Party has provided a public URL but the specific information required by paragraph 47 is not available, or the assessor could not find the information, then tick **No** and insert a comment stating that the information was not accessible at the time of the assessment and ask the Party to provide more information.

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.3.1	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (a) The total quantity of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs in each account at the beginning of the year	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.3.2	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (b) The total quantity of AAUs issued on the basis of the assigned amount pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.3.3	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (c) The total quantity of ERUs issued on the basis of Article 6 projects	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.3.4	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (d) The total quantity of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs acquired from other registries and the identity of the transferring accounts and registries	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.3.5	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (e) The total quantity of RMUs issued on the basis of each activity under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4	**Is Submission complete?** • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. **Has Party identified this type of information confidential?** • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.3.6	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (f) The total quantity of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs transferred to other registries and the identity of the acquiring accounts and registries	**Is Submission complete?** • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. **Has Party identified this type of information confidential?** • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.3.7	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (g) The total quantity of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs cancelled on the basis of activities under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.3.8	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (h) The total quantity of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs cancelled following determination by the Compliance Committee that the Party is not in compliance with its commitment under Article 3, paragraph 1	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.3.9	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (i) The total quantity of other ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs cancelled	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.3.10	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (j) The total quantity of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs retired	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.3.11	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (k) The total quantity of ERUs, CERs and AAUs carried over from the previous commitment period	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise
P1.4.3.12	13/CMP.1 Annex paragraph 47 (l) Current holdings of ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs in each account	Is Submission complete? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access required information and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential, or if the Party has stated that data outside of a date range is confidential • Tick **No** otherwise

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.4.4	13/CMP.1 Annex II paragraph 48 List of legal entities authorized by Party provided?	Has Party identified this type of information confidential? • Tick **Yes** if Party stated that this information is confidential • If part of the information is declared as confidential then ensure that the Party has clearly identified which elements are confidential and which are publicly available. Tick **Partial** if Party has stated some of the elements are confidential • Tick **No** otherwise Is public information provided? • Tick **Yes** if Party provided a public URL to access the list of legal entities authorized by the Party and if this information can be viewed. • If the Party clearly and explicitly states on the publicly accessible website that this specific information is confidential, or not shown due to non-occurrence, tick **Yes**. • Tick **No** otherwise. • If the Party has provided a public URL but the specific information required by paragraph 48 is not available, or the assessor could not find the information, then tick **No** and insert a comment stating that the information was not accessible at the time of the assessment and ask the Party to provide more information.

2.6 Previous Expert Review Team Recommendations

Ref-Nr	Annual Submission Item	Assessor Guidance
P1.5.x	The previous Annual Review recommendations	Check each recommendation from the previous annual review report that is relevant to the National Registry and check if the recommendations are covered in the submission. Previous recommendations are found at: **Home > National Reports > GHG Inventories (Annex I) > Inventory Review Reports** http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/5687.php Previous annual review report references should quote the full document reference. For example, FCCC/ARR/2008/FRA for the review report of France dated 26 March 2009. Include any reference to the specific recommendation within that document (i.e. section and paragraph number). Check if Party has provided explanation of how the recommendation was addressed.

3.0 SIAR Part 2 Assessment Guidance

For every problem identified during the assessment, the assessor must write a clear description of the problem in the comment field against each requirement.

3.1 Summary

The summary information follows the same layout as the summary for Part 1 of the SIAR.

Ref Nr	Description	Assessor Guidance
P2.0.1	Party name	Indicate the name of the Party as recorded in Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol and its amendment(s).
P2.0.2	Reporting period	Indicate the year for which the Party reported the information, typically the year prior to the assessment. The reporting period for the SIAR is aligned on a calendar year (i.e. from 01/01 to 31/12), covering the year preceding the submission year.
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Indicate the name of all files of the submission and the date of the submission. Expected files appear in the assessment template by default. Using the same format as Part 1 assessment, where possible a 'short name' should be assigned to each filename that is used to allow for easier cross referencing to the documents submitted. The Party's submitted documents should be put in one cell of the table and the ITL documents that are used as supporting documents should be put in the Comments cell of the table.
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	Indicate the reference to the previous annual review report, including the date of the report. The previous annual review report must have a published date of before the 15th April for the year in question. If the published date is after 15th April then the previous year's report must be used. The previous annual review recommendations can be found at the following UNFCCC web site location: **Home > National Reports > GHG Inventories (Annex I) > Inventory Review Reports** http://unfccc.int/national_reports/annex_i_ghg_inventories/inventory_review_reports/items/5687.php

3.1.1 Overall assessment

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.1.1	Is the information submitted by Party, in relation to its national registry, complete?	This should be **Yes** if P1.1.1 "Submission complete" is **Yes**, otherwise **No.** For clarification, a Yes here means that the Party has reported all required information on accounting of Kyoto Protocol units and any changes to the registry.
P2.1.2	Problem found with Party's national registry?	This should be **Yes** if: • any problems were identified in assessment P2.2.2 to P2.2.9 *Or* • The assessment of P2.2.10.5 is **Yes** *Or* • The assessment of P2.2.11.5 is **Yes** Otherwise **No** For clarification, a Yes here means that there is a problem with accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, detected either in the SEF, Registry to ITL transaction procedures or in its replacement procedures.
P2.1.3	Any unresolved problem with Party's national registry?	This should be **No** if: • the assessment of P2.2.10.4 is **Yes** *Or* • The assessment of P2.2.11.4 is **Yes**, Otherwise **Yes** (meaning that there are still unresolved problems with Party's national registry) For clarification, a Yes here means that the Party has not corrected a problem, or has not reported the correction of a problem, that caused a discrepancy or non-replacement.
P2.1.4	Problems identified with the significant changes to the Party's national registry?	This should be **Yes**, if the column "Problem Identified with the Change?" for P2.3.1 to P2.3.10 show a **Yes**, otherwise **No**. For clarification, a Yes here means that the Party has not submitted required paperwork to demonstrate compliance of the registry to the data exchange standards and relevant CMP decisions (15/CMP.1, paragraph 32).

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.1.5	National registry related recommendations from previous annual review were fully addressed?	This should be **Yes** if the column "Has Party acted on recommendation?" has a **Yes** entry for any of the prior ERT recommendations, see P2.4.1.1.x, otherwise **No**.
P2.1.6	Is there any recommendation that needs to be addressed by the Party?	This should be **Yes** if there are any recommendations listed in section 4.2, reference P2.4.2.x, otherwise **No**. It should be noted that recommendations may be made to address minor or major problems.

4.0 Summary of Findings

The summary of findings is filled in by the external assessor with text that summarizes the assessments made in SIAR Part 1 and SIAR Part 2. The summary of findings is phrased using terms the expert review team can understand, bearing in mind the expert review team might use the summary of findings text as is.

