



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

Standard Independent Assessment Report
Assessment Report
Part 2 - Substance

Reference:	IAR/2009/GBR/2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	10/08/2010
Prepared by:	Anita Dahya, Ministry of Economic Development		
Reviewed by:	Chris Collins/PQA		
Approved by:	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
Anita Dahya	Ministry of Economic Development	
Chris Collins	PQA	
Mr. Philip Brookfield	The Environment Agency	

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	30/06/2010	Initial draft
0.2	01/07/2010	Reviewed draft – summary of findings formatted.
1.0	06/07/2010	Version 1.0 to be sent to Party
1.1	09/08/2010	Incorporating feedback from Party
2.0	10/08/2010	Reviewed version 2.0 to be sent to Party

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	<p>Files provided by the Party:</p> <p>Ex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [SEF] SEF_GB_2010_1_18-0-25 13-4-2010.xls - [SEF]_GB_2010_2_18-8-40+27-4-2010.xls - [NIR] ukghgi-90-08_main_chapters_Issue2.docx; and ukghgi-90-08_Annexes_Issues2.doc; and UKGHGI 1990-2008_Cover Letter_UNFCCC submission.doc NIR] ukghgi-90-08_Annexes_Issue3_Revised+25+5+2010.pdf [NIR] ukghgi-90-08_main_chapters_Issue3_Revised_25+05+2010.pdf - [REPORTS] SIAR Reports 2009-GB v1.0.xls - [RESPONSE1] Part1 response from the Party - [RESPONSE2] Part2 response from the Party - [SYS REPORTS] CITL Test Plan for Version 4.1.doc - [SYS REPORTS] Release Notes version 4.0.16.pdf - [SYS REPORTS] Release Notes version 4.1.16.pdf - [SYS REPORTS] Release Notes version 4.2.21.pdf -[SYS REPORTS] Test Report Version 4.1.pdf -[SYS REPORTS] Test Report Version 4.2.pdf -[RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2, GBR-SIAR+Consultation+Form+on+Draft+Part+2.doc 	<p>Files provided by the ITL Administrator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [SEFCR] SEF_GB_2010_1_18-0-25 13-4-2010-CR.xls -[RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_GB_v1.1.xls - [SEFCR] SEF_GB_2010_2_18-8-40+27-4-2010-CR.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2008/GBR (30/04/2009); and FCCC/ARR/2009/GBR (09/04/10)	



Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction..... 5**
 - 1.1. Overall assessment5**
 - 1.2. Summary of findings.....6**
- 2. Identification of Problems..... 8**
- 3. Identification of Significant Changes.....12**
- 4. Recommendations.....16**
 - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations16**
 - 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems.....17**

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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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
	<p>1) The information on Kyoto Protocol units has been reported in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and is accurate. The national registry continues to fulfill the requirements related to its reporting and accounting of information on Kyoto Protocol units, transaction procedures, conformance to the technical standards, public availability of information, security, data integrity and recovery measures.</p> <p>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 did not have any findings and recommendations 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>4) The Party provided access to information from its national registry that substantiated or clarified the information reported in its annual submission.</p> <p>5) 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:</p> <p><i>Identification and evaluation of significant changes</i> - From the Party's NIR submission it is unclear as to whether changes made to the database structure and capacity, conformance to technical standards for data exchange between registry systems, and test procedures were considered to be significant and whether an evaluation was undertaken to determine whether Annex H testing was required and whether the readiness documentation was updated. The SIAR assessor recommends that Great Britain address this problem and report the results in its next annual submission.</p> <p>6) Great Britain has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 annual submission.</p> <p>7) The national registry has fulfilled the requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decisions 13/CMP.1.</p>

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
	<p data-bbox="277 256 501 284"><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p data-bbox="322 325 2049 416">8) The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party clearly specify in its next annual submission the nature and extent of changes that it has made to the publicly available information, and the actions taken to improve the user interface, including providing a clear indication of those elements that are deemed to be confidential.</p> <p data-bbox="322 459 2049 587">9) The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party ensure that any statements made in its National Inventory Report in relation to publicly available information are consistent with the information reported in the SEF tables, and that the information publicly available on the Kyoto units held in the national registry and other Kyoto transactions, which was last updated on 1 June 2008, is kept up to date and is consistent with the information reported in the SEF tables.</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 re-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 Party concerned and with the records of the transaction log, and with information reported by the other Parties involved in the transactions;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party re-submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.
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 re-submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
P2.2.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(e) ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs have been issued, acquired, transferred, cancelled, retired, or carried over to the subsequent or from the previous commitment period in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No discrepancies occurred for the Party and no problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to ERUs, CERs, AAUs and RMUs.
P2.2.6	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(f) tCERs and ICERs have been issued, acquired, transferred, cancelled, retired and replaced, in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No discrepancies occurred for the Party and no problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures related to tCERs and ICERS.
P2.2.7	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(g) The information reported under paragraph 11 (a) of section I.E. in the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 on the quantities of units in accounts at the beginning of the year is consistent with information submitted the previous year, taking into account any corrections made to such information, on the quantities of units in accounts at the end of the previous year;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records and with information submitted in the year prior to the reported year.
P2.2.8	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(h) The required level of the commitment period reserve, as reported, is calculated in accordance with paragraph 6 of the annex to decision 18/CP.7;	Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness	
P2.2.9	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(i) The assigned amount is calculated to avoid double accounting in accordance with paragraph 9 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1;	Only assessed by the Expert Review Team. Kept here for completeness	

