



UNFCCC ITL Administrator

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

<b>Reference:</b>	IAR/2009/SWE/2/1	<b>State:</b>	Final
<b>Version number:</b>	2.0	<b>Date:</b>	27/08/2010
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Mark Looman/BE Federal Public service of Health Heidi McKenna/Independent Consultant		
<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>
Heidi McKenna/Assessor	Independent Consultant	Action
Mark Looman/Assessor	BE Federal Public service of Health	Action
Bryan Eckstein/Assessor Coordinator	SRA International, Inc.	Action
Titti Norlin/RSA Main Contact	Swedish Energy Agency	Action

**Document change record**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>
0.1	13/08/2010	Initial draft for review
1.0	13/08/2010	Review
1.1	17/08/2010	Small comment suggested in P2.4.2.1
2.0	27/08/2010	Finalized with Party comments

## Summary

Ref Nr	Description	Value	Comments
P2.0.1	Party name	Sweden	
P2.0.2	Reporting period	2009	
P2.0.3	Submission under review	<p>Files submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- [SEF] SEF_SE_2010_2_16-34-44 12-3-2010.xls</li> <li>- [SEF2] SEF_SE_2010_3_13-7-26 4-5-2010.xls</li> <li>- [NIR] SE_NIR submission 2010 15 januari.pdf (15/01/2010)</li> <li>-[NIR A] SE_NIR-submission-2010-Annexes.pdf (15/01/2010)</li> <li>- [TEST] SE_20090720 SFW V4.1 Test Report.pdf (15/01/2010)</li> <li>- [CERT] SE_Certification email from CITL on golive_SE.pdf (15/01/2010)</li> <li>- [SOFT] SE_ETR v4.1.14 Release Notes.pdf (15/01/2010)</li> <li>- [REPORTS] SE_SIAR Reports 2009-SE v1 0.xls (23/04/2010) <i>(the assessor assumed this is the file referenced by the Party in [NIR A] p.99 as "SE_SIAR Reports 2010-SE v1 0.xls", where 2010 seems to be a typing error)</i></li> <li>- [RESPONSE1] SIAR Consultation Form SWE.doc (9/07/2010)</li> <li>- [RESPONSE2] SWE SIAR Consultation form on Draft Part 2.doc</li> </ul>	<p>Information from the ITL Administrator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- [SEFCR] SEF_SE_2010_2_16-34-44 12-3-2010-CR.xls (23/04/2010)</li> <li>- [SEFCR2] SEF_SE_2010_3_13-7-26 4-5-2010-CR.xls</li> <li>- [RRITL] SIAR_Reports_2009_SE_v1.1.xls (21/04/2010)</li> </ul>
P2.0.4	Previous annual review report reference	FCCC/ARR/2009/SWE (09/04/2010)	

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1. Overall assessment .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2. Summary of findings.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Identification of Problems.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Identification of Significant Changes.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Recommendations.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.1. Previous Expert Review Team recommendations .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.2. Recommendations to address identified problems.....</b>	<b>13</b>

## 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, security, data integrity, and recovery measures.</li><li>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 found that 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. The SIAR assessor reiterated the main findings contained in the SIAR.</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..</li><li>4) Sweden reported changes to its national registry. 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.</li><li>5) Party has reported its commitment period reserve in the 2009 annual submission.</li><li>6) The national registry has largely fulfilled the requirements regarding the public availability of information in accordance with section II.E of the annex to decisions 13/CMP.1 but is encouraged to act on the recommendations included in Section 4.2 of this report.</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.
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.

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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	
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 occurred for the Party
Repeat for each 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"/> N/A	No discrepancies occurred for the Party

Ref Nr	Requirement	Assessment	Comment
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"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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? <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.
P2.3.3	15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(c) A description of the database structure and capacity of the national registry.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Party has sufficiently reported on changes that were made to the national registry

Ref Nr	Requirement	Has the Party reported a change?	Problem Identified with the Change?	Comment
P2.3.4	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(d)</p> <p>A description of how the national registry conforms to the technical standards for data exchange between registry systems for the purpose of ensuring the accurate, transparent and efficient exchange of data between national registries, the clean development mechanism registry and the transaction log (decision 19/CP.7, paragraph 1)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>
P2.3.5	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(e)</p> <p>A description of the procedures employed in the national registry to minimize discrepancies in the issuance, transfer, acquisition, cancellation and retirement of ERUs, CERs, tCERs, ICERs, AAUs and/or RMUs, and replacement of tCERs and ICERs, and of the steps taken to terminate transactions where a discrepancy is notified and to correct problems in the event of a failure to terminate the transactions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>
P2.3.6	<p>15/CMP.1 paragraph 32.(f)</p> <p>An overview of security measures employed in the national registry to prevent unauthorized manipulations and to prevent operator error and of how these measures are kept up to date</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No changes occurred for the Party for this item.</p>