If the national registry assessment revealed some issues, each finding in the summary will contain a reference to the relevant decision(s). In addition, each finding in the summary will clearly identify whether the issue is related to the completeness of the submission or its substance.

4.1 Summary of Findings Outline

Assessors should use the structure presented in the template below when preparing the summary of findings section of the SIAR. Guidance on the content and language for each paragraph is provided in Sections 4.2 and 4.3. Adherence to this template and these language guidelines will help to ensure the consistency and comparability of the SIAR reports, and facilitate its use by Expert Review Teams. All text in the Summary of Findings must be in Times New Roman font size 11.

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
P2.2.1	*Please note that certain paragraphs should only be included when they are applicable to the assessed Party. The paragraphs should always be numbered contiguously 1 through n, where n is the number of paragraphs relevant to the assessment.* 1. [Insert text for Paragraph 1 here, replacing the bracketed text. This paragraph provides the overall registry assessment (positive or negative). Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 1 is found in Section 4.2 below.] 2. [Insert text for Paragraph 2.a.1 here, replacing the bracketed text. This paragraph provides a general assessment of the Party's submission of the required standard electronic format report tables. Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 2.a.1 is found in Section 4.3.1 below.] 3. [Insert text for Paragraph 2.a.2 here, replacing the bracketed text. This paragraph provides an assessment of the accounting of Kyoto Protocol units as reflected in the standard electronic format tables. Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 2.a.2 is found in Section 4.3.1 below.] 4. [If applicable (i.e. the Party has reported discrepancies or instances of non-replacement), insert text for Paragraph 2.a.3 here, replacing the bracketed text. Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 2.a.3 is found in Section 4.3.1 below.] 5. [If applicable (i.e. the Party has reported on corrective actions), insert text for Paragraph 2.a.4 here, replacing the bracketed text. Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 2.a.4 is found in Section 4.3.1 below.] 6. [Insert text for Paragraph 2.b.1 here, replacing the bracketed text. This paragraph provides an assessment of the Party's national registry and its adherence to the data exchange standards. Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 2.b.1 is found in Section 4.3.2 below.] 7. [Insert text for Paragraph 2.c.1 here, replacing the bracketed text. This paragraph provides an assessment on the Party's calculation of its commitment period reserve. Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 2.c.1 is found in Section 4.3.3 below.] 8. [Insert text for Paragraph 2.d.1 here, replacing the bracketed text. This paragraph provides and assessment on the Party's reporting of public information. Guidance on the content and language to be used for Paragraph 2.d.1 is found in Section 4.3.4 below.] Recommendations (*obligatory if there is at least one recommendation*) 9. [Insert one or more individually numbered paragraphs here for any additional recommendations that are not covered in the preceding paragraphs. These may be reiterations of the recommendations made in Section 4.2 of the Part 2 assessment

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
	template that have not been resolved by the end of the assessment cycle. These recommendations should be limited the recommendation which should be brought to the attention of the ERT. Minor recommendations from section 4.2 not resolved by the party do not need to be reiterated in this section. See Section 4.4 below for guidance.] 10. [Insert one or more individually numbered paragraphs here for any recommendations from previous ERT's that have not been addressed by the Party. Such recommendations should begin with "The SIAR assessor reiterates the previous ERT recommendation and recommends that the Party <insert recommendation>". See Section 4.4 below for guidance.]

4.2 Overall Assessment Result

Paragraph 1

The overall assessment result depends on whether the registry:

- fulfills all requirements;
- fulfills all major requirements and its public information is available;
- fulfills all major requirements and its public information is not available;
- has not fulfilled some major requirements.

Major requirements are the SEF comparison report consistency (i.e., SEF submitted and SEF comparison report does not demonstrate any problem), no unresolved discrepancies which would threaten accounting of Kyoto Protocol units and a complete submission, with the exception of the public information.

Paragraph 1 under "Section 1) overall assessment result", should be completed using one of the following paragraphs below, depending on the result of the assessment.

If the overall assessment is positive (all requirements met), use the following text:

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 fulfil 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.

If the overall assessment is positive (most requirements met), and public information is available, use the following text:

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 fulfil 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.

If the overall assessment is positive (most requirements met), but public information is not available, use the following text:

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.

If the overall assessment is negative (major requirements not met), use the following text:

Information on Kyoto Protocol units has been reported in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1, however The national registry does not fulfil all requirements with regard to its reporting and accounting of information on Kyoto Protocol units, transaction procedures, conformance to the technical standards, publicly availability of information, security, data integrity and recovery measures.

4.3 Observations and Recommendations

4.3.1 Standard electronic format and reports from the national registry

Observations and recommendations related to the standard electronic format and reports from the national registry are summarized in paragraphs 2.a.1-5, with paragraphs 2.a3-5 being included only where applicable. In each case, the assessor should include the relevant paragraphs below amending the content

to include or exclude text in [square brackets] as appropriate, replacing instructional text appearing within {curly braces} with reference content, and replacing **bold text** with the relevant information.

Paragraph 2.a.1

Party has [not] reported information on its accounting of Kyoto Protocol units in the required SEF tables, as required by decisions 15/CMP.1 and 14/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor reviewed the [findings included in the][findings and recommendations 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. [The SIAR assessor reiterated the [main findings][main findings and recommendations] contained in the SIAR.]

Paragraph 2.a.2

[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.] [However, the Party did not report information on {list from the current assessment with reference to requirements included in paragraphs 12–17 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1}. The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party include in its next annual submission the information required by paragraph 88 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1 on {list specific items from paragraph 88 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1)}].

Paragraph 2.a.3 (if applicable)

[Information reported by Party on records of any discrepancies and on any records of non-replacement were found to be consistent with information provided to the secretariat by the [international transaction log (ITL)][ITL].] [However, the SIAR identified the following as problems that will need corrective action from the Party in its national registry: {list unit type etc}.] [In response to [a] question[s] of the SIAR assessor on the corrective action[s] mentioned above, the SIAR assessor [concluded that the Party's records on its accounting of Kyoto Protocol units contained in its national registry are consistent with corresponding records of the ITL.]

Paragraph 2.a.4 (if applicable)

The Party has reported on corrective action[s] undertaken on {list unit type etc} that were identified as necessary by the previous ERT. [However, the SIAR assessor found that **Party** did not [undertake the corrective action, as recommended by the previous ERT, on {list unit type etc}[.][,]] [nor provided in its annual submission information on actions undertaken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur, [any changes to the national registry to prevent a discrepancy from reoccurring,][and the resolution of any previously identified question[s] of implementation pertaining to transactions, as required by paragraph 17 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1.]]