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
P2.2.10	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j) A discrepancy has been identified by the transaction log relating to transactions initiated by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall:	Has the discrepancy been identified by the transaction log? [] Yes [X] No	No discrepancies occurred for the Party.	
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 [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.10.2	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(ii) Assess whether the same type of discrepancy has occurred previously for that Party;	Has the same type of discrepancy occurred previously for that Party? [] Yes [] No [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.10.3	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iii) Assess whether the transaction was completed or terminated;	Was the transaction completed or terminated? [] Yes [] No [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.10.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?	Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? [] Yes [] No [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party.
	P2.2.10.5	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(v) Assess whether the problem that caused the discrepancy relates to the capacity of the national registry to ensure the accurate accounting of Kyoto Protocol units, issuance, holding, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs, 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 [X]N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
P2.2.11	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(k) Any record of non-replacement has been sent to the Party by the transaction log in relation to tCERs or ICERs held by the Party, and if so the expert review team shall:	Any tCERs or ICERs subject to non-replacement held by Party? [] 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.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.3	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(c)</p> <p>A description of the database structure and capacity of the national registry.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>In Chapter 14 Information on Changes in National Registry, paragraph 14.1, Table 14.1 the Party states that changes have been made to the database and capacity of its national registry.</p> <p>The Party does not clearly state whether or not the changes listed under this paragraph are considered to be significant, and if so, whether or not an evaluation was performed to determine the need to re-perform Annex H testing.</p> <p>In [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2, the Party has confirmed that the Greta upgrades were considered significant changes and that for each Registry change, testing has been performed with the CITL. The Party confirms that the tests and certification emails have been attached to the [Response] SIAR Part 2.</p>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>In Chapter 14, Information on Changes in National Registry, paragraph 14.1, the Party states that no changes have been made to the conformance to technical standards by its national registry.</p> <p>From the changes under 15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(c), where changes to the database structure and a new web service interface with the ITL have been noted, it would appear that the Party should have reported changes under this paragraph.</p> <p>In [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2, the Party has clarified that the changes to the messaging services were local changes and therefore only classified as database structure changes not as changes to the conformance of technical detail. Further, the Party has confirmed that the Registry still conforms to the DES.</p>

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.5	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(e) A description of the procedures employed in the national registry to minimize discrepancies in the issuance, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs, AAUs and/or RMUs, and replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and of the steps taken to terminate transactions where a discrepancy is notified and to correct problems in the event of a failure to terminate the transactions	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.
P2.3.6	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(f) An overview of security measures employed in the national registry to prevent unauthorized manipulations and to prevent operator error and of how these measures are kept up to date	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	No changes occurred for the Party for this item.
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 <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In Chapter 14 Information on Changes in National Registry, paragraph 14.1, the Party has included a statement clearly stating the actions taken to make improvements to data integrity measures.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.10	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(j)</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes [] No</p>	<p>[] Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>In Chapter 14, Information on Changes in National Registry, paragraph 14.1, the Party has listed test plans and test results for changes made the national registry.</p> <p>It appears that the documentation provided is incomplete in that it does not clearly include a summary of all tests that were executed.</p> <p>In [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2, the Party has provided further documentation to support changes made.</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>FCCC/ARR/2008/GBR:</p> <p>The ERT recommended that the United Kingdom include information on its commitment period reserve in its next annual submission. Refer section VIII Other Issues, 3. Commitment Period Reserve, paragraph 77.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Party has included the Commitment Period Reserve in Chapter 12, Information on accounting of Kyoto units, paragraph 12.5.</p>
P2.4.1.2	<p>FCC/ARR/2009/GBR:</p> <p>The ERT recommended that the United Kingdom further improve the measures in place in its national registry with a view to minimising operator errors and ensuring reliable interoperability with other registry systems, including the ITL, in accordance with paragraph 115 of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1 and paragraph 25 of the annex to decision 24/CP.8 and with a view to reporting in its next annual submission on the changes made to the registry following the successful implementation and testing of those measures, including any relevant test plans and test reports. Refer section VIII Conclusions and Recommendations, paragraph 108(j).</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Party has included in paragraph 14.2, Changes in Response to Review Recommendations the actions it has taken to address the matters raised. The party has clearly noted those matters that are being worked on in conjunction with the UNFCCC CAB, the De-fragmentation Working Group and its Registry system provider.</p>
P2.4.1.3	<p>FCC/ARR/2009/GBR:</p> <p>The ERT recommended that the United Kingdom take appropriate action to reduce the number of out-of-sequence messages sent by its registry. Refer section VIII Conclusions and</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Party has included in paragraph 14.2, Changes in Response to Review Recommendations the actions it has taken to address this issue.</p>

