

A6.4-PROC-ACCR-001

Procedure

Article 6.4 accreditation

Version: 01.1



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. Background	5
1.2. Objectives.....	5
2. SCOPE	5
2.1. Scope and applicability	5
2.2. Entry into force	6
3. NORMATIVE REFERENCE.....	6
4. DEFINITIONS	6
5. BASICS OF THE ARTICLE 6.4 ACCREDITATION PROCESS	6
5.1. Actors in the Article 6.4 accreditation process and main functions	6
5.2. Scope and status of accreditation	7
5.3. Objective and scope of accreditation assessments.....	7
5.4. General modalities of accreditation assessments	7
6. INITIAL ACCREDITATION	11
6.1. General.....	11
6.2. Application for accreditation	12
6.3. Completeness check.....	12
6.4. Appointment of the AT and preparation of workplan	12
6.5. Assessment by the AT	13
6.5.1. Desk review.....	13
6.5.2. On-site assessment	14
6.6. Consideration by the AEP	16
6.7. Consideration by the Supervisory Body.....	16
7. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	17
7.1. General.....	17
7.2. Initiation	18
7.3. Completeness check.....	18
7.4. Appointment of the AT	18

7.5.	Assessment by the AT	19
7.6.	Consideration by the AEP	21
7.7.	Consideration by the Supervisory Body.....	22
8.	REGULAR ON-SITE SURVEILLANCE	23
8.1.	General.....	23
8.2.	Initiation	23
8.3.	Completeness check.....	23
8.4.	Appointment of the AT and preparation of workplan	23
8.5.	Assessment by the AT	24
8.6.	Consideration by the AEP	26
8.7.	Consideration by the Supervisory Body.....	27
9.	REACCREDITATION	27
9.1.	Application for reaccreditation.....	27
9.2.	General modalities	28
9.3.	Consideration by the AEP	28
9.4.	Consideration by the Supervisory Body.....	29
10.	ACCREDITATION FOR ADDITIONAL SECTORAL SCOPES	29
11.	SPOT-CHECK	30
11.1.	Initiation	30
11.2.	Appointment of the AT and preparation of workplan	32
11.3.	Assessment by the AT	33
11.4.	Consideration by the AEP	33
11.5.	Consideration by the Supervisory Body.....	33
12.	UNDER OBSERVATION	34
13.	SUSPENSION OF ACCREDITATION	36
14.	WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION	38
14.1.	Voluntary withdrawal	38
14.2.	Withdrawal by the Supervisory Body	38
15.	EXPIRY OF ACCREDITATION	39
16.	TRANSFER OF ACCREDITATION TO ANOTHER ENTITY	39

17. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES.....	42
18. REPORTING OF ACTIVITIES	43
APPENDIX 1. DOCUMENTATION FOR ACCREDITATION ASSESSMENTS	44
APPENDIX 2. FORMS USED IN THE ARTICLE 6.4 ACCREDITATION PROCESS	48
APPENDIX 3. CRITERIA FOR UNDER-OBSERVATION STATUS, AND SUSPENSION AND WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION.....	50
APPENDIX 4. CONDITIONS OF UNDER-OBSERVATION STATUS, AND SUSPENSION AND WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION.....	51
APPENDIX 5. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF ARTICLE 6.4 ACCREDITATION PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS.....	52
APPENDIX 6. REVIEW OF COMPLAINTS AGAINST DESIGNATED OPERATIONAL ENTITIES	55
APPENDIX 7. REVIEW OF NON-CONFORMITIES RAISED BY ARTICLE 6.4 ASSESSMENT TEAM.....	58
APPENDIX 8. MODALITIES OF HEARING FROM DESIGNATED OPERATIONAL ENTITIES	61
APPENDIX 9. FEES AND COSTS	63

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1. The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA), at its third session, adopted rules, modalities and procedures (RMPs) for the mechanism established by Article 6, paragraph 4, of the Paris Agreement (the Article 6.4).¹ In accordance with the RMPs, a proposed or registered Article 6.4 activity (A6.4 activity) as well as monitored greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions or net GHG removals achieved by an A6.4 activity shall be independently assessed by a designated operational entity (DOE) against the requirement set out in the RMPs in order for the activity to be registered or renewed under the Article 6.4, or Article 6, paragraph 4 emission reductions to be issued.²
2. Pursuant to the RMPs, the Supervisory Body is responsible for the accreditation of operational entities as DOEs and the establishment of the requirements and process necessary to operate the accreditation.³ The CMA, at its third session, requested the Supervisory Body to review the accreditation standards and procedures of the clean development mechanism (CDM) with a view to applying them with revisions, as appropriate, for the Article 6.4 by the end of 2023, and expeditiously accredit operational entities as DOEs.⁴

1.2. Objectives

3. The objective of the “Procedure: Article 6.4 accreditation” (hereinafter referred to as this procedure) is to set forth concise and transparent rules for the process of the accreditation of operational entities⁵ under the Article 6.4.

2. Scope

2.1. Scope and applicability

4. This procedure sets out the process to operationalize the accreditation of operational entities.
5. This procedure contains the series of rules and actions that shall be followed and/or undertaken by applicant entities (AEs) and DOEs to obtain or maintain accreditation, as well as by the Supervisory Body and its support structure to conduct accreditation assessments of whether AEs/DOEs comply with the Article 6.4 accreditation requirements.⁶

¹ Decision 3/CMA.3, annex. Available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cma2021_10_add1_adv.pdf#page=25.

² RMPs, paragraphs 46, 51 and 57.

³ RMPs, paragraphs 24(a)(i) and 24(b).

⁴ Decision 3/CMA.3, paragraph 5(d)–(e).

⁵ In this procedure document, as in the standard document, the term “operational entity” includes both applicant entity (AE) and designated operational entity (DOE).

⁶ The term “Article 6.4 accreditation requirements” is defined in the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard”.

2.2. Entry into force

6. Version 01.0 of this procedure is effective as of 31 March 2024.

3. Normative reference

7. The following documents are indispensable for the application of this procedure:
- (a) "Article 6.4 accreditation standard";
 - (b) "Procedure on performance monitoring of designated operational entities";
 - (c) "Procedure for selection and performance evaluation of experts on the Article 6.4 accreditation roster of experts";
 - (d) "Forms used in the Article 6.4 accreditation procedure".

4. Definitions

8. In addition to the definitions contained in the "Article 6.4 accreditation standard", the following terms apply in this procedure:
- (a) "Shall" is used to indicate requirements to be followed;
 - (b) "Should" is used to indicate that among several possibilities, one course of action is recommended as particularly suitable;
 - (c) "May" is used to indicate what is permitted.

5. Basics of the Article 6.4 accreditation process

5.1. Actors in the Article 6.4 accreditation process and main functions

9. There are several actors involved in the Article 6.4 accreditation process, and the responsibility of each is as follows:
- (a) The **Supervisory Body** takes decisions on whether to:
 - (i) Accredite AEs as DOEs, maintain the accreditation of DOEs and reaccredit DOEs;
 - (ii) Conduct spot-checks of DOEs;
 - (iii) Place DOEs "under observation";
 - (iv) Suspend the accreditation of DOEs for some or all sectoral scopes;
 - (v) Withdraw the accreditation of DOEs for some or all sectoral scopes.
 - (b) The **Article 6.4 Accreditation Expert Panel (AEP)** serves as the technical panel under the guidance of the Supervisory Body and, in accordance with its terms of reference, considers the results of accreditation assessments of AEs/DOEs by Article 6.4 assessment teams, provides recommendations to the Supervisory Body on the accreditation status of, or related actions for, AEs/DOEs, and makes decisions on areas defined as per this procedure. The AEP may consider cases electronically or at its meetings;

- (c) **Article 6.4 assessment teams (ATs)** conduct accreditation assessments of AEs/DOEs in accordance with this procedure, the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and under the guidance of the AEP, to evaluate whether AEs/DOEs comply with the Article 6.4 accreditation requirements and submit assessment reports to the AEP. ATs are selected from the accreditation roster of experts which contain both external experts and secretariat staff;
- (d) The **secretariat** supports the implementation of this procedure;
- (e) **AEs/DOEs** apply for accreditation, extension of accreditation for additional sectoral scopes and/or reaccreditation and undergo accreditation assessments to demonstrate compliance with Article 6.4 accreditation requirements.