4.3.2 National registry

Observations and recommendations related to the national registry's performance, and any relevant changes applied during the reported period are summarized in paragraph 2.b.1 below. Assessment language for paragraph 2.b.1 is provided for the cases where the Party reported changes and this is verified, where the Party reported no changes and this is verified, where the Party reported changed but the reported changes were incomplete, and where the Party reported no changes but changes were identified by the SIAR. In each case, the assessor should include the relevant paragraph below amending the content to include or exclude text in [square brackets] as appropriate, replacing instructional text appearing within {curly braces} with reference content, and replacing **bold text** with the relevant information.

Paragraph 2.b.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.

If the Party reported changes and the changes are verified by the SIAR

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 problems related to the changes: {list problems}. The SIAR assessor recommends that **Party** address [this][these] problem[s] and to report the results in its next annual submission.]

If the Party reported no changes and this is verified by the SIAR

[**Party** reported no change in its national registry compared with the previous annual submission. The SIAR assessor 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.]

If the Party reported changes but the SIAR identified that the reported changes are incomplete

Party reported [a change][changes] in its national registry compared with the previous annual submission. [However, the SIAR has identified [a change][changes] in the national registry not fully reported by the Party. In response to questions raised by the SIAR during the review, the Party acknowledged the following changes in the national registry: {list changes}.] The SIAR assessor concluded that, taking into account the confirmed change[s] in the national registry, **Party**'s national registry [continues to][is not able to fully] perform [the functions set out in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1][and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1][nor continues to adhere to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems in accordance with relevant CMP decisions][, and a question of implementation regarding the national system is listed in section **XXX**)]. The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party in its next annual submission report any and all change(s) in its national registry in accordance with section I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1.

If the Party reported no changes, but the SIAR identified one or more changes

Party reported no change in its national registry compared with the previous annual submission. [However, the SIAR has identified [a change][changes] in the national registry not reported by the Party. In response to questions raised by the SIAR during the review, the Party acknowledged the following changes in the national registry: {list changes}]. The SIAR assessor concluded that, taking into account the confirmed change[s] in the national registry, **Party**'s national registry [continues to][is not able to fully] perform [the functions set out in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1][and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1][nor continues to adhere to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems in accordance with relevant CMP decisions][, and a question of implementation regarding the national system is listed in section **XXX**)]. The SIAR assessor 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.

4.3.3 Calculation of commitment period reserve

Observations and recommendations related to the Party's calculation of its commitment period reserve are summarized in paragraph 2.c.1 below. The assessor should include the relevant paragraphs below amending the content to include or exclude text in [square brackets] as appropriate, replacing instructional text appearing within {curly braces} with reference content, and replacing **bold text** with the relevant information.

Paragraph 2.c.1

Party has [not] reported its commitment period reserve in its 2011 annual submission. [The SIAR assessor recommends that **Party** include information on its commitment period reserve in its next annual submission.]

4.3.4 Publically available information

Paragraph 2.d.1

Paragraph 2.d.1 covers decision 22/CMP.1, para. 115 (f) and is related to the availability of public information. In terms of SIAR, any facts arising from the following sections should be reflected in this paragraph:

- P1.3.7, P1.4.1, P1.4.2, P1.4.3, P1.4.4
- P2.3.7, P2.3.8

If no issue is identified with regard to public information, the following standard paragraph should be used:

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.

If completeness issues are identified with regard to public information

The national registry has not fulfilled the requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decisions 13/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor recommends that Party include {list unavailable required public information}.

4.4 Additional Recommendations

If the assessor has recommendations that are not covered by the preceding paragraphs, or are of such significance that they should be strongly reiterated, these should be brought to the attention of the Expert Review Team as additional paragraph(s) included under the Recommendations heading at the end of the response to P2.2.1. The recommendations here may reiterate those recommendations that are documented in Section 4.2 of the Part 2 assessment template that have not been addressed by the end of the assessment cycle. In addition, if any previous year Expert Review Team recommendations have not been addressed by the Party, these items should be highlighted here. Please note that minor recommendations documented in Section 4.2 do not be reiterated under the Recommendations heading at the end of the response to P2.2.1. If a paragraph is included for this reason, the recommendation should be phrased accordingly: "The SIAR assessor reiterates the previous ERT recommendation and recommends that the Party <insert recommendation>".

5.0 Identification of Problems

When completing this section of the template, the assessor should use the comment field for each requirement to indicate whether problems have been identified or not. When a problem is identified, the comment should indicate:

1. A problem has been identified to indicate the nature of the problem identified;

2. There is a mismatch between information reported by the ITL and the national registry.

The assessment described in P.2.2.10.1 to P.2.2.10.5 and P.2.2.11.1 to P.2.2.11.5 is repeated for each discrepancy or non-replacement as applicable.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.2.1	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 Part1 (kept here for completeness). Insert a comment if there was a resubmission by Party.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance

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 transaction log;	Check the SEF Comparison Report (SIAR Reporting Requirement for ITL, report R-1) that there is a match between the ITL information and the latest SEF submission information from the Party and note any differences highlighted in the report. If no differences are identified, tick **No**.
		
		If differences are identified, tick **Yes**. In this case, the assessor must perform an investigation in collaboration with the RSA to explain any difference between the ITL SEF data and the registry SEF data. The investigation should first determine whether the difference has been resolved. If not, investigate if:
		
		  a) The national registry has a problem with accounting Kyoto Protocol units;
		
		  b) The national registry has a problem reporting Kyoto Protocol units correctly in its SEF submission;
		
		  c) The ITL has a problem with accounting Kyoto Protocol units;
		
		  d) The ITL has a problem reporting Kyoto Protocol units correctly in the SEF comparison report.
		
		If an issue is found with the accounting of Kyoto Protocol units by the national registry (case a, b) mark that a problem is identified against this requirement and in the overall assessment that a problem is found with the Party's national registry and put in the comment field the exact nature of the problem.
		
		Otherwise (c, d) put in the comment field the exact nature of the problem. Clearly indicate that there is no problem for accounting Kyoto Protocol units with the national registry.
		
		If values in table 2(b) differs between the registry and the ITL then the assessor should note the difference as a comment in the comments column and recommend a resolution for the inconsistency.
		
		SEF Comparison Report Table 2a, 2b, 3 and 5 should be considered when reviewing compliance with this requirement.

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;	SEF Comparison Report Table 2b should be considered when reviewing compliance with this requirement. Check whether the national registry data matches the ITL data for all registries. If there are no differences, tick **No**. Otherwise, tick **Yes**. If values in table 2(b) differs between the registry and the ITL then the assessor should note the difference as a comment in the comments column and recommend a resolution of the inconsistency.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.2.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(d) The information relating to acquisitions of CERs, tCERs, and lCERs 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;	SEF Comparison Report Table 2b should be considered when reviewing compliance with this requirement. Check whether the national registry data matches the ITL data for the CDM registry only. If there are no differences, tick **No**. Otherwise, tick **Yes**.

