



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

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

<b>Reference:</b>	IAR/2009/SVN/2/1	<b>State:</b>	Final
<b>Version number:</b>	2.0	<b>Date:</b>	13/07/2010
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Nadezhda Uledova/Russian Federation		
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Bryan Eckstein/SRA International, Inc.		
<b>Approved by:</b>	Vitaly Matsarski/UNFCCC		

**Circulation list**

<b>Name/Role</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Info/Action</b>
Nadezhda Uledova	Russian Federation	Action
Bryan Eckstein/Assessor Coordinator	Assessor Coordinator	Action
Irena Malesic/RSA – Main Contact	Environmental Agency of the Republic of Slovenia	Action

**Document change record**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
0.1	30/06/2010	Initial
1.0	02/07/2010	Review
2.0	13/07/2010	Final, party reported no comments to draft

## Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Slovenia	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	Files submitted: - [SEF] SEF_SI_2010_2_8-15-57+19-4-2010.xls - [NIR] SVN+NIR+2010+v3.pdf - [REPORTS] SIAR_Reports_2009_SI_v1.1.xls - [NIR1] SVN+NIR+2010+annex+6.doc - [NIR2] SVN+NIR+2010+annex+8.doc - [RESPONSE1] Odgovor+na+SIAR+Part+1.doc - [RESPONSE2] SI+Discrepant+Transaction+-+2009.xls - [NIR3] SVN NIR 2010 v4.pdf (official resubmission) - [NIR4] SVN NIR 2010 annex 6 v2.doc (official resubmission)	Information from the ITL Administrator: - [SEFCR] SEF_SI_2010_2_8-15-57+19-4-2010-CR.xls -[RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_SI_v1.1.xls
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2009/SVN (05/02/2010)	

**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.....15**
  - 4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations .....15**
  - 4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems.....16**

## 1. Introduction

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

### 1.1. Overall assessment

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

## 1.2. Summary of findings

Ref Nr	Summary of findings
P2.2.1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. Slovenia 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 finds 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.</li> <li>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. This information is consistent with that contained in the national registry and with the records of the international transaction log (ITL) and the CDM registry and meets the requirements set out in paragraphs 88(a) to (j) of the annex to decision 22/CMP.1.</li> <li>4. 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. The SIAR assessor concluded that Slovenia's national registry continues to perform the functions set out in the annex to decision 13/CMP.1 and the annex to decision 5/CMP.1, and continues to adhere to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems in accordance with relevant CMP decisions.</li> <li>5. Slovenia has reported its commitment period reserve in its 2009 annual submission.</li> <li>6. Slovenia has fulfilled all requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1.</li> </ol> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. The SIAR recommends that Slovenia, in its next annual submission, submit information on discrepancies in the national registry and provide more detailed description on actions and/or changes that were done to address the discrepancies. It is also recommended that Slovenia provide more detailed information in its next annual submission on any changes in the national registry, including updates to the national registry readiness documentation related to any changes.</li> </ol>

## 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	The ITL identified discrepancies with transactions proposed by the Party during the reported period (see [RRITL], Report R-2). In [NIR3], [NIR4] and [RESPONSE1] the Party confirmed the results of the ITL and provided [RESPONSE 2] with the data on discrepancies. But as the average number of discrepancies per transaction for the Party is less than the average number of discrepancies per transaction for all registries and as the discrepancies were resolved per the Data Exchange Standards, the discrepancies are not considered a problem.
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? <b>[ X ] Yes [ ] No</b>	Discrepancies with DES response codes 4003 and 4010 occurred for the Party.	
Repeat for each discrepancy type (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? <b>[ X ] Yes [ ] No [ ] N/A</b>	Discrepancy with DES response code 4003 has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log.
	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ X ] No [ ] N/A</b>	In [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that there were no discrepancies of the same type 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? <b>[ X ] Yes [ ] No [ ] N/A</b>	In [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that the transaction was terminated.
	P2.2.10.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?	Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? <b>[ X ] Yes [ ] No [ ] N/A</b>	There is no information in all the provided documents on any actions and/or changes that were done to address the discrepancy, but there were no additional discrepancies of this type.
	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ X ] No [ ] N/A</b>	There is no information on the cause of the discrepancy, but the problem that caused the discrepancy doesn't relate 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.



Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment	
Repeat for each discrepancy type (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	Discrepancy with DES response code 4010 has occurred and been correctly identified by the transaction log.
	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	In [NIR4], [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that there were no discrepancies of the same type 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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	In [NIR4], [RESPONSE2] and [RRITL] it is stated that the transaction was terminated.
	P2.2.10.4	22/CMP.1 paragraph 88.(j)(iv) Has the Party corrected the problem that caused the discrepancy?	Problem that caused the discrepancy corrected? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	There is no information in all the provided documents on any actions and/or changes that were done to address the discrepancy, but there were no additional discrepancies of this type.
	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	There is no information on the cause of the discrepancy, but the problem that caused the discrepancy doesn't relate 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.