5.2. Scope and status of accreditation

- 10. The Article 6.4 accreditation is based on the validation and verification/certification functions as well as on sectoral scopes of accreditation.⁷ An AE may apply for accreditation for both validation and verification/certification functions in one or more sectoral scopes.
- 11. The accreditation of a DOE is valid for five years from the date of the accreditation decision by the Supervisory Body.
- 12. Accreditation is granted to an entity registered under applicable national laws,⁸ irrespective of whether the entire organization or a part of it performs validation and/or verification/certification functions.
- 13. Accreditation is granted for both validation and verification/certification functions together, in one or more sectoral scopes. Likewise, if accreditation is suspended or withdrawn, it is done so for both validation and verification/certification functions together, in one or more sectoral scopes.

5.3. Objective and scope of accreditation assessments

- 14. The objective of an accreditation assessment of an AE/DOE is to assess and determine whether the AE/DOE complies with Article 6.4 accreditation requirements.
- 15. If the validation and/or verification/certification functions are performed by a part of an AE/DOE, and other parts of the AE/DOE are involved in other activities, these other activities may be assessed as they may affect validation and/or verification/certification activities, in particular with regard to independence and impartiality.

5.4. General modalities of accreditation assessments

- 16. The assessment of an AE for **initial accreditation** and of a DOE for **reaccreditation** consists of the following main elements:
 - (a) Desk review of the application documentation submitted by the AE/DOE with a view to identifying all missing or unclear information and having the AE/DOE gather all necessary information and documentation, as a preparation for the on-site assessment;

⁷ Sectoral scopes of accreditation are defined in the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard”.

⁸ Please refer to section 6 of the Article 6.4 accreditation standard for more details.

- (b) On-site assessment to assess whether the documented systems of the AE/DOE, and its competence and operational capability to perform validation and/or verification/certification functions comply with the Article 6.4 accreditation requirements. An on-site assessment shall take place at the central office of the AE/DOE and may also take place at any other offices of the AE/DOE or outsourced entities where the validation and/or verification/certification functions of the AE/DOE are performed. For reaccreditation, the selection of these other offices will be based on the results of previous assessments (regular on-site surveillances and performance assessments) and the results of the implementation of the “Procedure on performance monitoring of designated operational entities”.
17. If, after completion of an on-site assessment, the AE/DOE has demonstrated compliance with all Article 6.4 accreditation requirements, accreditation or reaccreditation shall be granted to the AE or the DOE, respectively, for both validation and verification/certification functions and in the sectoral scopes in which the AE/DOE has demonstrated its competence to perform its validation and verification/certification functions.
 18. After the Supervisory Body has granted accreditation or reaccreditation, the DOE is allowed to perform its validation and verification/certification functions in the accredited sectoral scopes.
 19. A DOE shall be subject to **performance assessments** during its accredited term. The purpose of a performance assessment is to assess the implementation of the systems of the DOE and its competence in an accredited sectoral scope through an assessment of a specific validation or verification/certification activity. The number and types of performance assessments for a DOE are set out in section 7.1 below.
 20. A DOE shall be subject to two **regular on-site surveillances**, as referred to in section 8 below, during its accreditation term. The purpose of a regular on-site surveillance is to verify whether the systems, competence and operational capability of the DOE continue to meet Article 6.4 accreditation requirements over the accreditation term. A routine on-site surveillance should take place at the central office of the DOE and may also include any other offices of the DOE or its outsourced entities where the validation and/or verification/certification functions of the DOE are performed.
 21. The Supervisory Body may decide to conduct a **spot-check** of a DOE at any time during the accreditation term of the DOE. In addition, the AEP may initiate a spot-check of a DOE in accordance with the “Procedure: Performance monitoring of designated operational entities”. The purpose of a spot-check is to assess whether a DOE still meets one or more specific Article 6.4 accreditation requirements because of a specific concern brought up to the Supervisory Body regarding the compliance of the DOE with Article 6.4 accreditation requirements or because of inadequate performance of the DOE monitored through the “Procedure: Performance monitoring of designated operational entities”. A spot-check may include a desk review, and/or an on-site assessment at any office of the DOE and outsourced entities where the validation and/or verification/certification functions of the DOE are performed, and/or an assessment at the site of the Article 6.4 project (A6.4 project) or programme of activities (A6.4 PoA) being validated or verified/certified.

22. For the planning of an assessment, the risk associated with the activities, locations and personnel covered by the scope of accreditation shall be taken into account while implementing the following provisions:⁹
- (a) Selection of the number and types of offices, outsourced entities and validation and verification/certification activity of the AE/DOE to be assessed during the initiation stage of the assessment;
 - (b) Planning of activities to be assessed by ATs.
23. For the conduct of assessment, the standard person-days and the number of AT members participating in the assessment are provided in Appendix 9 to this procedure, and the standard on-site assessment method to be used by an AT to conduct on-site assessment. Under special circumstances the secretariat may propose to deviate from the standard assessment modalities, based on the risk associated with activities, locations and personnel covered by the scope of accreditation, including:
- (a) The number of experts on the assessment team, with a possibility to have a one-person team;
 - (b) The number of days to be spent by the team on-site, with a possibility to have a one-day assessment;
 - (c) The format of the assessment, with a possibility to have some or all of the assessors working remotely through, for example, videoconferencing;
 - (d) The sites to be included in the assessment, with a possibility to visit only the non-central offices during the regular surveillance assessment.
24. In the event of the deviation, as referred in paragraph 23 above, the time between consecutive on-site assessments shall not exceed two years. Also, deviation shall not be exercised for performance assessment as referred to in section 7 below.
25. If a significant number (e.g. more than 10) of non-conformities (NCs) are raised by the AT in either the initial accreditation assessment, performance assessment, regular on-site surveillance assessment, reaccreditation assessment or extension of accreditation for additional sectoral scopes assessment, an additional five days may be allocated by the secretariat to the time frames required for the AE/DOE and the AT, respectively, to complete the required actions referred to in this procedure.¹⁰
26. Where accreditation assessments are conducted simultaneously, the following modalities apply:
- (a) If a regular on-site surveillance or the reaccreditation process is initiated while a performance assessment is still underway, the outcomes of the performance assessment should be taken into account in preparing the workplan for the regular on-site surveillance or the reaccreditation process;
 - (b) The outcomes of all performance assessments, regular on-site surveillances and any other accreditation assessments in the current accreditation term should be taken into account in preparing the workplan for the reaccreditation process;

⁹ Please refer to section 4.3 of the Article 6.4 accreditation standard on the risks associated with validation and verification/certification conducted by a DOE.

¹⁰ In this procedure, the number of days is to be considered as calendar days, unless specified otherwise.

