



PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT ON VALIDATION ACTIVITY (Version 02.0)

SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

Entity name:	
UNFCCC entity ref.no.:	
Site visit made by the A6.4-AT (Yes/No):	
On-site assessment dates (<i>if applicable</i>):	
Address of the site(s) visited:	
Scope(s) of accreditation of the activity under performance assessment:	
Approved methodology(ies) and tools used:	
Version no.:	
UNFCCC A6.4 project reference number	
A6.4 project title:	
Brief description of the A6.4 project:	
Technical area(s) of the activity:	
Crediting period type, starting date and duration:	
DOE team including technical reviewer/s:	
Name:	
Role/expert:	
A6.4-AT leader:	
A6.4-AT members:	
Start date of the performance assessment:	

SECTION 2: EVALUATION		
(Key : S = Satisfactory, NS = Not satisfactory, NA = Not applicable/cannot comment) Each "NS" under the column "Rating" has to be supported by a finding report for draft assessment or non-conformity (NC) report format for final assessment. One finding/NC report form can be used for one or more than one "NS" in the column "Ratings" as some of the requirements are related to each other.		
Criteria (as applicable to the activity assessed)	Draft assessment	
	Rating	Comments
1. Process requirements		
1.(a) Contract review and allocation of resources		
(i) Did the DOE carry out an effective review of the request for application and supplementary information before entering into a contractual agreement with the activity participant to ensure;		
a. That there are no impartiality issues that contravene the A6.4 accreditation requirements;		
b. That the DOE has necessary human resources with required competence to perform the validation;		
c. That the A6.4 project falls within the DOE's accredited sectoral scopes;		
d. Other considerations		
(ii) Has the DOE concluded the contract with an activity participant who is listed in the PDD?		
1.(b) Assessment of effective planning by the entity		
(i) Did the DOE follow procedure in compliance with the A6.4 accreditation standard for selecting the team members/technical reviewer for A6.4 project?		
(ii) Did the DOE confirm that the selected team has no conflict of interest with respect to the A6.4 project?		
(iii) Did the DOE change any team member during the process? If so, did the DOE follow procedures to ensure that the team continues to be competent and impartial?		
(iv) Were the tasks given to each member of the validation team clearly defined and communicated to the client with sufficient information to object to appointment?		
2. Validation		

2.(a) Has the DOE made the PDD publicly available through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC website for global stakeholder consultation as per the A6.4 activity cycle procedure (ACP-P) requirements?		
2.(b) Does the validation report reflect effectiveness of the DOE system to apply standard auditing techniques and “general validation requirements”, in order to validate and report the following as per the applicable version of VVS-P, relevant decision of CMA and the A6.4 Supervisory Body		
(i) The details of actions taken to take due account of comments received during global stakeholder consultation;		
(ii) Requirements for the approval by all parties involved in the A6.4 project have been met;		
(iii) Whether activity participants have been authorized by host Party and other participating Parties?		
(iv) Correct completion and authorization of the MoC statement;		
(v) Notification of prior consideration of the Article 6.4 mechanism;		
(vi) The accuracy, conservativeness, relevance, completeness, consistency and transparency of the information provided by the activity participants in the PDD? a. Requirement for physical site inspection; b. Requirement relating to double or revived registration contained in the activity standard;		
(vii) Selected methodology is applicable to the A6.4 project;		
(viii) Deviation from or revision of the selected methodology or methodological tool, if applicable;		
(ix) Deviation from elements and criteria of the A6.4 SD Tool, if applicable;		

(x) Project boundary in accordance with the selected baseline and monitoring mechanism methodology; a. All sources of GHG required by mechanism methodology included or whether the activity participants have justified that choice and whether the justification provided is reasonable if activity participants are allowed to choose whether a source, sink, or gas or reservoir is to be included within the project boundary; b. Identification of additional emission sources;		
(xi) Baseline scenario identification in accordance with the selected monitoring and baseline methodology and all baseline scenarios are considered and most reasonable baseline scenario correctly applied (if the most plausible scenario includes suppressed demand, the DOE shall, at initial validation and at the start of each crediting period, determine whether: the activity participants established the baseline scenario in compliance with the applied methodology(ies); demonstrated that the beneficiaries of the proposed A6.4 project are in suppressed demand conditions with respect to the identified basic human need(s); and that such conditions are likely to persist throughout the crediting period);		
(xii) Algorithm & formulae in accordance with the selected baseline and monitoring mechanism methodology; a. Appropriateness of the equations; b. Validation of choice of data & parameters, assumptions & calculations;		
(xiii) Additionality is demonstrated in accordance with the applied methodologies and tools of the A6.4 mechanism;		
(xiv) Monitoring plan is feasible to implement and the means of implementation of the monitoring plan are sufficient to ensure that GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals can be reported ex post and verified;		

