



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

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

Reference:	IAR/2009/PRT/2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	2.0	Date:	02/08/2010
Prepared by:	Miroslav Hrobak/Dexia banka Slovensko, a.s.		
Reviewed by:	Bryan Eckstein/SRA International, Inc.		
Approved by:	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
Miroslav Hrobak/Assessor	Dexia banka Slovensko, a.s.	Info
Bryan Eckstein/Assessor Coordinator	SRA International, Inc.	Info
Filomena Boavida	Climate Change Air and Noise, Portuguese Environment Agency	Action

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	10/06/2010	Initial Draft
1.0	14/06/2010	Review
1.1	02/08/2010	Updated Draft with Response from Party
2.0	02/08/2010	Reviewed draft – Final Part 2 to be sent to Party

Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Portugal	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files provided by the Party: - [SEF] SEF_PT_2010_1_14-18-58+4-3-2010.xls - [NIR] NIR_20100415_v20100525.pdf - [RESPONSE 1] SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 1 PRT.doc - [RRREG 1] SIAR Reports PT 2009 R2 R5.xls - [RESPONSE 2] PRT-SIAR Consultation Form on Draft Part 2 v2.doc - [RRREG 2] SIAR Reports PT template R2 R5 2009.xls	Files provided by the ITL Administrator: Ex: - [SEFCR] SEF_PT_2010_1_14-18-58+4-3-2010-CR.xls -[RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_PT_v1.1.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2009/PRT (09/04/2010)	

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.....12**
- 4. Recommendations.....15**
 - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations15**
 - 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems16**

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	<p style="text-align: center;">National Registry</p> <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, security, data integrity and recovery measures.</p> <p>2. Portugal has reported information on its accounting of Kyoto Protocol units in the required SEF tables, as required by decisions 15/CMP.1 and 14/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor found the findings included in the SIAR on the SEF and the SEF comparison report. 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. Information reported by Portugal 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).</p> <p>5. The SIAR assessor found 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.</p> <p>6. Party has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 annual submission.</p> <p>7. The national registry has not fulfilled all 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 the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166 to Representative identifier information.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>8. Portugal should enhance publicly available information on Representative identifier so it is compliant with paragraph 45 (d) in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. Specifically, Party identifier (the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166) should be added.</p>

9. Portugal is encouraged in its next submission to enhance the reporting of information in accordance with paragraphs 13-16 in the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and as specified in Section 4.2 of the SIAR.

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	There was a resubmission by Party of [NIR] document and [RRREG 1] reports.
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 Party concerned and with the records of the transaction log, and with information reported by the other Parties involved in the transactions;	Problem Identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party submitted a SEF which is consistent with the ITL records.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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	Report R-2 of [RRREG 1] document shows discrepancies for the reporting period with response codes 4003 and 4010.
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	

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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	Both ITL and the Party reported same discrepant transactions with response codes 4003 and 4010.
RESPONSE CODE 4003			
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	The Party reported in report R-2 of [RRREG 1] discrepant transactions with response code 4003 (PT1011372, PT1011373, PT1011374, PT1011375, PT1011377, PT1011378). The same information was reported in report R-2 of [RRITL].
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 [X] No [] N/A	The Party did not provide number of previous occurrences in report R-2 of [RRREG 1]. According to report R-2 of [RRITL] this discrepancy did not occur before.
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? [X] Yes [] No [] N/A	All discrepant transactions with response code 4003 have Transaction status 'Terminated' in report R-2 of [RRREG 1] as well as in report R-2 of [RRITL].