- (c) If a spot-check is initiated while a regular on-site surveillance or reaccreditation process is underway or will start shortly, the regular on-site surveillance or reaccreditation process should specify the issues that triggered the spot-check, where possible.
27. Where there is evidence identified by the AT that a DOE intentionally provided false information, intentionally omitted information that should have been provided, or deliberately violated any accreditation requirement,¹¹ the AT shall promptly submit a draft assessment report to the AEP. In this case, the following steps shall follow:
- (a) The AEP shall consider the case and decide whether to recommend that the Supervisory Body suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure. At this stage, the AEP may request the DOE to provide information relating to the alleged conduct;
 - (b) If the AEP recommends that the Supervisory Body suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE, the secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. The DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure, and/or request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 27(d) below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable;
 - (c) If the AEP decides not to recommend that the Supervisory Body suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE, the AT shall resume the accreditation assessment;
 - (d) The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP, together with the independent review report and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide whether to suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE in accordance with provisions in section 13 or 14 below, respectively, and based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure;
 - (e) If the Supervisory Body decides not to suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE, the AT shall resume the accreditation assessment.
28. Under exceptional circumstances, while considering the assessments conducted under the sections 6–17 below, the AEP may recommend to the Supervisory Body supported by proper justification that the Supervisory Body:
- (a) Conduct an on-site assessment to verify the implementation of corrective actions, including the modalities of such assessment (e.g. AT members, time frame);
 - (b) Submit any appropriate recommendation. The Supervisory Body shall consider such a recommendation at its next meeting and decide on the course of action.

¹¹ The terms “intentionally” and “deliberately” mean active or passive omission or violation, which cover the situations of through an act or through failure to act, through active intent or through gross negligence or negligent disregard.

29. The AEP may submit any appropriate recommendation to the Supervisory Body for failure of a DOE to meet deadlines specified in the regulations and decisions of the Supervisory Body or the AEP. Such recommendation shall be supported by a proper justification. The Supervisory Body shall consider such recommendation at its next meeting and decide on the course of action, including authorizing deviation from this procedure.
30. If the AT identifies any findings during an assessment, these findings shall be classified NCs or major NCs. Any finding is an NC if it is a non-fulfilment of an accreditation requirement of the Article 6.4. If a finding is not an NC, opportunities for improvement may be raised by the AT and recorded in the final assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013). A major NC is an NC that affects the capability of the management system to achieve the intended results, which may cover the following circumstances and trigger the suspension or withdrawal as specified in Appendix 3 below:¹²
 - (a) If there is a significant doubt that effective process control is in place, or that products or services will meet specified requirements;
 - (b) A number of NCs associated with the same requirement or issue could demonstrate a systemic failure and thus constitute a major NC.
31. If the AT identifies a major NC, the AT shall promptly submit a draft assessment report to the AEP. In this case, the AEP shall consider the case and decide whether to recommend that the Supervisory Body place the DOE under observation or suspend the accreditation of the DOE, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure.
32. Appendix 5 and Appendix 7 to this procedure provide AEs/DOEs with mechanisms to request a review of AEP recommendations and AT raising NCs, respectively.
33. All documentation provided by an AE/DOE for an accreditation assessment shall be in English.
34. The language to be used in any accreditation assessment shall be English. AEs/DOEs may use interpretation/translation services where necessary to ensure effective communication with ATs.

6. Initial accreditation

6.1. General

35. The process for initial accreditation comprises the following steps:
 - (a) Submission of an application for accreditation by an entity;
 - (b) Completeness check of the application documentation by the secretariat;
 - (c) Preparation of a workplan and appointment of an AT by the secretariat;
 - (d) Desk review by the AT of the documentation provided by the AE;
 - (e) On-site assessment by the AT at the central office of the AE and, as applicable, at any other offices of the AE or outsourced entities where the AE validation and/or verification/certification functions are to be performed;

¹² ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015.

- (f) Recommendation by the AEP to the Supervisory Body for accreditation or rejection of application;
- (g) Decision by the Supervisory Body for accreditation or rejection of application.

6.2. Application for accreditation

- 36. An entity that wishes to be accredited and designated as a DOE shall submit to the secretariat a duly completed application form (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-001), a declaration of all other offices of the entity or outsourced entities where the entity's validation and verification/certification functions are to be performed (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-002), and all other documents specified in Appendix 1 to this procedure, and pay the application fee specified in Appendix 9 to this procedure.
- 37. The application of an AE for accreditation shall be considered duly submitted when the secretariat has received both the application documentation and the application fee.
- 38. The AE may voluntarily withdraw its application for accreditation by submitting a written notification of withdrawal any time before the meeting of the Supervisory Body at which a decision on the accreditation is due to be made in accordance with paragraph 79 below.

6.3. Completeness check

- 39. The secretariat shall start processing the application once it is considered duly submitted in accordance with paragraph 37 above.
- 40. The secretariat shall undertake a completeness check of the application documentation. If the documentation is found incomplete, the secretariat shall inform the AE of the missing elements within seven days of the application being considered duly submitted. Subsequent steps of the process shall only continue once all requested documentation has been received by the secretariat.
- 41. The secretariat shall publish the name of the AE and the sectoral scopes applied for by the AE on the UNFCCC Article 6.4 website for global stakeholder consultation promptly after receiving all required documents from the AE. Parties, stakeholders¹³ and UNFCCC-accredited observer organizations shall have 30 days to provide any comments or information in respect of the AE to the secretariat through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC Article 6.4 website.

6.4. Appointment of the AT and preparation of workplan

- 42. The secretariat shall, within five days of receipt of all required documents from the AE, appoint an AT for the assessment, selecting its members from the roster of experts established for the purpose of accreditation assessments (hereinafter referred to as the Accreditation Roster of Experts) in accordance with relevant terms of references. The AT shall consist of at least two members, including a team leader. The size of the AT may vary depending on the size of the AE and the expected volume of validation and verification/certification activities to be performed by the AE, the application documentation and the sectoral scopes of accreditation applied for.

¹³ For the purpose of this procedure, all members of the public are considered to be stakeholders.

43. The secretariat shall inform the AE of the composition of the AT. The AE may object, in writing or by email within five days, to the selection of any AT member on the basis of conflict of interest by identifying such conflict of interest.
44. If the AE objects to the selection of an AT member, the secretariat shall, within five days of receipt of the objection, consider modifying the composition of the AT. If the secretariat considers the objection unjustified, or the AE does not object to the selection of any AT member within the time frame referred to in paragraph 43 above, the composition of the AT shall be deemed accepted. If the secretariat considers the objection justified and replaces a AT member, it shall inform the AE of the new AT member within the same five days. After this, the same steps in paragraphs 43 and 44 above shall repeat until the composition of the AT is deemed accepted.
45. Once the composition of the AT is deemed accepted, each AT member shall sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-004).
46. The secretariat shall, within five days of the end of the global stakeholder consultation, prepare a workplan (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-007) for the assessment, based on the application documentation and the comments and information received during the global stakeholder consultation in accordance with paragraph 41 above, and submit it to the AEP for comments. The workplan shall identify whether additional assessments shall be performed at offices other than the AE central office. The AEP may provide comments on the workplan within five days of receipt of the workplan. The secretariat shall finalize the workplan within five days of the deadline for commenting by the AEP.
47. The secretariat shall provide the AT with:
 - (a) All information related to the application, including the application documentation;
 - (b) The workplan for the assessment.

