



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

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

Reference:	SIAR/2017/UA/2/1	State:	Final
Version number:	1.0	Date:	11/08/2017
Prepared by:	T. Juraitė / Lithuanian Environmental Investment Fund		
Reviewed by:	G. Pfaff / Environment Agency Austria (EAA)		
Approved by:	M. Pieters /UNFCCC		

Circulation list

Name/Role	Organization	Info/Action
T. Juraitė	Lithuanian Environmental Investment Fund	Action
G. Pfaff	Environment Agency Austria (EAA)	Action
Ricardo Bothe-Palisoc	UNFCCC	Info
Yaroslav Mikhieiev	RSA - Ukraine	Action

Document change record

Version	Date	Description
0.1	27/07/2017	Initial version
0.2	11/08/2017	Assessed and Reviewed
1.0	14/09/2017	Final version

Summary

Ref Nr.	Description	
P1.0 .1	Party name	Ukraine
P1.0 .2	Reporting period	2016
P1.0 .3	Submission under review	<p>Files submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [SEF] RREG1_UA_2016_1_1_20161231 RREG1_UA_2016_2_1.xlsx • [NIR] Ukraine_NIR_2017.pdf • [NIR2015] UKR_NIR_2015 • [REPORTS] Annual review report 2016: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2017/arr/ukr.pdf • [RESPONSE] N/A • [ANNEX] N/A <p>Information from the ITL Administrator:</p> <p>[SEFCR] CR_RREG1_UA_2016_1_1_20161231.xlsx CR_RITL1_UA_2016_2_1_RREG1_UA_2016_2_1.xlsx</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [RITL] RITL2_UA_2016.xlsx RITL3_UA_2016.xlsx RITL4_UA_2016.xlsx RITL5_UA_2016.xlsx
P1.0 .4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2016/UKR - Report on the individual review of the annual submission of Ukraine submitted in 2016.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
1.1. Overall assessment.....	4
1.2. Summary of findings.....	5
2. Identification of Problems.....	7
3. Identification of Significant Changes.....	13
4. Recommendations.....	16
4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations	16
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
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 <input type="checkbox"/> NA P.2.4.1.1 P.2.4.1.2 P.2.4.1.3 P.2.4.1.4
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. Information on Kyoto Protocol units has not been reported completely in accordance with section I.E of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1, and that therefore, the assessors were not in a position to determine its accuracy. The national registry does not fulfill all requirements with regard to its reporting and accounting of information on Kyoto Protocol units, transaction procedures, conformance to the technical standards, publicly availability of information, security, data integrity and recovery measures. 2. Party has not reported on its accounting of Kyoto Protocol units for CP2 in the required SEF tables, as required by decisions 15/CMP.1 and 14/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor review the findings included in the findings and recommendations included in the SIAR on the SEF and the SEF comparison report 1. The SIAR was forwarded to the ERT prior to the review, pursuant to decision 16/CP.10. 3. Information on the accounting of Kyoto units has not 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 because no CP2 SEF tables have been submitted by the Party. The Party did not report information on: any discrepancies and notifications received by the national registry for CP2 units; serial numbers of any invalid units held in the national registry at the end of the year; any actions taken to correct discrepancies or prevent them from reoccurring as required in paragraphs 12-17 of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1. 4. The Party reported changes in its national registry compared with the previous annual submission. The SIAR assessor concluded that, taking into account the confirmed changes in the national registry, Party's national registry is not able to fully perform the functions set out in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1 nor continues to adhere to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems in accordance with relevant CMP decisions. The SIAR assessor recommends that the Party in its next annual submission to report any and all changes in its national registry in accordance with I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1 and explicitly state whether there were any changes related to paragraphs 32 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (j) of the annex II.E to decision 15/CMP.1. 5. Party has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2017 annual submission. 6. The national registry has not fulfilled the requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1. The SIAR assessor recommends that Party updates the information on the latest SEF tables on the national registry website and ensures that the publicly available information is up-to-date (i.e. updated as close to real time as possible, but updated on a monthly basis at a minimum). <p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. The SIAR assessor reiterates the previous ERT recommendation and recommends that the Party report information on Kyoto Protocol units in accordance with decision 15/CMP.1 and decision 3/CMP.11.

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
	<p>8. The SIAR assessor reiterates the previous ERT recommendation and recommends that the Party prepare and submit a disaster recovery plan and the other information collected annually on the registry transactions and security. It has to be noted that in its response to the Standard Independent Assessment Report Part 1, version 0.2, Party stated that a disaster recovery plan as well as other information collected annually on the registry transactions and security will be submitted to the ERT.</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 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.
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.

