



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

Standard Independent Assessment Report
Assessment Report
Part 2 - Substance

Reference:	IAR/2010/POL/2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	16/08/2011
Prepared by:	Helena Rimsa/MEPRD		
Reviewed by:	Bryan Eckstein & John Bedard/SRA International, Inc.		
Approved by:	Heidi McKenna/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
Helena Rimsa/Assessor	MEPRD	Action
Bryan Eckstein/Reviewer	SRA International, Inc.	Action
Przemyslaw Jedrysiak/ RSA Main Contact	The National Administration of the Emission Trading Scheme, Poland	Action
Heidi McKenna /Approval	UNFCCC	Action

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	03/07/2011	Initial draft
1.0	11/07/2011	Review of initial draft
1.1	08/08/2011	Updated draft with response from Party
2.0	16/08/2011	Approved version 2.0

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Poland	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2010	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	<p>Files provided by the Party:</p> <p>Ex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [SEF] SEF_PL_2011_2_14-53-8 5-5-2011.xls - [REPORTS] SIAR Reports 2010-PL v.1_2011.02.15.xlsx - [NIR] NIR 2011 Poland 15 April 2011.pdf - [RESPONSE1] Part1 response from Poland - [RESPONSE2] Part2 response from Poland 	<p>Files provided by the ITL Administrator:</p> <p>Ex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [SEFCR] SEF_PL_2011_2_14-53-8+5-5-2011-CR.xls -[RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2010_PL_v1.xls -[SIAR1] POL_SIAR_Part1_Assessment_Report_v2.0.docx
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2010/POL (04/04/2011)	

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction..... 4**
 - 1.1. Overall assessment4**
 - 1.2. Summary of findings.....5**
- 2. Identification of Problems..... 6**
- 3. Identification of Significant Changes.....11**
- 4. Recommendations.....14**
 - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations14**
 - 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems.....15**

1. Introduction

The SIAR Part 2 report assesses the substance of a Party's annual submission with regard to its national registry. Each section contains questions related to the specific items to be assessed.

1.1. Overall assessment

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment
P2.1.1	Is the information submitted by Party, in relation to its national registry, complete?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.2	Problem found with Party's national registry?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.3	Any unresolved problem with Party's national registry?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.4	Problems identified with the significant changes to the Party's national registry?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.5	National registry related recommendations from previous annual review were fully addressed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
P2.1.6	Is there any recommendation that needs to be addressed by the Party?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

1.2. Summary of findings

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
P2.2.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The information on Kyoto Protocol units has been reported in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and is accurate. The national registry continues to fulfill the requirements related to its reporting and accounting of information on Kyoto Protocol units, transaction procedures and conformance to the technical standards, public availability of information, security, data integrity and recovery measures. 2. Party has reported information on its accounting of Kyoto Protocol units in the required SEF tables, as required by decisions 15/CMP.1 and 14/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor reviewed the findings included in the SIAR on the SEF and the SEF comparison report. The SIAR was forwarded to the ERT prior to the review, pursuant to decision 16/CP.10. 3. Information on the accounting of Kyoto units has been prepared and reported in accordance with section I E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1, and reported in accordance with decision 14/CMP.1 using the SEF tables. 4. Information reported by Poland on records of any discrepancies was found to be consistent with information provided to the secretariat by the ITL. Poland has reported on corrective action undertaken to reduce number of occurrence of discrepancies between Polish registry and ITL through the implementation of new functionality: New Message Flow. 5. Poland provided access to information from its national registry that substantiated or clarified the information reported in its annual submission. 6. Poland reported changes in its national registry compared with the previous annual submission. However, the SIAR has identified changes in the national registry not fully reported by the Party. In response to questions raised by the SIAR during the review, Poland acknowledged the following changes in the national registry: implementation of new functionality and change in publicly accessible information. The SIAR assessor concluded that, taking into account the confirmed changes in the national registry, Poland'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. The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party in its next annual submission reports complete and unambiguous information of all change(s) in its national registry in accordance with section I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. 7. Poland has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2010 annual submission.

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
	<p>8. 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.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>9. The SIAR assessor reiterates the previous ERT recommendation and recommends that Poland report, in its next annual submission, the actions taken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur or any changes to the national registry to prevent a discrepancy from reoccurring in accordance with paragraph 17 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1.</p>

2. Identification of Problems

The purpose of this section is to identify any problems with the national registry based on the Party's annual submission and transaction log records that may affect the performance of the functions of the national registry pursuant to paragraph 88 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(a) The information is complete and submitted in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP;	Assessed in SIAR Part 1. Kept here for completeness	
P2.2.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(b) The information relating to issuance, cancellations, retirement, transfers, acquisitions, replacement and carry-over is consistent with information contained in the national registry of the Party concerned and with the records of the transactions log;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.
P2.2.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(c) The information relating to transfers and acquisitions between national registries is consistent with the information contained in the national registry of the	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.