6.5. Assessment by the AT

6.5.1. Desk review

48. The AT shall undertake the desk review of the application documentation.
49. If the AT considers the information contained in the application documentation sufficient and adequate for the assessment, it shall prepare and finalize a desk review report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-008) and send it to the AE within 15 days of receipt of the documents referred to in paragraph 47 above, and proceed with the on-site assessment in accordance with paragraph 53 below. The AT shall not raise any NC at the stage of desk review.
50. If the AT considers that there is missing, unclear and/or inadequate information in the application documentation, the AT shall prepare a draft desk review report and send it to the AE within 15 days of receipt of the documents referred to in paragraph 47 above, and request the AE to provide additional and/or amended documentation.
51. The AE shall provide the requested additional and/or amended documentation within 20 days of receipt of the draft desk review report.
52. No later than 30 days after sending the draft desk review report to the AE, the AT shall prepare a final desk review report. If the AT, at the first round of the desk review stage, considers the additional and/or amended documentation adequate, or the additional

and/or amended documentation inadequate, or there are still missing documents but they can be assessed during the on-site assessment, the AT shall send it to the AE and proceed with the on-site assessment in accordance with paragraph 53 below. If the AT, at the second round of the desk review stage, considers that the additional and/or amended documentation is not adequate or there are still missing documents and they need to be addressed or submitted prior to the on-site assessment, the AT shall submit a final desk review report to the AEP requesting to consider allowing the AT to conduct an additional round of desk review for the AEP's consideration at its next meeting.

6.5.2. On-site assessment

53. After the desk review, the AT shall conduct an on-site assessment covering all offices identified in the workplan. If there is more than one office assessed, all office assessments shall be compiled into one reporting, and the final decision on accreditation shall be made based on the outcomes of all offices assessed.
54. The AT leader, taking into account the availability of the AT members and the AE and with support from the secretariat, shall coordinate the dates and logistics for the on-site assessment. The visit to the central office shall be conducted within 60 days of receipt of the final desk review report by the AE. The visits to other offices or outsourced entities, if any, shall be conducted after the visit to the central office as per the workplan.
55. If the AE is not available for the AT visit to the central office within the time frame referred to in paragraph 54 above, the secretariat shall request the AE to reconfirm its interest in proceeding with the application for accreditation and seek justification in writing or by email for the delay, and the AE shall reply to the secretariat within seven days of its receipt. The secretariat shall present the case to the AEP for its decision on whether to allow the delay or recommend that the Supervisory Body reject the application.
56. The AT shall conduct the assessment at each office identified in the workplan. If the AT identifies any NC, it shall prepare a non-conformity report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-012) for each NC during the office visit. The AT shall provide the AE with objective evidence for each NC raised. The AE shall have an opportunity to seek clarification from, and ask questions of the AT on the NCs raised.
57. The AE shall provide a written acceptance of any NCs that it agrees with during the AT office visit.
58. If the AE disagrees with any NCs raised by the AT, the AE may request a review of the NCs by the AEP in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure. All agreed NCs shall continue to be addressed as per the provisions in this section up to the step immediately before the preparation of a (draft) final assessment report. For the NCs placed under review, if the AEP decides to maintain them in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure, they shall be addressed as per the provisions in this section and the AT shall prepare a (draft) final assessment report covering all NCs. If the AEP decides to drop them in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure, the AT shall prepare a (draft) final assessment report excluding the dropped NCs.
59. The AT shall prepare an on-site assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-011) and make it available to the AE with non-conformity reports, as applicable, for information, within 15 days of the completion of the visits to all the offices as per the workplan.

60. If the AT has not identified any NC, it shall prepare a draft final assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013) and make it available to the AE for comments at the same time as the on-site assessment report. The AE shall have five days to provide comments on the draft final assessment report. The AT shall finalize the final assessment report, taking under consideration the comments of the AE, make it available to the AE for information, and submit it together with the on-site assessment report to the AEP within five days of the deadline for commenting by the AE. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 6.6 below.
61. If the AT has identified one or more NCs, the AE shall conduct a root-cause analysis, and propose corrective actions for each agreed NC, including a time frame for implementation, within 15 days of receipt of the on-site assessment report.
62. The AT shall assess the proposed corrective actions together with the root-cause analysis and communicate its acceptance or non-acceptance to the AE within five days of receipt of them.
63. If the AE does not present a root-cause analysis or propose corrective actions by the deadline referred to in paragraph 61 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the AE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 6.6 below.
64. If the AT does not accept the proposed corrective actions, it shall provide the AE with explanations to such rejection. The AE shall have an additional seven days to propose revised corrective actions.
65. The AT shall assess the revised proposed corrective actions within five days of their receipt.
66. If the AT does not accept the revised proposed corrective actions, or if the AE does not propose revised corrective actions by the deadline referred to in paragraph 64 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the AE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 6.6 below.
67. If the original or revised proposed corrective actions for all agreed NCs are accepted by the AT, the AE shall implement all the corrective actions and submit evidence of their implementation to the AT within 60 days of their acceptance by the AT.
68. The AT shall assess the implementation of all the corrective actions within 10 days of receipt of the evidence of implementation.
69. If the AE does not submit evidence of implementation by the deadline referred to in paragraph 67 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the AE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and the non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 6.6 below.
70. If the AT considers that all the agreed NCs have been adequately addressed through the implementation of the corrective actions, the AT shall close the NCs and prepare a draft final assessment report and make it available to the AE for comments within seven days of the completion of the assessment of the implementation of all the corrective actions.

71. If the AT considers that at least one NC has not been adequately addressed, the AE shall have an additional 30 days to pursue implementation of the corrective actions and submit further evidence to the AT.
72. The AT shall assess the further implementation of the corrective actions within 10 days of receipt of the further evidence. Regardless of whether the AT still considers the implementation of corrective actions unsatisfactory, or whether the AE has submitted adequate further evidence of implementation of the corrective actions, the AT shall prepare a draft final assessment report and make it available to the AE for comments within seven days of the completion of the assessment of the further implementation of the corrective actions, or the deadline for submission of further evidence, as applicable.
73. The AE shall have five days from the day the draft final assessment report was made available to it to provide comments on the draft final assessment report. At this stage, the AE shall not provide additional evidence of implementation of corrective actions to the NCs.
74. The AT shall finalize the final assessment report, taking under consideration the comments provided by the AE, make it available to the AE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and non-conformity reports within five days of the deadline for commenting by the AE.

6.6. Consideration by the AEP

75. The AEP shall consider the reports prepared by the AT. If the AEP considers that one or more NCs remain open, it may provide one final opportunity to the AE to resolve the remaining NCs in accordance with relevant provisions in the previous section of this procedure, before the AEP concludes the assessment.
76. If the AEP considers that all NCs have been closed or that no NCs have been raised, it shall recommend that the Supervisory Body accredit the AE for all sectoral scopes applied for.
77. If the AEP considers that, after the final opportunity referred to in paragraph 75 above, as applicable, there still remains one or more open NCs, it shall recommend to the Supervisory Body one of the following options:
 - (a) Accredite the AE only for some sectoral scopes applied for;
 - (b) Reject the application for accreditation.
78. The secretariat shall inform the AE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 77(a) and (b) above, the AE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. In this case, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 79 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case.

6.7. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

79. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP together with the independent review report, as applicable, and decide on one of the following options:
 - (a) Accredite the AE for all sectoral scopes applied for;

- (b) Accredit the AE for some sectoral scopes applied for;
 - (c) Reject the application for accreditation.
80. If the Supervisory Body decides to accredit the AE for some or all sectoral scopes applied for, the secretary of the Supervisory Body shall issue an accreditation certificate to the AE.
81. The secretariat shall maintain a public list of DOEs on the UNFCCC Article 6.4 website, containing information on:
- (a) Their accredited sectoral scopes;
 - (b) Contact details and addresses of the central office and any other offices of the entity as well as those of the outsourced entities where the validation and verification/certification functions are performed;
 - (c) A summary of the requests for registration and issuance submitted per DOE.