If values in table 2(b) differs between the registry and the ITL then the assessor should note the difference as a comment in the comments column and recommend a resolution of the inconsistency. |
| | | |
| 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; | Check [RRITL], report R-2 and compare the average number of discrepancies per transaction reported for the registry with the average number of discrepancies per transaction for all registries; Check if the Party registry figures significantly exceed the average figures reported by all registries. If this is not the case, tick **No**.

If this is the case, tick **Yes** as the registry does not perform in accordance with the modalities of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. This metric serves as evidence that transactions were carried out, but not in conformance to the decisions. This assessment would be triggered by evidence of systematic non-compliance with the DES, shown by inconsistencies in the SEF.

When performing the assessment the assessors should utilise Section 8 - Common Discrepancies; Section 9 - Common Response Codes; and Section 10 – Out-of-Sequence Message Handling, of this document, as additional information for the assessment of discrepancies and correct course of action. Certain response codes in specific circumstances are not considered discrepancies and therefore should not be reflected as **Yes** in P2.2.5. However, the comment should reflect the assessors interpretation based on Sections 8-10.

Determining significance

To determine whether the Party's figures significantly exceed the average, check the column "within Control limits for the reported year" on report R-2. This column indicates whether the figure reported by the registry is within three standard deviations of the average registry's figure. If the column value is "No", this indicates that the discrepancy is more often reported by the Party than by the average registry. |

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.2.6	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(f) tCERs and lCERs 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;	Check [RRITL], report R-2 and compare the average number of discrepancies per transaction reported by the registry with the average number of discrepancies per transaction for all registries; Check if the Party registry figures significantly exceed the average figures reported by all registries. If this is not the case, tick **No**. If this is the case, tick **Yes** as the registry does not perform in accordance with the modalities of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. This metric serves as evidence that transactions were carried out, but not in conformance to the decisions. This assessment would be triggered by evidence of systematic non-compliance with the DES, shown by inconsistencies in the SEF. **When performing the assessment the assessors should utilise Section 8 - Common Discrepancies; Section 9 - Common Response Codes; and Section 10 – Out-of-Sequence Message Handling, of this document, as additional information for the assessment of discrepancies and correct course of action.** Certain response codes in specific circumstances are not considered discrepancies and therefore should not be reflected as **Yes** in P2.2.6. However, the comment should reflect the assessors interpretation based on Sections 8-10. <u>Determining significance</u> To determine whether the Party's figures significantly exceed the average, check the column "within Control limits for the reported year" on report R-2. This column indicates whether the figure reported by the registry is within three standard deviations of the average registry's figure. If the column value is "No", this indicates that the discrepancy is more often reported by the Party than by the average registry.
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;	Check the SEF comparison report ([RRITL] report R-1, Table 1) and apply the same procedure for reporting problems as the one outlined in 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(b) (P2.2.2) above. The ITL ensures the beginning totals in Table 1 of the year's SEF is consistent with the ending totals in Table 4 of the previous year's SEF. If there are no differences between the ITL data and Party's registry data, tick **No**. Otherwise, tick **Yes**.
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;	Not assessed under the SIAR. Only assessed by the ERT – kept here for completeness.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
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;	Not assessed under the SIAR. Only assessed by the ERT – 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:	*Report R-2 described in [RRITL] supports the assessments of paragraph 88(j).* This assessment should be made for each reported discrepancy. And for registries with multiple reported discrepancies the P2.2.10.x rows should be repeated for each discrepancy. Assessors should bear in mind that many discrepancies are systematic and recurrent for the same reason and have the same remedy. In the interest of efficiency and concise communication of assessments these should be only reported in one set of P2.2.10.x rows. From the same perspective, it is reasonable that a Party reports action to tackle systematic problems only once, and not for each occurrence. **When performing the assessment the assessors should utilise Section 8 - Common Discrepancies; Section 9 - Common Response Codes; and Section 10 – Out-of-Sequence Message Handling, of this document, as additional information for the assessment of discrepancies and correct course of action.** Tick **Yes** if a discrepancy has been identified in R2 in [RRITL]. Tick **No** if no discrepancies have been identified in R2 in [RRITL]
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;	If the ITL and the Party have reported the same discrepancy (see reports R-2 in [RRITL] and [RRREG]), than **Yes** should be reported for each discrepancy identified. Points P2.2.10.1 to P2.2.10.5 should be repeated for each discrepancy identified. Add a comment on the assessment template if necessary. Otherwise, an investigation should be performed with the purpose of confirming that the ITL correctly identified the discrepancy. A comment should be added for any such discrepancy containing the outcome of the investigation (confirming that the ITL was correct or not and if not, why). This should be **N/A** if no discrepancies have been identified in R-2 in [RRITL] **and** in R-2 in [RRREG].

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.2.10.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(ii) Assess whether the same type of discrepancy has occurred previously for that Party;	The number of previous occurrences is reported by the Party in report R-2 of [RRREG]. The average number of previous occurrences per year is reported by the Party in report R-2 of [RRREG]. The average number of previous occurrences per transaction is reported by the ITL in report R-2 of [RRITL]. Tick **N/A** if no discrepancies have been identified in report R-2 in [RRITL] **and** in report R-2 in [RRREG].
P2.2.10.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iii) Assess whether the transaction was completed or terminated;	There are two potential reasons why the ITL Report R-2 indicates a transaction status "Complete". They are: 1. The transaction completed normally but there were out-of-sequence messages subsequent to the ITL checking and completing the transaction. 2. There is a fault in the ITL allowing completion of a discrepant transaction. This is highly unlikely, with no evidence to-date this has ever occurred. The assessor should seek further details from the ITL Administrator if they believe that this is the case. In the first case the assessor should check the initial response to the transferring registry. If there were no discrepancies then see the section on out-of-sequence messages for recommendations concerning them. The final state of the transactions is reported by the Party in report R-2 of [RRREG] and by the ITL in report R-2 of [RRITL]. Add a comment if the final state is not "Complete" or "Terminated". This should be **N/A** if no discrepancies have been identified in R-2 in [RRITL] **and** in R-2 in [RRREG].
P2.2.10.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?	Verify that the Party has reported an action and/or change to address each discrepancy or that there is a clear statement that no discrepancy occurred and there no action and/or change were required. If the Party did not report actions to address discrepancies or prevent them from recurring and if the assessment of the discrepancies shows improvements can be made to prevent discrepancies from recurring, then the assessor should make a recommendation that the improvements should be made. This should be N/A if no discrepancies have been identified in R-2 in [RRITL] and in R-2 in [RRREG].