	Party concerned and with the records of the transaction log, and with information reported by the other Parties involved in the transactions;		
P2.2.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(d) The information relating to acquisitions of CERs, tCERs, and ICERs from the CDM registry is consistent with the information contained in the national registry of the Party concerned and with the records of the transaction log, and with the clean development mechanism (CDM) registry;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.
P2.2.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(e) ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs have been issued, acquired, transferred, cancelled, retired, or carried over to the subsequent or from the previous commitment period in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No discrepancies occurred for the Party and no problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs.
P2.2.6	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(f) tCERs and ICERs have been issued, acquired, transferred, cancelled, retired and replaced, in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No discrepancies occurred for the Party and no problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to tCERs and ICERS.
P2.2.7	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(g) The information reported under paragraph 11 (a) of section I.E. in the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 on the quantities of units in accounts at the beginning of the year is consistent with information submitted the previous year, taking into account any corrections made to such information, on the quantities of units in accounts at the end of the previous year;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records and with information submitted in the year prior to the reported year.
P2.2.8	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(h) The required level of the commitment period reserve, as reported, is calculated in accordance with paragraph 6 of the annex to decision 18/CP.7;	Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness	

P2.2.9	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(i) The assigned amount is calculated to avoid double accounting in accordance with paragraph 9 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1;	Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness	
P2.2.10	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j) A discrepancy has been identified by the transaction log relating to transactions initiated by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall:	Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? [x] Yes [] No	The ITL identified in its [RRITL] ten transactions corresponding to DES response codes specified as discrepancies. Poland reported in its [REPORTS] these ten transactions that were considered discrepant according to applicable DES response codes. These transactions were terminated with three response codes: 4003, 4010 and 5103. NOTE: The ITL Administrator is aware that response codes 4003 and 4010 can occur under normal circumstances due to the DES transaction message flow model utilized in ITL releases prior to version 2.0. An improved DES transaction message model was deployed in ITL v2.0 in Q4 of 2010, and this has reduced the number of occurrences dramatically. The 4003 and 4010 codes were correctly reported by the party, but are not be assessed as discrepancies
Repeat for each	P2.2.10.1 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(i) Verify that the discrepancy has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log;	Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? [x] Yes [] No []N/A	Discrepant transactions with response code 5103 were reported by the ITL in [RRITL] and Poland [REPORTS].

P2.2.10. 2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(ii) Assess whether the same type of discrepancy has occurred previously for that Party;	Has the same type of discrepancy occurred previously for that Party? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The discrepant transactions with response code 5103 occurred for Poland in previous year as reported during last year's review.
P2.2.10. 3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iii) Assess whether the transaction was completed or terminated;	Was the transaction completed or terminated? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	1 transaction reported as discrepant with transaction code 5103 was terminated.
P2.2.10. 4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?	Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	Poland reported in its [NIR] that new functionality was implemented in its registry – New Message Flow, to minimize occurrences of discrepancies such as those triggering response codes 4003 and 4010. However, it is not clear what problem caused response code 5103 to be triggered or if any change is required to prevent a reoccurrence. In [RESPONSE2] Poland gave the response that the response code occurred due to mistaken actions of account's user that did choose wrong party code when proceeding the transaction although there are several procedures implemented to avoid any mistakes such as teaching videos, warning messages wtc.
P2.2.10. 5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(v) Assess whether the problem that caused the discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, issuance, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERS, ICERs, AAUs and RMUs, the replacement of tCERS and ICERs, and the carry-over of ERUs, CERs and AAUs	Discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The discrepancy is not assumed as related to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
P2.2.11	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k) Any record of non-replacement has been sent to the Party by the transaction log in relation to tCERs or ICERs held by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall:	Any tCERs or ICERs subject to non-replacement held by Party? [] Yes [x] No	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.	
Repeat for each non-replacement type (incl Type number	P2.2.11.1	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(i) Verify that the non-replacement has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log;	Has the transaction log identified the non-replacement? [] Yes [] No [x] N/A	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(ii) Assess whether non-replacement has occurred previously for that Party;	Has this type of non-replacement previously occurred for that Party? [] Yes [] No [x] N/A	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(iii) Assess whether the replacement was subsequently undertaken;	Was the replacement subsequently undertaken? [] Yes [] No [x] N/A	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(iv) Examine the cause of the non-replacement and whether the Party has corrected the problem that caused the non-replacement;	Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the non-replacement? [] Yes [] No [x] N/A	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.11.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(v) Assess whether the problem that caused the non-replacement relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation, and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs, AAUs and RMUs, and the replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and if so, initiate a thorough review of the registry system in accordance with part V of these guidelines.	Non-replacement relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting? [] Yes [] No [x] N/A	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.

3. Identification of Significant Changes

The purpose of this section is to identify any **significant changes** in the national registry reported by the Party that may affect the performance of the functions contained in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and the adherence to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems in accordance with relevant COP/MOP decisions.