7. Performance assessment

7.1. General

82. The number and types of performance assessments for planning purposes should be determined as follows:
- (a) A minimum of three performance assessments, reasonably spaced along with the regular surveillances, in the five-year accreditation term for any DOE as the mandatory basis;¹⁴
 - (b) Additional performance assessment(s) based on the volume of work as follows:
 - (i) One additional performance assessment on a validation activity per year if the DOE submitted 50 or more requests for registration in the previous 12 months;
 - (ii) One additional performance assessment on a verification activity per year if the DOE submitted 150 or more requests for issuance in the previous 12 months;
 - (c) Addition or reduction of the number of performance assessments based on the output of the “Procedure: Performance monitoring of designated operational entities” by:
 - (i) One additional performance assessment on a validation or verification/certification activity if the indicator I_2 is in the yellow zone for the registration or issuance process, respectively, for three consecutive monitoring periods;
 - (ii) One less performance assessment on a validation or verification/certification activity if the indicator I_2 is in the green zone for the registration or issuance process, respectively, for four consecutive monitoring periods. This reduction

¹⁴ The total number of performance assessments may increase to one performance assessment per year within the five-year accreditation term based on the risk-based approach analysis.

in the number of performance assessments shall be effected only from those added in accordance with paragraph 82(b) above.

83. The launching of performance assessments is subject to a DOE notifying the secretariat, through a dedicated interface on the UNFCCC website, of the timing of the site inspection of the proposed A6.4 activity related to requests for registration or renewal or requests for issuance, as per the provisions related to such notification as defined under "Procedure: Article 6.4 activity cycle procedure for projects" and "Procedure: Article 6.4 activity cycle procedure for programme of activities".
84. The DOE shall make at least one submission of a request for registration, renewal or issuance under the Article 6.4 activity cycle within the five-year accreditation term to ensure the implementation of the established quality management system of the 6.4 DOE and its competence; otherwise, the DOE's reaccreditation shall be rejected as highlighted under paragraph 174(c) below.

7.2. Initiation

85. The secretariat shall select validation and verification/certification activities for performance assessments to be conducted for a DOE based on the notification of site inspection by the DOE for requests for registration or renewal or requests for issuance, as highlighted under paragraph 83 above.
86. The secretariat shall notify the DOE of the validation or verification/certification activity selected for a performance assessment. The DOE shall submit to the secretariat the documentation for the assessment specified in Appendix 1 to this procedure within five days of receipt of the notification.

7.3. Completeness check

87. The secretariat shall undertake a completeness check of the documentation for the assessment. If any of the required documents are not received by the secretariat by the deadline referred to in paragraph 86 above, the secretariat shall send a reminder to the DOE within seven days of the deadline. If any of the required documents are still not received by the secretariat within seven days of sending the reminder, the secretariat shall report the case to the AEP, and the AEP shall make a recommendation to the Supervisory Body to place the DOE under observation.

7.4. Appointment of the AT

88. The secretariat shall, within five days of receipt of all required documents, including the confirmation of the on-site inspection date from the DOE, appoint an AT for the assessment, selecting its members from the Accreditation Roster of Experts. The AT shall consist of a team leader and an expert qualified in the sectoral scopes of the A6.4 project or A6.4 PoA in the validation or verification/certification activity selected for the performance assessment. The size of the AT may be reduced or increased to ensure that the competence of the AT is maintained and that the AT may adequately observe the DOE verification team during a performance assessment based on a verification/certification.
89. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the composition of the AT. The DOE may object, in writing or by email within five days, to the selection of any AT member on the basis of conflict of interest by identifying such conflict of interest.

90. If the DOE objects to the selection of an AT member, the secretariat shall consider modifying the composition of the AT within five days of receipt of the objection. If the secretariat considers the objection unjustified, or the DOE does not object to the selection of any AT member within the time frame referred to in paragraph 89 above, the AT shall be deemed accepted. If the secretariat considers the objection justified and replaces a AT member, it shall inform the DOE of the new AT member within the same five days. After this, the same steps in paragraphs 89 and 90 above shall repeat until the composition of the AT is deemed accepted.
91. Once the composition of the AT is deemed accepted, each AT member shall sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-004).
92. The secretariat shall provide the AT with the documentation for the assessment referred to in paragraph 86 above.

7.5. Assessment by the AT

93. The AT may request additional documents based on the initial review of the documentation for the assessment within five days of receipt of the first set of documentation. The DOE shall submit the requested additional documents within five days of receipt of the request. A performance assessment on a validation and verification/certification activity shall be based on the observation of the validation and verification carried out by the DOE team during the on-site inspection at the project activity site(s) and the desk-review evaluation of a draft validation and verification report and other documentary evidence submitted by the DOE.¹⁵ Regarding the on-site inspection, the DOE shall, with the support of the secretariat, coordinate the dates and logistics for the visit to the project activity site(s) by its validation and verification team with the AT. The DOE shall submit to the AT a draft validation and verification report, duly reviewed internally for its completeness and adequacy, including Corrective Action Requests, Clarification Requests and/or Forward Action Requests, within 45 days of the on-site inspection.
94. The AT shall conduct the assessment of the documentation, including any additional documents that have been requested by the AT.
95. The AT shall, within 15 days of receipt of the documentation for the assessment, prepare a draft performance assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-014 or A6.4-FORM-ACCR-015, as applicable), containing findings including those of potential NCs, objective evidence for each finding and a conclusion on whether the DOE conducted the validation or verification/certification activity competently, and make it available to the DOE for comments.
96. The DOE shall have five days to seek or provide clarification regarding the findings from or to the AT. The DOE may also submit additional documents to support its clarification.
97. The AT shall raise an NC for each finding that the AT concludes to be an issue showing non-compliance with an Article 6.4 accreditation requirement, prepare a non-conformity report for each NC, as applicable, finalize the performance assessment report, including

¹⁵ In accordance with the “Article 6.4 validation and verification standard for projects” and the “Article 6.4 validation and verification standard for programmes of activities”, an on-site inspection by a DOE may be exempted from certain verification/certification activities. If such verification/certification activity is chosen for a performance assessment, the assessment may be based on the remote inspection and/or the desk-review evaluation.

- a conclusion on whether the DOE conducted the validation/verification activity competently, and make them available to the DOE for information within five days of the deadline for commenting by the DOE.
98. If the AT concludes that the DOE conducted the validation or verification/certification activity incompetently, the AT shall submit the performance assessment report to the AEP within five days of the deadline for commenting by the DOE. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 7.6 below. In the interim, any NCs shall continue to be addressed in accordance with the relevant provisions of this section.
99. The DOE shall consider the performance assessment report and non-conformity reports and provide a written acceptance of any NCs that it agrees with within five days of receipt of the reports.
100. If the DOE disagrees with any NCs raised by the AT, the DOE may request a review of the NCs by the AEP in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure. All agreed NCs shall continue to be addressed as per the provisions in this section up to the step immediately before the preparation of a (draft) final assessment report. For the NCs placed under review, if the AEP decides to maintain them in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure, they shall be addressed as per the provisions in this section and the AT shall prepare a (draft) final assessment report covering all NCs. If the AEP decides to drop them in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure, the AT shall prepare a (draft) final assessment report excluding the dropped NCs.
101. If the AT has not identified any NC, it shall prepare a draft final assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013) and make it available to the DOE for comments at the same time as the performance assessment report. The DOE shall have five days to provide comments on the draft final assessment report. The AT shall finalize the final assessment report taking into account the comments of the DOE, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the performance assessment report within five days of the deadline for commenting by the DOE. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 7.6 below.
102. If the AT has identified one or more NCs, the DOE shall conduct a root-cause analysis and propose corrective actions for each agreed NC, including a time frame for implementation, within 15 days of receipt of the performance assessment report and non-conformity reports.
103. The AT shall assess the proposed corrective actions together with the root-cause analysis and communicate its acceptance or non-acceptance to the DOE within five days of receipt of them.
104. If the DOE does not present a root-cause analysis or propose corrective actions by the deadline referred to in paragraph 102 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the performance assessment report and non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 7.6 below.
105. If the AT does not accept the proposed corrective actions, it shall provide the DOE with explanations to such rejection. The DOE shall have an additional seven days to propose revised corrective actions.
106. The AT shall assess the revised proposed corrective actions within five days of their receipt.