(xv) The environmental impacts, social impacts and sustainable development co-benefits have been monitored in accordance with the monitoring plan and Article 6.4 sustainable development tool and the monitoring results correspond to these impacts and co-benefits of the project;		
a. The DOE shall determine the appropriateness, relevance, and sufficiency of the information provided in the A6.4 Environmental and social safeguards risk assessment form, A6.4 Environmental and social management plan form, and A6.4 Sustainable development impact form, as reported in the PDD, by the steps as outlined in VVS for project;		
b. The DOE shall validate the presented risk assessment and risk mitigation plan as well as the defined activity-level environmental and social indicators defined;		
c. If the DOE identifies unavoidable negative impacts that exceed the environmental and social safeguard elements and criteria and cannot be remediated by consultation or mitigation, the DOE may submit a request for deviation after assessing the evidence provided by the activity participants and shall revise the respective A6.4 SD Tool forms accordingly as per the provisions in VVS-P and follow the relevant provisions of the activity cycle procedure;		
(xvii) The comments, if any, have been received from local stakeholders or Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC-admitted observer organizations and due issues have been addressed;		
2.(c) Whether the applied sampling approach is in accordance with the guidelines? if applicable		
2.(d) Risks associated with providing competent, consistent and impartial validation and/or certification are taken into account throughout the accreditation term?		
3. Skills and technique (only if on-site visit is made by the A6.4-AT)		
3.(a) The members of the team of the DOE:		

(i) Applied standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness, conservativeness, relevance, completeness, consistency and transparency of information provided?		
(ii) Based all findings on adequate factual evidence and referenced where necessary?		
(iii) Apply the most recent applicable decisions and guidance provided by the A6.4 Supervisory Body?		
(iv) Determine whether information provided by the activity participants is reliable and credible and whether the A6.4 project meets all applicable Article 6.4 mechanism rules and requirements?		
(v) Safeguard the confidentiality of all information obtained or created during the validation?		
4. Assessment of the presentation of the validation report		
4.(a) Has the team of DOE raised all relevant issues through corrective actions requests (CARs), clarification requests (CLs) or forward actions requests (FARs)? (i) Are the raised CARs/CLs/FARs accurately identified, formulated, discussed and closed adequately by the DOE? (ii) Did the team report the issues, responses and means of validation on all CARs, CLs and FARs?		
4.(b) Does the validation opinion include:		
(i) Summary of method and the process used and the validation criteria applied?		
(ii) Summary of validation conclusions?		
(iii) Statement on the validation of expected A6.4 emission reductions or net GHG removals?		
(iv) Statement whether the proposed A6.4 project meets all applicable Article 6.4 mechanism rules and requirements, including reasons?		
4.(c) Does the validation report cover the following:		
(i) A summary of validation process and its conclusions;		
(ii) Results of the dialogue between the DOE and the activity participants, as well as any adjustments made to the project design following the local and global stakeholder consultations;		

(iii) Reference to the data and information material used as evidence for validation and lists of interviewees as well as a description of how the sample size was determined and how the field check was carried out, if a sampling approach was applied;		
(iv) Details of the validation team, technical experts, internal technical reviewers; their roles and details of who conducted the site visit;		
(v) Information on quality control within the team and in the validation process;		
(vi) Details of the involved validation team, technical experts and internal technical reviewers including the on-site inspection reviewers, together with their roles in the validation activity;		
4.(d) Final decisions on validation are given by top management of the DOE?		
Did the DOE conduct the verification/certification activity competently?	☐ YES ☐ NO	
A6.4-AT leader signature:		
Date:		
SECTION 3: CLARIFICATION ON FINDINGS BY THE DOE		
SECTION 4: ASSESSMENT OF CLARIFICATION BY THE A6.4-AT AND RAISING NCs		
General comments: ☐ Case to be presented to the AEP since there is evidence that the DOE intentionally provided false information, intentionally omitted to provide information that should have been provided, or deliberately violated accreditation requirement. <i>The A6.4-AT shall substantiate issues in this section, if the checkbox above is ticked.</i>		
Did the DOE conduct the validation activity competently? ☐ YES ☐ NO		

Final conclusions:	
A6.4-AT leader signature:	
Date:	

- - - - -

Document information

Version	Date	Description
02.0	07 November 2025	Revision to align with version 02.0 of the Article 6.4 Accreditation Standard.
01.0	24 April 2024	Initial publication.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Form
Business Function: Accreditation
Keywords: A6.4 mechanism, performance assessment, validation