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
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, lCERs, AAUs and RMUs, the replacement of tCERs and lCERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAUs	Report R-2 of [RRREG], identifies the discrepancies related to the capacity of the registry to ensure accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units. If the discrepancy is listed in the relevant section of the reporting requirements, the assessment should identify the discrepancy as related to the accounting capacity of the registry. Add a comment on the assessment template if necessary. **When performing the assessment the assessors should utilise Section 8 - Common Discrepancies; Section 9 - Common Response Codes; and Section 10 – Out-of-Sequence Message Handling, of this document, as additional information for the assessment of discrepancies and correct course of action.** Certain response codes in specific circumstances are not considered discrepancies and therefore should not be reflected as **No** in P2.2.10.5. However, the comment should reflect the assessors interpretation based on Sections 8-10. This should be **N/A** if no discrepancies have been identified in R-2 in [RRITL] **and** in R-2 in [RRREG].
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 lCERs held by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall:	*Report R-4 of [RRREG] supports the review of non-replacements for registries.* *Report R-3 of [RRITL] supports the review of non-replacements for the ITL* This should be **Yes** if instances of non-replacement have been identified in R-3 in [RRITL] and/or in R-4 in [RRREG] This should be **No** if no non-replacements have been identified in R-3 in [RRITL] **and** in R-4 in [RRREG].
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;	Verify that: • All non-replacements listed in report R-4 of [RRREG] are also listed in report R-3 of [RRITL]. • All non-replacement listed in report R-3 of [RRITL] are also listed in report R-4 of [RRREG] If there is a difference, add a new column to the ITL report on non-replacements identifying the gap. Points P2.2.11.1 to P2.2.11.5 should be repeated for each non-replacement identified. This should be **N/A** if no non-replacements have been identified in R-3 in [RRITL] **and** in R-4 in [RRREG].

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.2.11.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(ii) Assess whether non-replacement has occurred previously for that Party;	SIAR assessor should ask the ITL team of the UNFCCC Secretariat to check whether non-replacements were reported in report R-3 of [RRITL] or report R-4 of [RREG] for previous years. The SIAR assessor should report the results of this research as **Yes** if there were non-replacements in previous years and **No** if there were not. This should be **N/A** if no non-replacements have been identified in R-3 in [RRITL] **and** in R-4 in [RRREG].
P2.2.11.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(iii) Assess whether the replacement was subsequently undertaken;	The column "number of units outstanding to fulfil the notification" at the "post target date" of reports R-3 of [RRITL] and R-4 of [RRREG] provide information on subsequent fulfilments of the replacement requirements. This should be **N/A** if no non-replacements have been identified in R-3 in [RRITL] **and** in R-4 in [RRREG].
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;	Party may provide an explanation together with report R-4 of [RRREG] or report R-3 of [RRITL]. Use the comment column in the template for detailing the result of the examination following a non-replacement. This should be **N/A** if no non-replacements have been identified in R-3 in [RRITL] **and** in R-4 in [RRREG].
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, lCERs, AAUs and RMUs, and the replacement of tCERs and lCERs, and if so, initiate a thorough review of the registry system in accordance with part V of these guidelines.	An additional column could be added to report R-3 of [RRITL] detailing whether the examination of a case of non-replacement led to the conclusion that the registry is unable to properly account for Kyoto Protocol units. This should be **N/A** if no non-replacements have been identified in R-3 in [RRITL] **and** in R-4 in [RRREG].

5.1 Assessor Guidance on Recommendations

For each problem identified, the assessor makes recommendations for consideration by the Expert Review Team. The recommendations must have the following elements:

- The nature of the problem including a reference to the review requirement;
- What concrete measures that Party needs to take to fully address the problem;
- The time frame the Party needs to execute the measures; and
- How the Party needs to demonstrate its success in executing the measures.