	Recommendations, paragraph 108(k).		
P2.4.1.4	<p>FCC/ARR/2009/GBR:</p> <p>The ERT recommended that the United Kingdom enhance the user interface of the registry by providing the public information referred to in paragraphs 45, 46 and 48 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, and report, in next annual submission, on any changes made to that public information Refer section VIII Conclusions and Recommendations, paragraph 108(l).</p>	[X] Yes [] No	<p>The Party has included in paragraph 14.2, Changes in Response to Review Recommendations the changes it has made to the list of publicly available information as listed in paragraph 14.2, 32(g). From the information provided it is unclear as to how this recommendation has been fully addressed in relation to improving the user interface and clearly identifying on the public website which elements are confidential.</p> <p>In [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2, the Party has noted the recommendation and has indicated that it is in the process of updating the public pages with the required information.</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	P2.3.3	In its next NIR submission, the Party, should clearly state if changes are significant and whether Annex H testing has been re-performed, and whether the readiness documentation was required to be updated.	<p>The Party does not clearly state whether or not the changes listed under this paragraph are considered to be significant, and if so, whether or not an evaluation was performed to determine the need to re-perform Annex H testing.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor notes that the Party confirmed in [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2 that the Registry software upgrades that were deployed in 2009 were considered significant. For each Registry change, testing has been performed with the CITL. The Party confirms that the tests and certification emails have been attached to the [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party should clearly state if changes are significant and whether Annex H testing has been re-performed, and whether the</p>

			readiness documentation was required to be updated.
P2.4.2.2	P.2.3.4	In its next NIR submission, the Party, should clearly state whether there were significant changes.	<p>From the changes under 15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(c), where changes to the database structure and a new web service interface with the ITL have been noted, it would appear that the Party should have reported changes under this paragraph.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor notes that the Party in [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2 has clarified that the changes to the messaging services were local changes and therefore only classified as database structure changes not as changes to the conformance of technical detail. Further, the Party has confirmed that the Registry still conforms to the DES.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party should clearly state whether there were significant changes,</p>
P2.4.2.3	P2.3.10	In its next NIR submission, the Party, should state whether there have been changes to the test procedures. The Party is also encouraged to include a summary of all tests that were executed as part of the test plan in its next annual submission.	<p>It appears that the documentation provided is incomplete in that it does not clearly include a summary of all tests that were executed.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor notes that the Party in [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2 has provided further information in relation to Registry software testing including test summaries.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party ensure that it includes a summary of all tests that are executed as part of a test plan in its next annual submission.</p>
P.2.4.2.4	P2.4.1.4	<p>In its next NIR submission, the Party should clearly identify, the nature and extent of changes that it has made to the publicly available information and the actions taken to improve the user interface, including providing a clear indication of those elements that are deemed to be confidential.</p> <p>Further, the Party should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> immediately update the information publicly available on the Kyoto units held in the national registry and other Kyoto 	<p>The Party has included in paragraph 14.2, Changes in Response to Review Recommendations the changes it has made to the list of publicly available information as listed in paragraph 14.2, 32(g). From the information provided it is unclear as to how this recommendation has been fully addressed in relation to improving the user interface and clearly identifying on the public website which elements are confidential.</p> <p>The SIAR assessor notes that the Party in [RESPONSE] SIAR Part 2 has noted this recommendation and that it will</p>

		<p>transactions, which was last updated on 1st June 2008; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ensure that any statements made in its NIR in relation to publicly available information are consistent with the information reported in the SEF tables.	<p>ensure that all required publicly available information will be displayed on its registry home page as soon as possible.</p>
--	--	---	---