107. If the AT does not accept the revised proposed corrective actions, or if the DOE does not propose revised corrective actions by the deadline referred to in paragraph 105 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the performance assessment report and non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 7.6 below.
108. If the original or revised proposed corrective actions for all agreed NCs are accepted by the AT, the DOE shall implement all the corrective actions and submit evidence of their implementation to the AT within 30 days of their acceptance by the AT.
109. The AT shall assess the implementation of all the corrective actions within 10 days of receipt of the evidence of implementation.
110. If the DOE does not submit evidence of implementation by the deadline referred to in paragraph 108 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the performance assessment report and the non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 7.6 below.
111. If the AT considers that all the agreed NCs have been adequately addressed through the implementation of the corrective actions, the AT shall close the NCs and prepare a draft final assessment report and make it available to the DOE for comments within seven days of the completion of the assessment of the implementation of all the corrective actions.
112. If the AT considers that at least one NC has not been adequately addressed, the DOE shall have an additional 15 days to pursue the implementation of the corrective actions and submit further evidence to the AT.
113. The AT shall assess the further implementation of corrective actions within 10 days of receipt of the further evidence. Regardless of whether the AT still considers the implementation of corrective actions unsatisfactory, or whether the DOE has submitted adequate further evidence of implementation of the corrective actions, the AT shall prepare a draft final assessment report, including a conclusion on whether the DOE conducted the validation/verification activity competently, and make it available to the DOE for comments within seven days of the completion of the assessment of the further implementation of the corrective actions, or the deadline for submission of further evidence, as applicable.
114. The DOE shall have five days from the day the draft final assessment report was made available to it to provide comments on the draft final assessment report. At this stage, the DOE shall not provide additional evidence of implementation of corrective actions to the NCs.
115. The AT shall finalize the final assessment report, taking under consideration the comments provided by the DOE, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the performance assessment report and non-conformity reports within five days of the deadline for commenting by the DOE.

7.6. Consideration by the AEP

116. The AEP shall consider the reports prepared by the AT. If the AEP considers that one or more NCs remain open, it may provide one final opportunity to the DOE to resolve the

remaining NCs in accordance with the relevant provisions in the previous section of the procedure, before the AEP concludes the assessment.

117. If the AEP considers that all NCs have been closed or that no NCs have been raised, it shall inform the Supervisory Body of the completion of the performance assessment. However, if the AEP considers that the DOE conducted the validation or verification/certification activity incompetently or that at least one NC requires follow-up to verify the effectiveness of the corrective action, it may make a recommendation to the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraph 28 above.
118. If the AEP considers that, after the final opportunity referred to in paragraph 116 above, as applicable, there still remains one or more open NCs, it shall recommend one of the following options to the Supervisory Body:
 - (a) Place the DOE under observation, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure;
 - (b) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure;
 - (c) A course of action in accordance with paragraph 28 above.
119. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 119(a) and (b) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP recommendation is the option referred to in paragraph 119(b) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 120 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.

7.7. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

120. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP together with the independent review report and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, on one of the following options:
 - (a) Maintain the accreditation of the DOE;
 - (b) Place the DOE under observation;
 - (c) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
121. The conditions of under-observation status and suspension of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure. The modalities for placing and lifting an under-observation status and a suspension of accreditation are defined in section 12 and section 13 below, respectively.
122. If the Supervisory Body decides to place the DOE under observation or suspend its accreditation, the secretariat shall promptly update the status of the DOE on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.

8. Regular on-site surveillance

8.1. General

123. A DOE shall be subject to two regular on-site surveillance assessments during its five-year accreditation term: one during the second year and another one during the fourth year of the term.
124. If a regular on-site surveillance takes place at more than one office, all office assessments shall be compiled into one reporting, and the final decision on accreditation shall be made based on the outcomes of all offices assessed.

8.2. Initiation

125. The secretariat shall notify the DOE at least 90 days in advance of the 30-day period within which all the office visits for a regular on-site surveillance assessment will take place. The DOE may request a shift of the period by not more than 30 days earlier or later. The DOE and the secretariat shall agree on the period promptly.
126. The DOE shall submit to the secretariat the documentation for the assessment specified in Appendix 1 to this procedure within 15 days of the agreement on the period for the office visits.

8.3. Completeness check

127. The secretariat shall undertake a completeness check of the documentation for the assessment. If any of the required documents are not received by the secretariat by the deadline referred to in paragraph 126 above, the secretariat shall send a reminder to the DOE within seven days of the deadline. If any of the required documents are still not received by the secretariat within seven days of sending the reminder, the secretariat shall report the case to the AEP, and the AEP shall make a recommendation to the Supervisory Body to place the DOE under observation.

8.4. Appointment of the AT and preparation of workplan

128. The secretariat shall, within five days of receipt of all required documents from the DOE, submit the draft workplan for the regular on-site surveillance assessment to the AEP for comments. The workplan shall identify the offices where the regular on-site surveillance assessment will be conducted and provide the instructions to the AT on how to assess the corrective actions that were implemented by the DOE to address the NC(s) raised in previous assessments. The workplan may also include that the AT is to observe a meeting of the impartiality committee of the DOE.
129. In preparing the draft workplan (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-007) and in identifying which sites to visit, the secretariat shall consider:
- (a) The documents submitted by the DOE;
 - (b) The number of employees of the DOE;
 - (c) The functions performed at each office;
 - (d) The required technical competence of the AT;

- (e) The performance of the DOE as monitored through the implementation of the “Procedure on performance monitoring of designated operational entities”;
 - (f) The volume of the DOE’s validation and verification/certification work;
 - (g) Any other influencing factors.
130. The AEP may provide comments on the draft workplan within five days of receipt of the workplan. The secretariat shall finalize the workplan within five days of the deadline for commenting by the AEP.
131. The secretariat shall, within five days of finalization of the workplan, appoint an AT for the assessment, selecting its members from the Accreditation Roster of Experts.
132. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the composition of the AT. The DOE may object, in writing or by email within five days, to the selection of any AT member on the basis of conflict of interest by identifying such conflict of interest.
133. If the DOE objects to the selection of an AT member, the secretariat shall consider modifying the composition of the AT within five days of receipt of the objection. If the secretariat considers the objection unjustified, or the DOE does not object to the selection of any AT member within the time frame referred to in paragraph 132 above, the composition of the AT shall be deemed accepted. If the secretariat considers the objection justified and replaces a AT member, it shall inform the DOE of the new AT member within the same five days. After this, the same steps in paragraphs 133 and 134 above shall be repeated until the composition of the AT is deemed accepted.
134. Once the composition of the AT is deemed accepted, each AT member shall sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-004).
135. The secretariat shall provide the AT with:
- (a) The documentation for the assessment referred to in paragraph 126 above;
 - (b) The workplan for the assessment.

8.5. Assessment by the AT

136. The AT leader shall coordinate the dates and logistics for the office visits, taking into account the availability of the team members and the DOE and with support from the secretariat. The AT leader shall send an assessment plan to the DOE at least 10 days prior to each office visit.¹⁶
137. The AT shall review the documentation for the assessment before the office visits.
138. The AT shall conduct the assessment at each office identified in the workplan. If the AT identifies any NC, it shall prepare a non-conformity report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-012) for each NC during the office visit. The AT shall provide the DOE with objective evidence for each NC raised. The DOE shall have an opportunity to seek clarification from, and ask questions of, the AT on the NCs raised.