5.2 Identification of Significant Changes

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
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	Checked in the SIAR Part 1. No assessment is required as this is not considered a significant change.
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	If the party has reported a change for this item, tick **Yes** in the column labelled 'Has the Party reported a change'. Otherwise, tick **No** and leave the column labelled 'Problem Identified with the Change' empty. If a change has been reported, assess if it is considered a significant change. • If deemed a significant change, assess the nature of the change and the supplied documentation is in accordance with the readiness documentation available in [RGREG] and ensure adherence to these guidelines. If these materials are provided and are acceptable, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column. Otherwise, tick **Yes** in this column. If not deemed a significant change, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
P2.3.3	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(c) A description of the database structure and capacity of the national registry.	If the party has reported a change for this item, tick **Yes** in the column labelled 'Has the Party reported a change'. Otherwise, tick **No** and leave the column labelled 'Problem Identified with the Change' empty. If a change has been reported, assess if it is considered a significant change. • If deemed a significant change assess the nature of the change and the supplied documentation is in accordance with the readiness documentation available in [RGREG] and ensure adherence to these guidelines. If the Party has confirmed that a significant change has occurred then the supplied documentation must cover the criteria laid out in section 5. 'Highlighted readiness documentation' below. This is to confirm that the Registry has carried out sufficient planning, implementation and testing to ensure smooth implementation and operation of the change. Only the relevant parts of section 5 will be required, those appropriate to the change. I.e. a change to the Disaster Recovery within the Registry will require the corresponding Disaster Recovery part of the Readiness documentation. The highlighted areas in section 5 are the mandatory minimum that must be addressed. If these materials are provided and are acceptable, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column. Otherwise, tick **Yes** in this column. • If not deemed a significant change, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column.
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)	If the party has reported a change for this item, tick **Yes** in the column labelled 'Has the Party reported a change'. Otherwise, tick **No** and leave the column labelled 'Problem Identified with the Change' empty. If a change has been reported, assess if it is considered a significant change. • If deemed a significant change assess the nature of the change and that the supplied documentation is in accordance with the readiness documentation available in [RGREG] and ensure adherence to these guidelines. If these materials are provided and are acceptable, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column. Otherwise, tick **Yes** in this column. • If not deemed a significant change, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
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, lCERs, AAUs and/or RMUs, and replacement of tCERs and lCERs, 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	If the party has reported a change for this item, tick **Yes** in the column labelled 'Has the Party reported a change'. Otherwise, tick **No** and leave the column labelled 'Problem Identified with the Change' empty. If a change has been reported, assess if it is considered a significant change. • If deemed a significant change assess the nature of the change and that the supplied documentation is in accordance with the readiness documentation available in [RGREG] and ensure adherence to these guidelines. If these materials are provided and are acceptable, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column. Otherwise, tick **Yes** in this column. • If not deemed a significant change, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
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	If the party has reported a change for this item, tick **Yes** in the column labelled 'Has the Party reported a change'. Otherwise, tick **No** and leave the column labelled 'Problem Identified with the Change' empty. If a change has been reported, assess if it is considered a significant change. • If deemed a significant change assess the nature of the change and that the supplied documentation is in accordance with the readiness documentation available in [RGREG] and ensure adherence to these guidelines. If the Party has confirmed that a significant change has occurred then the supplied documentation must cover the criteria laid out in section 5. 'Highlighted readiness documentation' below. This is to confirm that the Registry has carried out sufficient planning, implementation and testing to ensure smooth implementation and operation of the change. Only the relevant parts of section 5 will be required, those appropriate to the change. I.e., a change to the Security procedures within the Registry will require the corresponding Security Plan part of the Readiness documentation to be updated and submitted. The highlighted areas in section 5 are the mandatory minimum that must be addressed. If these materials are provided and are acceptable, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column. Otherwise, tick **Yes** in this column. Changes to user-authentication method are considered significant. For the user-authentication mechanism section of the security plan, check that the Party reported on one of the recommended methods (see reporting guidance) and possibly on additional improvements. The recommended methods are deemed to meet the requirements of paragraphs 25 (b) and (c) of decision 24/CP.8. If a change related to user-authentication occurred but the Party did not refer to one of the recommended methods, assess carefully whether the method meets the requirements of paragraphs 25(b) and (c) of decision 24/CP.8. • If not deemed a significant change, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column.
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	Checked in the SIAR Part 1. No assessment required, as this is not considered a significant change.
P2.3.8	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(h) The Internet address of the interface to its national registry	Checked in the SIAR Part 1. No assessment required, as this is not considered a significant change.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
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	If the party has reported a change for this item, tick **Yes** in the column labelled 'Has the Party reported a change'. Otherwise, tick **No** and leave the column labelled 'Problem Identified with the Change' empty. If a change has been reported, assess if it is considered a significant change. • If deemed a significant change assess the nature of the change and that the supplied documentation is in accordance with the readiness documentation available in [RGREG] and ensure adherence to these guidelines. If the Party has confirmed that a significant change has occurred then the supplied documentation must cover the criteria laid out in section 5. 'Highlighted readiness documentation' below. This is to confirm that the Registry has carried out sufficient planning, implementation and testing to ensure smooth implementation and operation of the change. Only the relevant parts of section 5 will be required, those appropriate to the change. I.e. a change to the Disaster Recovery within the Registry will require the corresponding Disaster Recovery part of the Readiness documentation to be updated and submitted. The highlighted areas in section 5 are the mandatory minimum that must be addressed. If these materials are provided and are acceptable, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column. Otherwise, tick **Yes** in this column. • If not deemed a significant change, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessor Guidance
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.	If the party has reported a change for this item, tick **Yes** in the column labelled 'Has the Party reported a change'. Otherwise, tick **No** and leave the column labelled 'Problem Identified with the Change' empty. If a change has been reported, assess if it is considered a significant change. • If deemed a significant change assess the nature of the change and that the supplied documentation is in accordance with the readiness documentation available in [RGREG] and ensure adherence to these guidelines. If the Party has confirmed that a significant change has occurred then the supplied documentation must cover the criteria laid out in section 5. 'Highlighted readiness documentation' below. This is to confirm that the Registry has carried out sufficient planning, implementation and testing to ensure smooth implementation and operation of the change. Only the relevant parts of section 5 will be required, those appropriate to the change. I.e., a change to the Test procedures within the Registry will require the corresponding Test Plan and Test Report parts of the Readiness documentation to be updated and submitted. The highlighted areas in section 5 are the mandatory minimum that must be addressed. If these materials are provided and are acceptable, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column. Otherwise, tick **Yes** in this column. • If not deemed a significant change, tick **No** in the 'Problem Identified with Change' column.

6.0 Highlighted Readiness Documentation

The information within the readiness documentation below is important and must be part of the readiness documentation set of the Party. Failure to provide this information must lead to a recommendation being issued.

The bold text represents the mandatory elements for each section that must be provided as a minimum when resubmitting the Readiness Documentation.

Database and Application Backup
Detailed backup plan for the production database and software.

The plan should include:

    a. **Scope or content of backup procedures** (i.e., database, application software, server logs, and application logs referred to in the section "Application Logging Documentation");

    b Identification of backup hardware and software;

    c. **Backup retention periods** (note that some application logs should be kept for a period of 15 years – see section 7 of the data exchange standards);

    d. **Frequency of database backups** (recommendation: minimum daily) and any method of rolling forward from the point of backup, for example using database log files;

    e. Personnel responsible for backup (including a primary individual and an alternate, or a staffing plan);

    f. Specific back up schedule and procedures e.g. backup is schedule at 23:00 each day and tapes removed and sent off site by 10:00 the following day;

    g. Identification of backup media and its location;

    h Strategy to monitor performance of backup tasks, including notification of backup failures, backup log review, spot checks, audit, management reporting.

Disaster Recovery Plan
Designed to enable Registry to survive in the event of catastrophic failure or disruption of the host environment and to re-establish normal business operations as quickly as possible.

The disaster recovery plan should include:

   a. Appropriate **strategies to ensure that critical operations can resume normal processing within a reasonable time frame;**

   b. Specific minimum hardware and software requirements to host the registry on a temporary basis;

       Data recovery procedures allowing backed up data to be recovered. The disaster recovery plan should be explicit regarding;

   c. **Which registry data can be recovered and to which point in time it can be recovered**;

   d. Methods used for ensuring data backups and database logs used for recovery are available on the recovery site. Should clearly state if automated tools, such as data replication tools, are used to support this;

   e. Which registry data may be lost during when a disaster occurs;

   f. **Periodic testing strategy to demonstrate the effectiveness of the disaster recovery plan**;

   g. **Expectation for time frame in which registry could begin operation following a disaster** – dependent on the volume of transactions, cost and other factors and is not expected to be the same for each registry;

   h. Contingency planning, for the eventuality that the primary facility cannot perform required daily operations, should address;

   i. Identification of off-site facility with adequate disk space/storage and availability to serve as an emergency hosting environment;

   j. Off-site location of documentation and procedure manuals, as well as any paper-based forms, necessary to deploy under a Disaster Recovery scenario;

   k. Roles and responsibilities for primary and alternate personnel at the offsite location;

   l. Communication mechanisms to notify all appropriate parties that a contingency plan is in effect (i.e., ITL, other registries or users).

Security Plan
Defined in order to protect the application and data from unrestricted and unsolicited use.