If a change to a Party's national registry has been identified under paragraph 22 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 then information relating to this change should be submitted by the Party in accordance with paragraph 32 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. This section assesses the submitted changes reported by Party in accordance with paragraph 32 of decision 15/CMP.1, and the further guidance elaborated in the Independent Assessment Report common operational procedure.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.1	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(a) The name and contact information of the registry administrator designated by the Party to maintain the national registry	Not a significant change, left here for completeness		
P2.3.2	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(b) The names of the other Parties with which the Party cooperates by maintaining their national registries in a consolidated system	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.
P2.3.3	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(c) A description of the database structure and capacity of the national registry.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.4	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(d)</p> <p>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)</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Poland reported in its [NIR] that the software of its registry was upgraded to new version on May 2010. Registry communication to CITL was changed so after the upgrade the registry is using different type of messaging system.</p> <p>During the SIAR review it was found that there is no information about the results of the software change or testing results related to a second change to implement a New Message Flow, but Poland in its [RESPONSE] reported that the new functionality was implemented only in 2011.</p> <p>It is recommended to include in Poland's next annual submission:</p> <p>1) clear information about the full timing of upgrades made in Poland's national registry, as well as 2) the results of New Message Flow implementation and testing documentation.</p>
P2.3.5	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(e)</p> <p>A description of the procedures employed in the national registry to minimize discrepancies in the issuance, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs, AAUs and/or RMUs, and replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and of the steps taken to terminate transactions where a discrepancy is notified and to correct problems in the event of a failure to terminate the transactions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>
P2.3.6	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(f)</p> <p>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</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.7	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(g) A list of the information publicly accessible by means of the user interface to the national registry	Not a significant change, left here for completeness		
P2.3.8	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(h) The Internet address of the interface to its national registry	Not a significant change, left here for completeness		
P2.3.9	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(i) A description of measures taken to safeguard, maintain and recover data in order to ensure the integrity of data storage and the recovery of registry services in the event of a disaster	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.
P2.3.10	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(j) The results of any test procedures that might be available or developed with the aim of testing the performance, procedures and security measures of the national registry undertaken pursuant to the provisions of decision 19/CP.7 relating to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>In Chapter 13(h) of [NIR] Poland states that no changes have been made to the results of its test procedures.</p> <p>Still, as there were changes reported in Poland's national registry affecting communications between the national registry and the CITL, and the corresponding testing completed for the new version of the national registry is included in [NIR], it is believed that new test reports have been created. Also, from the e-mail from the CITL administrator reported in Annex 7 of [NIR], it can be understood that new test report was made as test report from the ETS compliance test performed on 19 April 2010 was examined by the European Commission (Cecile Pierce). Therefore, it is believed that test results have changed in the reported year.</p> <p>Poland in its [RESPONSE2] reported that the actual implementation of New Message Flow functionality occurred only in 2011 (outside the reporting period covered in the current SIAR) and that the full test results will be included in Poland's NIR next year. It is recommended that Poland report on any changes to its national registry in the next annual submission.</p>

4. Recommendations

4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations

This section assesses Party's response to the previous annual review recommendations.

Ref Nr	Recommendation from previous Annual Review report (with ref)	Has Party acted on recommendation?	Comment
P2.4.1.1	<p>As written in FCCC/ARR/2010/POL (04/04/2011), paragraph 111:</p> <p>However, the ERT noted from the SIAR that Poland did not provide, in its annual submission, information on actions undertaken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur and to prevent it from reoccurring, in accordance with paragraph 17 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. During the SIAR review, Poland reported on planned changes to the national registry to prevent any discrepancy from reoccurring by implementing a new functionality minimizing the occurrence of discrepancies in the middle of 2010. The ERT reiterates the recommendation from the previous review report and from the SIAR that Poland report, in its next annual submission, the actions taken to correct any problem that caused a discrepancy to occur or any changes to the national registry to prevent a discrepancy from reoccurring in accordance with paragraph 17 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Although Poland reported its measures undertaken in 2011 to minimize discrepancies in transactions, there is no information in its [NIR] referencing this recommendation or that the recommendation has been addressed. It is recommended again to include clear information (as a chapter or paragraph) in Poland's next annual submission on how the recommendation is addressed, including documentation of any changes to test results.</p>
P2.4.1.2		<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	

4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems

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

Ref Nr	Recommendation Ref	Recommendation description	Comment
P2.4.2.1	P1.5.1	The recommendations stated in previous year's Annual review report should be included in the Party's next annual submission and the Party should report on how the recommendations are addressed.	It is recommended to include in Poland's next annual submission information recommendations stated in SIAR and Annual Review Report are fulfilled. In [RESPONSE2] Party noted recommendations and in its next year annual submission previously stated recommendations will be included as well as Party's response to such.
P2.4.2.2	P2.3.6	The Party is encouraged to report, in the next annual submission, on changes made in its registry database, infrastructure and or procedures to support a user authentication mechanism as suggested by the ITL Administrator's Change Advisory Board.	In [RESPONSE2] Party noted recommendations and in its next year annual submission previously stated recommendations will be included as well as Party's response to such.