¹⁶ The assessment plan shall contain the assessment requirements, assessment schedule, responsibilities amongst AT members and administration and logistic information.

139. The DOE shall provide a written acceptance of any NCs that it agrees with during the AT office visit.
140. If the DOE disagrees with any NCs raised by the AT, the DOE may request a review of the NCs by the AEP in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure. All agreed NCs shall continue to be addressed as per the provisions in this section up to the step immediately before the preparation of a (draft) final assessment report. For the NCs placed under review, if the AEP decides to maintain them in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure, they shall be addressed as per the provisions in this section, and the AT shall prepare a (draft) final assessment report covering all NCs. If the AEP decides to drop them in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 7 to this procedure, the AT shall prepare a (draft) final assessment report excluding the dropped NCs.
141. The AT shall prepare an on-site assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-011) and make it available to the DOE with non-conformity reports, as applicable, for information, within 15 days of the completion of the visits to all the offices as per the workplan.
142. If the AT has not identified any NC, it shall prepare a draft final assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013) and make it available to the DOE for comments at the same time as the on-site assessment report. The DOE shall have five days from the day the draft final assessment report was made available to it to provide comments on the draft final assessment report. The AT shall finalize the final assessment report taking under consideration the comments of the DOE, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report within five days of the deadline for commenting by the DOE. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 8.6 below.
143. If the AT has identified one or more NCs, the DOE shall conduct a root-cause analysis and propose corrective actions for each agreed NC, including a time frame for implementation, within 15 days of receipt of the on-site assessment report.
144. The AT shall assess the proposed corrective actions together with the root-cause analysis and communicate its acceptance or non-acceptance to the DOE within five days of receipt of them.
145. If the DOE does not present a root-cause analysis or propose corrective actions by the deadline referred to in paragraph 143 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 8.6 below.
146. If the AT does not accept the proposed corrective actions, it shall provide the DOE with explanations to such rejection. The DOE shall have an additional seven days to propose revised corrective actions.
147. The AT shall assess the revised proposed corrective actions within five days of receipt of them.
148. If the AT does not accept the revised proposed corrective actions, or if the DOE does not propose revised corrective actions by the deadline referred to in paragraph 146 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 8.6 below.

149. If the original or revised proposed corrective actions for all agreed NCs are accepted by the AT, the DOE shall implement all the corrective actions and submit evidence of their implementation to the AT within 30 days of their acceptance by the AT.
150. The AT shall assess the implementation of all the corrective actions within 10 days of receipt of the evidence of implementation.
151. If the DOE does not submit evidence of implementation by the deadline referred to in paragraph 149 above, the AT shall prepare a final assessment report, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and the non-conformity reports within seven days of the deadline. The AEP shall consider the case in accordance with section 8.6 below.
152. If the AT considers that all the agreed NCs have been adequately addressed through the implementation of the corrective actions, the AT shall close the NCs and prepare a draft final assessment report and make it available to the DOE for comments within seven days of the completion of the assessment of the implementation of all the corrective actions.
153. If the AT considers that at least one NC has not been adequately addressed, the DOE shall have an additional 15 days to pursue implementation of the corrective actions and submit further evidence to the AT.
154. The AT shall assess the further implementation of the corrective actions within 10 days of receipt of the further evidence. Regardless of whether the AT still considers the implementation of corrective actions unsatisfactory, or whether the DOE has submitted adequate further evidence of implementation of the corrective actions, the AT shall prepare a draft final assessment report and make it available to the DOE for comments within seven days of the completion of the assessment of the further implementation of the corrective actions, or the deadline for submission of further evidence, as applicable.
155. The DOE shall have five days from the day the draft final assessment report was made available to it to provide comments on the draft final assessment report. At this stage, the DOE shall not provide additional evidence of implementation of corrective actions to the NCs.
156. The AT shall finalize the final assessment report, taking under consideration the comments provided by the DOE, make it available to the DOE for information, and submit it to the AEP together with the on-site assessment report and non-conformity reports within five days of the deadline for commenting by the DOE.

8.6. Consideration by the AEP

157. The AEP shall consider the reports prepared by the AT. If the AEP considers that one or more NCs remain open, it may provide one final opportunity to the DOE to resolve the remaining NCs in accordance with the relevant provisions in the previous section of this procedure, before the AEP concludes the assessment.
158. If the AEP considers that all NCs have been closed or that no NCs have been raised, it shall inform the Supervisory Body of the successful completion of the regular on-site surveillance.
159. If the AEP considers that, after the final opportunity referred to in paragraph 157 above, as applicable, there still remains one or more open NCs, it shall recommend to the

Supervisory Body, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, one of the following options:

- (a) Place the DOE under observation;
- (b) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.

160. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 160(a) and (b) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP recommendation is the option referred to in paragraph 160(b) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 161 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.

8.7. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

161. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP together with the independent review report and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, on one of the following options:
- (a) Maintain the accreditation of the DOE;
 - (b) Place the DOE under observation;
 - (c) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
162. The conditions of under-observation status and suspension of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure. The modalities for placing and lifting an under-observation status and a suspension of accreditation are defined in section 12 and section 13 below, respectively.
163. If the Supervisory Body decides to place the DOE under observation or suspend its accreditation, the secretariat shall promptly update the status of the DOE on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.

9. Reaccreditation

9.1. Application for reaccreditation

164. A DOE that wishes to be re-accredited after the expiry of the current accreditation term shall apply for reaccreditation between 10 and 12 months before the expiry date of the current accreditation term.
165. When applying for reaccreditation, the DOE may apply for accreditation in additional sectoral scopes as referred to in section 10 below.
166. The DOE shall submit to the secretariat a duly completed application form (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-001) and all other documents specified in Appendix 1 to this procedure and pay the application fee specified in Appendix 9 to this procedure.

167. The application of a DOE for reaccreditation shall be considered duly submitted when the secretariat has received both the application documentation and the application fee.

9.2. General modalities

168. The provisions and timelines in sections 6.3–6.5 above regarding the completeness check, appointment of an AT, preparation of a workplan, desk review and on-site assessment shall apply *mutatis mutandis*, except for:
- (a) Publication of the name of the DOE and the sectoral scopes applied for global stakeholder consultation, which is not necessary;
 - (b) The time frame for implementing corrective actions referred to in paragraph 67 above, which shall be 30 days instead of 60 days;
 - (c) The additional time frame for pursuing the implementation of corrective actions referred to in paragraph 71 above, which shall be 15 days instead of 30 days;
 - (d) The workplan, which shall provide the instructions to the AT on how to assess the corrective actions that were implemented by the DOE to address the NC(s) raised in previous assessments.
169. The performance assessments initiated but not completed before a DOE is re-accredited shall remain in effect regardless of the proceeding of reaccreditation assessment.
170. In case of a delay in the reaccreditation process, the AEP may recommend that the Supervisory Body extend the accreditation of the DOE accordingly and the Supervisory Body shall consider the AEP's recommendation in the next meeting. The extension shall be granted only if the DOE has applied for reaccreditation within the time frame referred to in paragraph 164 above and the DOE is not fully responsible for the delay in the process of reaccreditation.
171. The DOE may voluntarily withdraw its application for reaccreditation by submitting a written notification of withdrawal any time before the meeting of the Supervisory Body at which a decision on the reaccreditation is due to be made in accordance with paragraph 176 below.