Access to Registry data should be secured at multiple levels to ensure redundancy of protection:

a. Server security: Web and/or database server should be secured use authenticated access, appropriate assignment of roles and associated rights and also physically secured to prevent unauthorized access to the data and application;

b. User-authentication security: ensures no unauthenticated access to information in the registry. This can be accomplished by requiring unique user id's and passwords that are regularly maintained by a Systems Administrator, or more sophisticated means involving physical tokens;

c. Session security: ensures that data is not intercepted as it is broadcast over the Internet. This is accomplished by encrypting data passed to and from the registry;

d. The security plan should;

e. Define rules & responsibilities for security, recognizing that actions by persons are the most significant contributing factor to the success or failure of security planning;

f. Assign a network and database administrator;

g. **Describe arrangements for personnel screening**;

h. **Determine who has physical access to the registry Web, Back End and/or Database servers;**

i. Determine which audit trails records activities at the Web, Back End and/or Database levels;

j. **Describe how communications are encrypted**: from the registry users to the registry, from the ITL to the registry and between the registry nodes if applicable;

k. **Describe firewalls and anti-virus measures;**

l. **Describe the password policy (length, formation, duration);**

m. **Describe private keys protection policies;**

n. **Describe how user IDs and passwords are removed or invalidated after users have become inactive**.

o. **Describe which method is used for user-authentication security**

Application Logging Documentation

The data exchange standards define information that a registry must log and keep for extended periods of time.

The documentation should include:

   a. **A description of the registry data model or file structures used to maintain a transaction log, as defined in section 7.1 of the data exchange standard;**

   b. A description of the registry data model or file structures used to maintain a reconciliation history log, as defined in section 7.2 of the data exchange standard;

   c. **A description of the registry data model or file structures used to maintain a notification log, as defined in section 7.3 of the data exchange standard;**

   d. **A description of the registry data model or file structures used to maintain an internal audit log, as defined in section 7.4 of the data exchange standard;**

   e. A description of naming convention, medium of storage used to store messages sent and received by the registry, in accordance with section 7.5 of the data exchange standard;

   f. Activity logging that is utilized to track unauthorized attempts to log on to the server as well as general usage;

   g. Assignment of personnel to review activity logs on a regular basis;

   h. A description of the personnel and procedures used to review application logs.

Time Validation Plan

A registry must define and follow specific procedures to validate server time on a periodic basis, for successful data exchange

The plan should include:

   a. **Identification of the client software or hardware used as NTP client;**

   b. **Version of NTP used;**

   c. Process and frequency of clock correction used and tolerance for discrepancies;

   d. Identification of NTP time server(s);

   e. Assignment of personnel to perform or monitor time validation;

   f. Process used to detect and escalate failures in the NTP process, for example, to correct clocks, identify excess time drift, identify disagreement between servers and communications failures;

   g. Process for adjusting time in case the time validation process is out of control.

Version Change Management
A clear migration path should exist to upgrade from version to version of registry software and database schemas.

The Version Change Management Plan should include:

a. A description of how the registry software (binaries and source code if applicable) is versioned and kept track of (naming conventions, directory structures, use of version control system);

b. A description of how all documentation pertaining to the registry software is versioned and kept track of;

c. A description of how changes to the registry software are tracked from their inception to their closure;

d. **A description of how changes to the registry software are notified to the registry users, the ITL and relevant STL(s) once they are deployed in production;**

e. A description of how new versions of registry software are tested prior to their deployment in production. This should include a description of pre-production environments, whether and how test plans are established for the change and whether and how test reports are produced.

Test Plan
Ensures that a registry has performed testing prior to implementing changes to the live registry.

The test plan describes the various levels and types of testing that will be done throughout development. It should include:

a. **Description of overall test strategy, testing procedures and available or foreseen test documentation;**

b. Identification of Testing tools;

c. Assignment of personnel to perform testing of the software, both on the initial release and for an upgrade in hardware or software;

d. Description of test environment(s) and how these environment(s) are managed to ensure that results of testing in test environment(s) replicate the results expected in the production environment;

e. Evidence that the plan provides for systematic testing in logical order of all module subsystem, and system requirements against a well-defined set of test cases
;
f. Evidence of testing of all user roles supported by the registry (administrator, public user…);

g. Identification of the test cases that form part of regression tests which are performed on each release;

h. Description of how test logs are produced and kept. Test logs should contain information on which test cases were run, who run them, at which time, and whether the test case passed or failed; if a test case fails, a reference or description of the incident should be provided;

i. A description of how incidents following testing are reported and kept track of. Incidents occur when the expected outcome of a test case do not match the actual outcome.

Test Report Provides evidence that a registry has performed testing	

The test report details the various levels and types of testing that have been completed throughout development. It should include:
 	
   a. **A summary of all tests that were executed as part of the test plan.** The summary should include the number of test cases executed and the number of test cases where an incident was detected;
 	
   b. For each test case: who ran the test, when and whether it passed or failed;
 	
   c. For each test case where an incident was reported: the description or reference to the incident.	

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Previous Expert Review Team Recommendations

This section assesses Party's response to the previous annual review recommendations. For each recommendation from the previous annual review, template reference P2.4.1.x. the assessor checks to see if it has been fully addressed.

Recommendation from previous Annual Review report (with ref)	This should be a summary of the recommendation as made to the Party along with a unique recommendation reference. Any recommendations from previous annual review report must include the recommendation reference and must quote the full document reference, for example FCCC/ARR/2008/FRA for the Report of the review of the initial report of France dated 26 March 2009.
Has Party acted on recommendation?	The assessors should read the Party's submission and assess whether or not the recommendation has been acted satisfactorily upon.
Comment	Any comments on the recommendations that are not for inclusion in final report.

7.2 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.

For each recommendation the assessor needs to provide three items of information.

Recommendation Ref	Insert a new reference to the recommendation – this reference will be used to keep track of the recommendations in subsequent submission by the Party and reviews by the external assessor. The "recommendation ref" in section 4.2 of SIAR Part 2 should be filled in with the reference to the sections within Part 1 or Part 2 assessment (ex. P2.3.7, P2.3.9).

Recommendation description	The recommendation described using terms the expert review team can understand, bearing in mind the ERT might use the recommendation text as it is. Recommendations should be well structured with clear statements of the observed behaviour, the assessment, what needs to be done to rectify the issue and a deadline for the completion of the recommendation. Below are 2 examples; **Example 1:** The external assessor identified some minor limitations regarding **changes to the registry.** Because of the change to a new software release, the submission should include test plans and test results to demonstrate that the registry system continues to work correctly and in compliance with the technical standards. Therefore, it is recommended that the Party submits these complementary documents by dd-mmm-yyyy **Example 2:** The external assessor identified some a minor limitation regarding the lack of information on the Commitment Period Reserve, as required in 15/CMP.1 annex I.E, paragraph 18. Therefore, it is recommended that the Party submits these complementary documents by dd-mmm-yyyy. **Example 3**: The external assessor, in review of Report R-4 of [RRITL], identified that there was an above average number of reconciliation inconsistencies detected in the national registry. It is recommended that the Party take action to reduce the number of inconsistencies.
Comment	Any comments on the recommendation that are not for inclusion in final report.