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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	The Party states in report R-2 of [RRREG 1] that all discrepant transactions resulted from incoming transfer stuck in non-final state. The registry considered units its property and available for further transfers while ITL considered units locked in transactions and thus property of other registry. The origin therefore does not lie in the national registry and no action needs to be taken. In paragraph 13.4 of [NIR] the Party states that no changes have been made to the procedures employed in its national registry to minimize discrepancies.
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 response code 4003 is common discrepancy among registries. This is due to a limitation in the DES message model for external transfers.
RESPONSE CODE 4010			
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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The Party reported in report R-2 of [RRREG 1] discrepant transactions with response code 4010 (PT1011372, PT1011373, PT1011374, PT1011375, PT1011377, PT1011378). The same information was reported in report R-2 of [RRITL].
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	The Party did not provide number of previous occurrences in report R-2 of [RRREG 1]. According to report R-2 of [RRITL] this discrepancy did not occur before.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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	All discrepant transactions with response code 4010 have Transaction status 'Terminated' in report R-2 of [RRREG 1] as well as in report R-2 of [RRITL].
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	The Party states in report R-2 of [RRREG 1] that all discrepant transactions resulted from incoming transfer stuck in non-final state. The registry considered units its property and available for further transfers while ITL considered units locked in transactions and thus property of other registry. The origin therefore does not lie in the national registry and no action needs to be taken. In paragraph 13.4 of [NIR] the Party states that no changes have been made to the procedures employed in its national registry to minimize discrepancies.
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 response code 4010 is common discrepancy among registries. This is due to a limitation in the DES message model for external transfers.

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.
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 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	In paragraph 13.3 of [NIR] the Party reports there was one major update of registry software which makes use of new generic webservice. In paragraph 13.7 of [NIR] the Party shows detailed test results.

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	As stated in paragraph 99 and reiterated in paragraph 111 of the previous annual review report [FCCC/ARR/2009/PRT]: <i>"The ERT recommends that Portugal make available the required public information referred to in paragraphs 45–48 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 through the user interface of its registry and report, in its next annual submission, on any changes to the public information available."</i>	[X] Yes [] No	Public information is available through national registry's website. The Party provides reference to publicly available information in chapter 11.4 of [NIR]. The Party does not make reference in its submission that it is addressing recommendation from FCCC/ARR/2009/PRT.
P2.4.1.2	As stated in paragraph 102 and reiterated in paragraph 111 of the previous annual review report [FCCC/ARR/2009/PRT]: <i>"The ERT recommends that Portugal, in its future annual submissions, include the relevant test plans and test reports for each release of its registry during the reporting period and that it consider the registry reporting guidance agreed by the Registry System Administrators Forum in the independent assessment report (IAR) common operational procedure developed pursuant to decision 16/CP.10."</i>	[X] Yes [] No	Test reports from internal tests and ETS Testing are included in paragraph 13.7 of [NIR]. The Party does not make reference in its submission that it is addressing recommendation from FCCC/ARR/2009/PRT.
P2.4.1.3	As stated in paragraph 102 and reiterated in paragraph 111 of the previous annual review report [FCCC/ARR/2009/PRT]: <i>"In addition, the ERT recommends that Portugal provide more detail in its next annual submission"</i>	[X] Yes [] No	In paragraph 13.6 of [NIR] the Party reports that no changes have been made to the data integrity measures. The Party states in [RESPONSE 1] that it considered the recommendation to improve recovery of its services and during the reported period it prepared a disaster recovery plan which was successfully conducted in March 2010.

	<p><i>on changes made to its registry to improve the recovery of its services in the event of a disaster, in accordance with paragraph 32 (j) of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and the IAR reporting guidance.”</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
P2.4.2.1	P1.4.1.4	<p>The public user interface of the national registry includes a numeric identifier but not the Party identifier (two-letter country code) that defines the Representative identifier. Portugal should enhance publicly available information on Representative identifier so it is compliant with paragraph 45 (d) in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. Specifically, Party identifier (the two-letter country code defined by ISO 3166) should be added.</p>	<p>Information on Representative identifier is accessible through national registry’s website as a part of Account List report. Representative identifiers are accessible, however Party identifier (two-letter country code) is not provided, only unique number is. The Party stated in [RESPONSE 2] that in the new software version which is scheduled to be deployed in June/July 2010 the Party identifier (two-letter country code) along with the unique number will be provided.</p>
P2.4.2.2	P2.2.10.2	<p>Portugal initially did not submit information in accordance with paragraphs 13-16 in the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 in the format suggested. Portugal is encouraged in its next submission to provide documentation carrying information on reports R-2 to R-5 in Microsoft Excel format respecting the layout identified in the SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries.</p>	<p>[RRREG 1] document was not provided by the Party in layout identified in the SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries, for example number of previous occurrences of discrepancies was not included in report R-2. The Party did provide document [RRREG 2] respecting the layout identified in the SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries together with [RESPONSE 2].</p>