



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

Standard Independent Assessment Report
Assessment Report
Part 2 - Substance

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|---------------|------------|
| Reference: | IAR/2009/CAN/2/1 | State: | Final |
| Version number: | 2.0 | Date: | 23/07/2010 |
| Prepared by: | Georgi Kadinov/ Executive Environmental Agency | | |
| Reviewed by: | Heidi McKenna/UNFCCC | | |
| Approved by: | Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC | | |

Circulation list

| Name/Role | Organization | Info/Action |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Georgi Kadinov /Assessor | Executive Environmental Agency | Action |
| Heidi McKenna/ Assessor Coordinator | UNFCCC | Info |
| Rob James/ RSA Main Contact | Environment Canada | Info |

Document change record

| Version | Date | Description |
|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| 0.1 | 01/07/2010 | Initial draft |
| 1.0 | 05/07/2010 | Review |
| 2.0 | 23/07/2010 | Final. No comments reported by Party |

Summary

| Ref Nr | Description | Value | Comments |
|--------|---|--|---|
| P2.0.1 | Party name | Canada | |
| P2.0.2 | Reporting period | 2009 | |
| P2.0.3 | Submission under review | [NIR1] NIR_2010-Part1_FINAL.pdf - [NIR2] NIR_2010-Part2_FINAL.pdf - [NIR3] NIR_2010-Part3_FINAL.pdf - [DRTest] CKPNR-DR_Test-2009-11-18-Specification_and_Results.pdf - [CMP] CKPNR-ITServiceContinuityManagementPlan-(v1.10)-PROTECTED_A.pdf - [RESPONSE 1] 2010 AR - SIAR Consultation Form CAN.doc | Files provided by the ITL Administrator: Statement that no transactions occurred in the Party's national registry during or before the reported period |
| P2.0.4 | Previous annual review report reference | FCCC/ARR/2009/CAN 01/03/2010 | |

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction..... | 4 |
| 1.1. Overall assessment | 4 |
| 1.2. Summary of findings..... | 5 |
| 2. Identification of Problems..... | 6 |
| 3. Identification of Significant Changes..... | 11 |
| 4. Recommendations..... | 14 |
| 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations | 14 |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

1.2. Summary of findings

| Ref Nr | Summary of findings |
|--------|--|
| P2.2.1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The reported information is accurate and prepared in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and is accurate. The national registry fulfills the requirements related to its reporting and accounting of information on Kyoto Protocol units, transaction procedures, conformance to the technical standards, security, data integrity and recovery measures.<li>2. Canada is not required to submit a SEF report for the reported year as described in by decisions 15/CMP.1 and 14/CMP.1 as the national registry did not transfer or acquire any Kyoto Protocol units in the reported period. The SIAR was forwarded to the ERT prior to the review, pursuant to decision 16/CP.10.<li>3. There were no records of discrepancies and no records of non-replacement found during the reported period as no transactions were proposed.<li>4. The national registry meets the registry requirements contained in the annex to decision 5/CMP.1, the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and technical standards for data exchange elaborated in accordance with relevant Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties (CMP) to the Kyoto Protocol decisions.<li>5. Canada has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 annual submission.<li>6. Canada stated that public information referred to in paragraphs 45 to 48 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 was made publically available when Canada's national registry became operational; as this did not occur during the reported year, Canada is encouraged to report on public information in its next annual submission. |

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 | The Party is not required to submit a SEF report as the national registry did not transfer or acquire any Kyoto Protocol units in the reported period. |
| P2.2.3 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(c) The information relating to transfers and acquisitions between national registries is consistent with the information contained in the national registry of the Party concerned and with the records of the transaction log, and with information reported by the other Parties involved in the transactions; | Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | The Party is not required to submit a SEF report as the national registry did not transfer or acquire any Kyoto Protocol units in the reported period. |
| 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 | The Party is not required to submit a SEF report as the national registry did not transfer or acquire any Kyoto Protocol units in the reported period. |

| Ref Nr | Requirement | Assessment | Comment |
|--------|--|--|--|
| P2.2.5 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(e) ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs have been issued, acquired, transferred, cancelled, retired, or carried over to the subsequent or from the previous commitment period in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1; | Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | The Party is not required to submit a SEF report as the national registry did not transfer or acquire any Kyoto Protocol units in the reported period. |
| 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 | The Party is not required to submit a SEF report as the national registry did not transfer or acquire any Kyoto Protocol units in the reported period. |
| 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 | The Party is not required to submit a SEF report as the national registry did not transfer or acquire any Kyoto Protocol units in the reported period. |
| P2.2.8 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(h) The required level of the commitment period reserve, as reported, is calculated in accordance with paragraph 6 of the annex to decision 18/CP.7; | Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness | |
| P2.2.9 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(i) The assigned amount is calculated to avoid double accounting in accordance with paragraph 9 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1; | Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness | |

| Ref Nr | Requirement | Assessment | Comment | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| P2.2.10 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j) A discrepancy has been identified by the transaction log relating to transactions initiated by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall: | Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? [] Yes [x] No | The ITL identified no discrepancies as transactions were not proposed by the Party during the reported period. Note the following applies for all assessment comments in P.2.2.10 | |
| Repeat for each discrepancy type (include Type Number) | P2.2.10.1 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(i) Verify that the discrepancy has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log; | Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? [] Yes [] No [] N/A | The ITL identified no discrepancies as transactions were not proposed by the Party during the reported period. |
| | P2.2.10.2 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(ii) Assess whether the same type of discrepancy has occurred previously for that Party; | Has the same type of discrepancy occurred previously for that Party? [] Yes [] No [] N/A | The ITL identified no discrepancies as transactions were not proposed by the Party during the reported period. |
| | 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? [] Yes [] No [] N/A | The ITL identified no discrepancies as transactions were not proposed by the Party during the reported period. |
| | P2.2.10.4 | 22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy? | Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? [] Yes [] No [] N/A | The ITL identified no discrepancies as transactions were not proposed by the Party during the reported period. |
| | 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? [] Yes [] No [] N/A | The ITL identified no discrepancies as transactions were not proposed by the Party during the reported period. |

| 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 | The ITL identified no non-replacement notification to the Party's registry during the reported period. Note the following applies for all assessment comments in P.2.2.11 | |
| 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 [] N/A | The ITL identified no non-replacement notification to the Party's registry during the reported period. |
| | 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 [] N/A | The ITL identified no non-replacement notification to the Party's registry during the reported period. |
| | 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 [] N/A | The ITL identified no non-replacement notification to the Party's registry during the reported period. |
| | 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 [] N/A | The ITL identified no non-replacement notification to the Party's registry during the reported period. |

| Ref Nr | Requirement | Assessment | Comment |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| P2.2.11.5 | <p>22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k)(v)</p> <p>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.</p> | <p>Non-replacement relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> | <p>The ITL identified no non-replacement notification to the Party's registry during the reported period.</p> |

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 | Party states that no changes have been made to the database and capacity of its national registry |

| 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 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> |
| P2.3.5 | <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes [] No | [] Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Party report that changes have been made to the data integrity measures to implement a disaster recovery site. |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes [] No | [] Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Party report that changes have been made to the results of its test procedures. |

4. Recommendations

4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations

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

| Ref Nr | Recommendation from previous Annual Review report (with ref) | Has Party acted on recommendation? [x] Yes [] No | Comment |
|----------|---|--|--|
| P2.4.1.1 | <p>In paragraph 97 of [FCCC/ARR/2009/CAN], the following recommendation was issued as part of the centralized review:</p> <p><i>The ERT noted from the SIAR that the information on the national registry is not currently publicly available. In response to the SIAR, the Party stated that the required information would be made publicly available but that the website is not currently accessible. The Party stated that this information would be made publicly available once Canada's national registry has begun live operations with the international transaction log (ITL). The ERT reiterates the recommendation in the SIAR that Canada provide through its registry the public information referred to in paragraphs 45 to 48 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, and report, in its next annual submission, on any changes to that public information.</i></p> | | <p>The external assessor did not locate information in the Party's initial submission ([NIR1], [NIR2], or [NIR3]) related to the previous ERT recommendation; however, in [RESPONSE1], Canada states:</p> <p><i>"Canada's national registry completed initialization with the ITL in June 2008 and completed the "go-live" procedure on Feb. 12, 2010. As such, the national registry was not operating in the Production environment at any time during the reporting period of January 1 to December 31, 2009.</i></p> <p><i>In response to the 2009 SIAR, Canada stated that public information referred to in paragraphs 45 to 48 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 would be made publically available once Canada's national registry had begun live operations with the ITL. As this did not occur during 2009, the information referred to in paragraphs 45 to 48 of the annex to Decision 13/CMP.1 did not exist.</i></p> <p><i>When Canada's registry began live operations with the ITL in the Production environment on February 12, 2010, registry information was made publically available through Environment Canada's internet site at the URL, http://ec.gc.ca/mcpc-ckpnr/. This change will be described in Canada's 2011 NIR submission."</i></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 |
|--------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------|
|--------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------|

No recommendations.