8.0 Common Discrepancies

The following table of response codes should be used as additional information when performing the assessment of 1) the ITL's report R-2 as described in [RRITL] and 2) the Party's report as described in [RRREG] .

Discrepancies are reported both by the registries and the ITL. The table below lists the discrepancies and provides further details on their meaning.

Response Code	DES Meaning	Notes
3005	For this transaction an acceptNotification with status of Completed or Terminated was received by the ITL for a transaction for which the ITL or CITL had already detected a discrepancy.	As of DES version 1.1.2 (Annex E version 1.1.5), messages using out-of-sequence response codes have been discontinued and should not be used. If this is received during the normal DES transaction message sequence this indicates a significant flaw in the registry that should be reported as a problem/discrepancy. If out-of-sequence responses have also been recorded for the transaction received it is highly likely this response is due to the out-of-sequence message handling, see below, and should not be reported as a problem/discrepancy.
4003	For this transaction an acceptProposal containing unit blocks not held by the registry was received by the ITL.	This response can be given for several reasons. 1. The unit blocks are in the process of being acquired by the registry, but the external transfer has yet to complete. In this case the transaction will also have a 4010 response code. This is due to a limitation in the DES message model for external transfers and should not be reported as a problem/discrepancy. 2. The unit blocks are in the process of being acquired by the registry, but the external transfer was subsequently cancelled. This is due to a flaw in the DES message model for external transfers and should not be reported as a problem/discrepancy. If out-of-sequence responses have also been recorded for the transaction received it is highly likely this response is due to the out-of-sequence message handling, see below.

Response Code	DES Meaning	Notes
4010	For this transaction an acceptProposal containing unit blocks that are subject to an ongoing transaction was received by the ITL.	This response can be given for several reasons. 1. The unit blocks are in the process of being acquired by the registry, but the external transfer has yet to complete. In this case the transaction will also have a 4003 response code. This is due to a flaw in the DES message model for external transfers and should not be reported as a problem/discrepancy. 2. The unit blocks are subject of an ongoing transaction in the ITL but were completed in the registry. This is due to the fact the transferring registry completes prior to the ITL in the DES message flow and hence this should not be reported as a problem/discrepancy. If out-of-sequence responses have also been recorded for the transaction received it is highly likely this response is due to the out-of-sequence message handling, see below.

9.0 Common Response Codes

These response codes are not viewed as discrepancies, and do not reflect on the ability of a Party's registry to account correctly. These would not normally give rise to any form of input in to the review process, but are reported to provide context for the discrepancies that do arise. In isolation they should not be reported as problems. If they exceeded the control limits a recommendation can be made to reduce the number of occurrences of the problems. These discrepancies can be indicators of a problem with a registry and when taken in conjunction other factors, *might* indicate significant problem.

Example recommendation text regarding responses that exceed the control limits where the assessor feels and improvement can be made:

The assessor notes that the national registry has proposed a significant number of transactions that received response code nnnn as a result of the verification by the international transaction log, where response code is documented in Annex E of the Data Exchange Standards for Registry Systems under the Kyoto Protocol Technical Specifications. The national registry should be capable of preventing the submission of such proposals by improvements to the validation performed by the national registry. The assessor recommends the Party improves their national registry to eliminate this response from the ITL.

Response Code	DES Meaning	Notes
1514	For this transaction an acceptNotification with status of Completed or Terminated was received by the ITL for a transaction from a registry that did not initiate a transaction.	If out-of-sequence responses have also been recorded for the transaction it is highly likely this response is due to the out-of-sequence message handling, see below. If this is received during the normal DES transaction message sequence and there are no out-of-sequence response this probably indicates a flaw in the registry that has: • The registry under review attempted to finalize the wrong transaction. • The registry under review sent the wrong status for the correct transaction. • Another registry is attempted to finalize the transaction.
3001	For this transaction two or more acceptProposal messages have been received	This can indicate a flaw in the registry software that allows multiple proposals to be sent with the same transaction ID. In practice it occurs when a transferring registry does not believe a proposal has been successfully sent to the ITL and it is sent again.
3003	For this transaction an acceptNotification with a completed status has been sent by the transferring registry after the transaction had been completed.	This can indicate a flaw in the registry software that allows a transaction to be completed multiple times. In practice it occurs when a transferring registry does not believe a transaction has been successfully completed by the ITL and it is sends the completion message again.

Response Code	DES Meaning	Notes
3013	For this transaction an acceptNotification with this Transaction ID has been sent be the transferring registry after the transaction was finalized.	This can indicate a flaw in the registry software that allows a transaction to be finalized several times with different final states. In practice it occurs when an out-of-sequence set of messages are sent after transaction completion. Since the ITL does not change the final state of transactions this has no material impact on the accounting within the system.
3016	For this transaction and acceptNotification from the acquiring registry was received when the transaction was found to have a discrepancy by the STL.	This check is highly unlikely to occur in practice since the acquiring registry is not informed of the transactions if it has a discrepancy and check 1513 prevents registries other than the acquiring registry accepting a transaction proposal. The implementation of this check actually looks for a most recent status of STL Checked(No Discrepancy), which often leads it occurring in conjunction with 3013 response code.
4007	The transaction proposal was for an external transfer but the Initiating and Acquiring Registries were the same.	This indicates poor validation of external transfers by a registry and a recommendation should be made to improve this validation to ensure external transfer proposals always have different transferring and acquiring registries.
4008	Units identified in the transaction must not have inconsistencies identified through reconciliation with the ITL.	This simply means a proposal was sent in involving one or more unit blocks that are have been highlighted as inconsistent with one or more registries. No investigation is required.
5904	Transaction inconsistent with Party policy.	This code is given by the acquiring registry and no investigation is required.

10.0 Out-of-Sequence Message Handling

The production operation of the Registry System has shown the handling of out-of-sequence messages leads to large numbers of response due to technical reasons. These responses do not indicate accounting flaws in the registries or transaction log, but more where the standards pertaining to the handling of out-of-sequence messages needs to be improved. There is consensus on the need for improvement and work is underway to improve the DES following the common operational procedures of the RSA Forum. In the SIAR assessment, response codes arising from out-of-sequence message flows should not be flagged as indicating a problem with a Party's national registry in P2.1.2.

If a registry exceeds the control limits with respect to response codes in the 3000 to 3999 range then a standard recommendation should be made in P2.2.1 and P2.4.2.x:

> *The assessor notes that the international transaction log has recorded response codes in the range 3000 to 3999. This range of response codes, documented in Annex E of the Data Exchange Standards for Registry Systems under the Kyoto Protocol Technical Specifications (DES), indicate that the national registry has sent a significant number of messages to the international transaction log that do not strictly comply to the message sequences mandated in the DES. The assessor recommends that the Party takes action to reduce the number of out-of-sequence messages sent by their national registry.*