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 by the ITL 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 by the ITL 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.
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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No discrepancies have been identified by the ITL for the Party and no problem has been identified with regard to its transaction procedures.	
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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	No non-replacements occurred for the Party.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	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		The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the name or contact information of the registry administrator.
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	The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the cooperation arrangement.
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	The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the database or capacity of the national registry.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.4	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(d) A description of how the national registry conforms to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems for the purpose of ensuring the accurate, transparent and efficient exchange of data between national registries, the clean development mechanism registry and the transaction log (decision 19/CP.7, paragraph 1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the name or contact information of the registry administrator.
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	The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the discrepancy procedures.
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	The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the security measures.

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	The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the data integrity measures.
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 type="checkbox"/> No	The Party's provided reference does not contain any indication that there was or that there was not a change to the 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?	Comment
P2.4.1.1	ARR, G.3: "The ERT further recommends that Ukraine ensure the proper functioning of the national registry and that it meet the requirements specified in section II of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and the detailed technical requirements for national registries defined in the data exchange standards".	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	<p>Recommendation has not been addressed by the Party in NIR.</p> <p>The assessor recommends the Party to add references to the ERT's recommendation next to the explanation of how this recommendation was covered and provide additional information on the compliance of the technical standards.</p>
P2.4.1.2	ARR, G.4: "The ERT recommends that the Party update the information on the national registry website (carbonunitsregistry.gov.ua) and ensure that the publicly available information is up to date (i.e. updated as close to real time as possible, but updated on a monthly basis at a minimum). Further, the ERT recommends that the Party include up-to-date account information, project information under Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol , holding and transaction information, and a list of legal entities authorized by the Party".	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	<p>Recommendation has not been addressed by the Party in NIR.</p> <p>In its response to the Standard Independent Assessment Report Part 1, version 1.0, Party stated that the information at the website carbonunitsregistry.gov.ua would be updated until the end of August 2017.</p>
P2.4.1.3	ARR, G.5: "The ERT recommends that the Party report information on Kyoto Protocol units in accordance with decision 15/CMP.1 and decision 3/CMP.11".	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	<p>Recommendation has not been addressed by the Party in NIR.</p> <p>In its response to the Standard Independent Assessment Report Part 1, version 1.0, Party stated that the latest SEF tables were uploaded</p>

			to the UNFCCC submission portal on 21 st July 2017.
P2.4.1.4	ARR, G.6: “The ERT reiterates the recommendation in the SIAR that the Party prepare and submit a disaster recovery plan and the other information collected annually on the registry transactions and security”.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	Recommendation has not been addressed by the Party in NIR. In its response to the Standard Independent Assessment Report Part 1, version 1.0, Party stated that a disaster recovery plan as well as other information collected annually on the registry transactions and security will be submitted to the ERT
P2.4.1.5	ARR, G.2: “The ERT recommends that Ukraine present the revised value of the CPR in the next NIR using the latest inventory submission as the basis for the calculation of the CPR in accordance with the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, the annex to decision 11/CMP.1 and decision 1/CMP.8, paragraph 18, and that the Party take into account the provisions of decision 13/CMP.1, annex, paragraph 8 quinquiesc”.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA	Recommendation has been addressed by the Party in [NIR], Section 12.5, page 319, by using the latest inventory submissions multiplied by eight for calculating the CPR.

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	P1.2.2	The Party has not submitted a CP2 SEF and thus the overall submission by the Party cannot be compared with ITL records. The Party is obliged to make its SEF report for CP2 SEF available to assessor.	The recommendation has been addressed by the Party. The CP2 SEF has been provided to assessor and is available, and published in the following UNFCCC site: National Inventory Submissions 2017