<b>Ref Nr</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Has the Party reported a change?</b>	<b>Problem Identified with the Change?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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	Sweden sufficiently reported the changes to test results as a result of changes to the software and technical standards

## 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	[FCCC/ARR/2009/SWE] Section VII paragraph 88 and 98 (j) recommends that the Party should enhance the availability the information referred to in paragraphs 45 to 47 of the annex to decision 13/CMP.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Public accessibility to the referenced information has been enhanced with some minor suggestions noted in Section 4.2.
P2.4.1.2	[FCCC/ARR/2009/SWE] Section VII paragraph 88 and 98 (k) recommends that the Party should report, in its next annual submission, on some transactions that were recorded in Sweden's database as rejected, whereas they should be recorded as terminated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Sweden noted that it is working with its software developer to resolve this noted recommendation.
P2.4.1.3	In [FCCC/ARR/2009/SWE] Section VII paragraph 89 and 98 (i) the ERT recommends that Sweden include correct information on its commitment period reserve in its next annual submission.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Sweden sufficiently reported its CPR in its annual submission.
P2.4.1.4	In [FCCC/ARR/2009/SWE] Section VII paragraph 91 and 98 (h) the ERT recommends that the Party report in its next annual submission any changes in its national registry in accordance with section I.G of the annex to decision 15/CMP.1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Sweden sufficiently reported changes to the registry in its annual submission.

### 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	1.4.1.2-1.4.1.3	As part of the SIAR process, Sweden notes that it considers information under paragraph 45 to the annex of decision 13/CMP.1 to be confidential. The SIAR assessor suggests that Sweden re-examine whether account type and commitment period are indeed confidential information; Sweden did not respond to this suggestion in its [RESPONSE2] as part of the SIAR process.	<p>The text of the original recommendation also included: "Sweden should make all required public information available on its public website or clearly state which information is considered confidential on its public website and cite reference to the regulation that renders it confidential."</p> <p>In its [RESPONSE2], the Party indicates that a small clarification has been added on the following websites:</p> <p><a href="http://www.energimyndigheten.se/en/International/Instruments/EU-ETS---Implementation-in-Sweden/EUETS/Reports/SUS-Report-Tool/">http://www.energimyndigheten.se/en/International/Instruments/EU-ETS---Implementation-in-Sweden/EUETS/Reports/SUS-Report-Tool/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.energimyndigheten.se/en/International/Instruments/EU-ETS---Implementation-in-Sweden/EUETS/Reports/Kyoto-units-in-SUS/">http://www.energimyndigheten.se/en/International/Instruments/EU-ETS---Implementation-in-Sweden/EUETS/Reports/Kyoto-units-in-SUS/</a></p>
P2.4.2.2	1.4.2.4	<p><i>The Party has addressed the following recommendation as part of the SIAR process. It is retained here for completeness:</i></p> <p>Sweden does not provide clear information on its public website that no JI project information is available since it does not participate in any JI projects. As Sweden signaled as part of the SIAR process, Sweden is encouraged to include a statement on its public website by the time of its next NIR submission to the effect that Sweden does not participate in JI projects rather than a display of an empty list.</p>	<p>In its [RESPONSE2], the Party indicates that they have added the following sentence on the public website:</p> <p><a href="http://www.energimyndigheten.se/en/International/Instruments/EU-ETS---Implementation-in-Sweden/EUETS/Reports/Kyoto-units-in-SUS/">http://www.energimyndigheten.se/en/International/Instruments/EU-ETS---Implementation-in-Sweden/EUETS/Reports/Kyoto-units-in-SUS/</a></p> <p><i>"Sweden has not issued ERUs. For information on procedures for JI/article 6 projects in Sweden visit the <a href="#">Swedish DNA and DFP website</a>"</i></p>
P2.4.2.3	P2.4.1.2	Sweden is encouraged to report in its next annual submission the results of its investigation of the transactions that were recorded during 2008 in Sweden's database as rejected, whereas they should be recorded as terminated.	<p>In its [RESPONSE2], the Party indicates that in the R2-report, the discrepant transactions are shown as 'Rejected'. In the Greta database this is indeed the status that these transactions are assigned. However, this is a Greta status rather than an ITL status and in the S-IAR guidance for the discrepant transaction report, it says:</p> <p>"Final state shall be one of "Completed", "Terminated"</p>

			<p>"Cancelled", "Failure by the initiating registry to terminate the transaction" or "Other". Quotes shall be omitted."</p> <p>Therefore, in the current Greta version 4.3 discrepant transaction report we should have mapped the Greta 'Rejected' status to the ITL 'Terminated' status and so these transactions would be reported according to the correct UN status as 'Terminated'. This will be corrected in next years S-IAR R2-report.</p>