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? <b>[ ] Yes [ X ] No</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	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? <b>[ ] Yes [ ] No [ X ] N/A</b>	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>The Party reported in [NIR] and [NIR3] changes of the database structure and capacity of the national registry. But these changes concern not the database structure and capacity of the national registry but the functional changes:</p> <p>“A general description of functional changes to the SI GRETA Registry in 2009 is as follows: Version 4.1: This new release enabled</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Operators to surrender Certified Emission Reduction Units (CERs) and Emission Reduction Units (ERUs) and to set CER/ERU percentage surrender limits for individual installations within their operating zone, in line with EU and national policy.</li> <li>- Registry Administrators and thus Member States, perform a new EUA Conversion and Retirement Process (as specified in the EU Registry Regulations) as part of their EU annual compliance requirements.</li> </ul> <p>This new release also included a 'maintenance' element whereby high priority legacy bugs are also resolved. Update from Version 3.0.84 to Version 4.1 Internal database procedures have been improved to increase resource efficiency. “</p> <p>No additional documents on this issue were provided.</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 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
P2.3.5	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 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
P2.3.10	<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 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Party reported in [NIR] and [NIR3] that Slovenian registry used Greta software and had made in the reported period an update form Version 3.0.84 to Version 4.1. Slovenian registry used the CITL test plan for Version 4.1 of the Greta software. Test plan is not submitted.</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? [ X ] Yes [ ] No	Comment
P2.4.1.1	In paragraph 115 of FCCC/ARR/2009/SVN there is recommendation in (g) to enhance the availability of the public information referred to in paragraphs 45–48 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1, and report, in its next annual submission, on any changes to that public information		<p>In [NIR] and [NIR3] (paragraph 13.2, page 276), the Party states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were no recommendations from the 2008 Annual Review.</li> <li>- During 2009 review the ERT noted from the SIAR that Slovenia has not made publicly available the information referred to in paragraphs 45–48 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1.</li> <li>- Until end of 2009 all relevant information which are not subject to the confidentiality has been made public available.</li> <li>- At the time of preparation NIR 2010 the review report of the 2009 submission has been not final yet.</li> </ul> <p>The Party provides reference to this publicly available information in [NIR] and [NIR3] (paragraph 12.4, page 272).</p> <p>It is clearly stated that the required information could be accessed via registry website, but a public URL is not provided in [NIR] and [NIR3]. However, in [RESPONSE1] the Party submitted information that publicly available information could be accessed via the national registry website at the URL:  <a href="http://rte.arso.gov.si/Default.aspx?Module=/PublicReportsA">http://rte.arso.gov.si/Default.aspx?Module=/PublicReportsA</a>  and that his information would be included in next NIR.</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	P2.2.10	It is recommended to provide more detailed information on the discrepancies and to submit information on the actions and/or changes to address the discrepancy.	There were discrepancies in the national registry but the Party didn't provide this information in [NIR] and [NIR3]. There is also no information on any actions and/or changes that were done to address the discrepancy.
P2.4.2.2	P2.3.3	It is recommended to provide more detailed information on the changes of the database structure and capacity of the national registry.	The Party reported in [NIR] and [NIR3] changes of the database structure and capacity of the national registry. But these changes concern not the database structure and capacity of the national registry but the functional changes:  “A general description of functional changes to the SI GRETA Registry in 2009 is as follows: Version 4.1: This new release enabled – Operators to surrender Certified Emission Reduction Units (CERs) and Emission Reduction Units (ERUs) and to set CER/ERU percentage surrender limits for individual installations within their operating zone, in line with EU and national policy. – Registry Administrators and thus Member States, perform a new EUA Conversion and Retirement Process (as specified in the EU Registry Regulations) as part of their EU annual compliance requirements. This new release also included a 'maintenance' element whereby high priority legacy bugs are also resolved. Update from Version 3.0.84 to Version 4.1 Internal database procedures have been improved to increase resource efficiency. “ No additional documents on this issue were provided. Please refer to Appendix 7 in “SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3”
P2.4.2.3	P2.3.10	It is recommended to provide more detailed information on the changes in the results of test procedures.	The Party reported in [NIR] and [NIR3] that Slovenian registry used Greta software and had made in the reported period an update from Version 3.0.84 to Version 4.1. Slovenian national registry used the CITL test plan for



			Version 4.1 of the Greta software. Test plan and test results were not submitted. Please refer to Appendix 7 in "SIAR Reporting Requirements and Guidance for Registries v4.3"
--	--	--	---