P2.4.2.2	P.1.2.4 P1.2.6 P1.2.8 P1.2.10 P1.2.12	<p>The Party reported in [NIR 2017], Section 12.4, page 319 that information on discrepancies and notifications in the Registry is presented in Table 12.1 of the NIR submitted in 2015.</p> <p>However, the information cannot be compared with the ITL list.</p> <p>Therefore, the assessor recommends the Party to include clear statements indicating whether the respective issue has occurred and/or been addressed to its national registry during the reported period or not.</p>	<p>Party's response to this recommendation:</p> <p>No discrepancies have been identified between Ukraine Registry and ITL Data. This fact was stated in the Paragraphs 6, 8, and 10 of the Report upon expiration of the additional period for fulfilling commitments by Ukraine (True-up period report) submitted to the UNFCCC Secretariat on 04 July 2017. The draft report on the individual review of the resubmitted True-up period report for the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol was received on 01 August 2017. That confirmed absence of any discrepancies.</p>
P2.4.2.3	P1.2.13	<p>In [NIR 2017], Section 14, page 323, the Party did not make any statement whether any actions were taken to correct any problem that caused discrepancies from occurring, or to prevent discrepancies from reoccurring for the period under the review.</p> <p>The assessor recommends the Party make a detailed description in [NIR] of the changes and the documented results of the change should be submitted in accordance with the requirements for [NIR] Section 14, or make a clear statement that no actions were taken for the period under the review.</p>	<p>Party's response to this recommendation:</p> <p>No discrepancies have been identified between Ukraine Registry and ITL Data. This fact was stated in the Paragraphs 6, 8, and 10 of the Report upon expiration of the additional period for fulfilling commitments by Ukraine (True-up period report) submitted to the UNFCCC Secretariat on 04 July 2017. The draft report on the individual review of the resubmitted True-up period report for the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol was received on 01 August 2017. That confirmed absence of any discrepancies.</p> <p>This and other related information on changes that occurred during the reported period will be reflected in NIR 2018.</p>
P2.4.2.4	P.1.3.1 – P.1.3.6 P.1.3.8 – P.1.3.10	<p>In [NIR], Section 14.1, page 323, the Party refers to the chapter 12.1, which does not contain any indication that there was, or that there was not a respective change in the national registry.</p> <p>If no change has occurred, the assessor recommends the Party add a clear statement saying that no change corresponding to a respective paragraph of decision 15/CMP.1 annex II.E. occurred during the reported period.</p>	<p>Party's response to this recommendation:</p> <p>There were no any technical changes in status of the national registry since 23 August 2016 until 24 May 2017 – the date of NIR submission. Ukrainian side co-operated with the UNFCCC Bodies and participated in CMP22/12 in order to get permission for the retirement of the CP1 AAUs delayed since 18 November 2015 according to the Plan submitted to the Enforcement Branch on 6 December 2017. The Plan was completed in June 2017. NIR 2017 reflected the status of the national registry in 2016. Detailed documents flow for</p>

			<p>2016-2017 is presented at the UNFCCC website: http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/compliance/questions_of_implementation/items/9575.php.</p> <p>This and other related information on changes that occurred during the reported period will be reflected in NIR 2018.</p>
P2.4.2.5	P1.3.7	<p>In [NIR], Section 12.4, page 319, the Party states that the previously reported public information is still relevant.</p> <p>However, the assessor notices that the information in [NIR 2015] does not coincide with the contact information available at: http://www.carbonunitsregistry.gov.ua/en/272.htm</p> <p>The assessor recommends the Party note the change of the contacts happened after 1st January 2015.</p>	<p>Party's response to this recommendation:</p> <p>The change of contacts was added to the Registry website at the same date as the NIR submission in 2017. During 2015 and 2016 the contact information was the same as in 2014.</p>
P2.4.2.6	P1.4.3 – P1.4.3.12	<p>The Party provides reference to this publicly available information in [NIR], Section 12.4, which refers to [NIR 2015].</p> <p>The Party's publicly accessible information is referenced at: http://www.carbonunitsregistry.gov.ua/en/257.htm</p> <p>Since the information for 2015 and 2016 is not accessible, the assessor recommends the Party complement both [NIR] and the publicly available website at the above URL by providing the latest SEF tables.</p>	<p>Party's response to this recommendation:</p> <p>The update on the Registry website was performed on 30 August 2017 successfully including the latest SEF tables.</p> <p>This and other related information on changes that occurred during the reported period will be reflected in NIR 2018.</p>
P2.4.2.7	P1.4.1 – P1.4.4	<p>The assessor notes that the published information dates from 25/07/2015.</p> <p>The assessor recommends the Party ensure the relevant published information is up-to-date at Party's owned and maintained website as close to real-time as possible, but not less frequent than monthly.</p>	<p>Party's response to this recommendation:</p> <p>The update on the Registry website was performed on 30 August 2017 successfully. Hereafter the information will be updated in real time. However since the Doha Amendment did not enter into force the significant information updates seem to be rarer than on a monthly basis.</p>

		In its response to the Standard Independent Assessment Report Part 1, version 0.2, Party stated that the information at the website carbonunitsregistry.gov.ua would be updated until the end of August 2017.	
--	--	---	--