9.3. Consideration by the AEP

172. The AEP shall consider the reports prepared by the AT. If the AEP considers that one or more NCs remain open, it may provide one final opportunity to the DOE to resolve the remaining NCs in accordance with the relevant provisions in section 6.5 above, before the AEP concludes the assessment.
173. If the AEP considers that all NCs have been closed or that no NCs have been raised, it shall recommend that the Supervisory Body re-accredit the DOE for all sectoral scopes applied for.
174. If the AEP considers that, after the final opportunity referred to in paragraph 172 above, as applicable, there still remains one or more open NCs, it shall recommend to the Supervisory Body one of the following options:
- (a) Re-accredit the DOE only for some sectoral scopes applied for;

- (b) Temporarily extend the accreditation of the DOE and, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure:
 - (i) Place the DOE under observation; or
 - (ii) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for all sectoral scopes;
 - (c) Reject the application for reaccreditation.
175. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 175(a), (b) and (c) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 175(b)(ii) and (c) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 176 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.

9.4. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

176. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP together with the independent review report and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide on one of the following options:
- (a) Re-accredit the DOE for all sectoral scopes applied for;
 - (b) Re-accredit the DOE only for some sectoral scopes applied for;
 - (c) Temporarily extend the accreditation of the DOE and based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure:
 - (i) Place the DOE under observation; or
 - (ii) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for all sectoral scopes;
 - (d) Reject the application for reaccreditation.
177. The conditions of under-observation status and suspension of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure. The modalities for placing and lifting an under-observation status and a suspension of accreditation are defined in section 12 and section 13 below, respectively.
178. If the Supervisory Body decides to re-accredit the DOE, the secretary of the Supervisory Body shall issue an accreditation certificate to the DOE. The new accreditation term shall be valid for five years from the date of expiry of the previous accreditation term.
179. The secretariat shall promptly update the status of the DOE on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.

10. Accreditation for additional sectoral scopes

180. A DOE may apply for accreditation for additional sectoral scopes at any time within its accreditation term.

181. The AEP shall consider the application and decide on the scope of the assessment, taking into account the sectoral scopes for which the DOE is currently accredited, and the additional sectoral scopes applied for.
182. The provisions and timelines defined in sections 6.3–6.7 above regarding the completeness check, appointment of a AT, preparation of a workplan, desk review, on-site assessment, and consideration by the AEP and the Supervisory Body shall apply *mutatis mutandis*, except for:
 - (a) Publication of the name of the DOE and the additional sectoral scopes applied for global stakeholder consultation, which is not necessary;
 - (b) The time frame for implementing corrective actions referred to in paragraph 67 above, which shall be 30 days instead of 60 days;
 - (c) The additional time frame for pursuing the implementation of corrective actions referred to in paragraph 71 above, which shall be 15 days instead of 30 days.
183. An accreditation for a maximum of three additional sectoral scopes may be granted based on an assessment performed and consideration given in accordance with sections 6.5–6.7 above but without conducting any site visit.
184. The accreditation for additional sectoral scopes of a DOE shall be valid only until the expiry of the existing accreditation term of the DOE. It is noted that the application of additional sectoral scope can also be applied along with the application of reaccreditation as referred in to paragraph 165 above.

11. Spot-check

11.1. Initiation

185. The Supervisory Body may decide to conduct a spot-check of a DOE at any time during its accreditation term.
186. The consideration by the Supervisory Body to conduct a spot-check of a DOE may be triggered by, *inter alia*:
 - (a) The review process conducted by the Supervisory Body on a request for registration or a request for issuance submitted by the DOE;
 - (b) Information received from a third party on the possible inadequate performance of the DOE in its validation or verification/certification activities as well as on any changes which may significantly impair the compliance of the DOE with Article 6.4 accreditation requirements, such as changes in ownership, organizational structure, internal policies and procedures, resources and personnel;
 - (c) A recommendation of the AEP based on, *inter alia*, the result of handling complaints against the DOE in accordance with Appendix 6 to this procedure.
187. The reason that triggered a spot-check shall remain confidential.
188. The Supervisory Body may decide to immediately suspend the accreditation of the DOE under a spot-check. If the Supervisory Body decides to do so, it shall provide the DOE with an opportunity for a hearing at a Supervisory Body meeting prior to suspending the accreditation. Also in this case, the assessment for lifting the suspension in accordance

- with section 13 below shall not be initiated until and unless the Supervisory Body decides to continue the suspension based on the outcome of the spot-check conducted in accordance with the present section.
189. The Supervisory Body, once it has decided to conduct a spot-check, shall agree on the scope of the spot-check. For this purpose, if the AEP recommends that the Supervisory Body conduct a spot-check, it shall also propose the scope of the spot-check.
190. The AEP shall initiate a spot-check of a DOE if its performance on validation or verification/certification activities as monitored through the implementation of the "Procedure: Performance monitoring of designated operational entities" declines, as the final version of a monitoring report prepared in accordance with the procedure shows that the DOE is in the red zone for the indicators I₂ or I₃.
191. Notwithstanding the provision in paragraph 190 above, the AEP may not initiate a spot-check of a DOE that has reached the red zone of indicators I₂ or I₃ if the following two conditions are met:
- (a) The issues in the scope of the spot-check have been covered and resolved in recent assessments;
 - (b) A visit to the central office of the DOE under a regular on-site surveillance or reaccreditation assessment is planned to take place in the next 90 days; in such case, the issues envisaged for the spot-check shall be considered and addressed in the regular surveillance or reaccreditation assessment.
192. If the AEP initiates a spot-check of a DOE in accordance with paragraph 190 above, it shall agree on the scope of the spot-check and inform the Supervisory Body of the initiation of the spot-check and the scope. The scope shall be based on the information gathered in the implementation of the "Procedure: Performance monitoring of designated operational entities".
193. The scope of a spot-check shall include the following:
- (a) Identification of the type and the site of the spot-check, such as:
 - (i) On-site assessment at the central office of the DOE and/or any other offices of the DOE or outsourced entities where the DOE validation or verification/certification functions are performed;
 - (ii) On-site assessment at an A6.4 project or A6.4 PoA site regarding which the DOE performed a validation or verification/certification;
 - (iii) Off-site document review;
 - (b) Specific aspects to be focused on during the spot-check, such as:
 - (i) Management personnel of the DOE and its validation and verification/certification personnel in relation to its competence to perform validation and verification/certification functions;
 - (ii) Organizational and management structure of the DOE, in particular for providing validation and verification/certification services in an independent and impartial manner;

- (iii) Any other area identified as relevant to verify the compliance of the DOE with Article 6.4 accreditation requirements.

194. The name of the DOE under spot-check shall be made public in the report of the Supervisory Body meeting at which the Supervisory Body decided to conduct the spot-check or was informed by the AEP of the initiation of the spot-check.

11.2. Appointment of the AT and preparation of workplan

195. The secretariat shall, within five days of the Supervisory Body's decision to conduct the spot-check in accordance with paragraph 185 above, or the initiation of the spot-check by the AEP in accordance with paragraph 190 above, appoint an AT for the spot-check, selecting its members from the Accreditation Roster of Experts. The AT shall consist of at least two members, including a team leader. The size of the AT may vary depending on the nature of the issue that triggered the spot-check.

196. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the composition of the AT. The DOE may object, in writing or by email within five days, to the selection of any AT member on the basis of conflict of interest by identifying such conflict of interest.

197. If the DOE objects to the selection of an AT member, the secretariat shall consider modifying the composition of the AT within five days of receipt of the objection. If the secretariat considers the objection unjustified, or the DOE does not object to the selection of any AT member within the time frame referred to in paragraph 196 above, the AT shall be deemed accepted. If the secretariat considers the objection justified and replaces an AT member, it shall inform the DOE of the new AT member within the same five days. After this, the same steps in paragraphs 197 above and 198 shall repeat until the composition of the AT is deemed accepted.

198. Once the composition of the AT is deemed accepted, each AT member shall sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-004).

199. The secretariat shall, within five days of the Supervisory Body's decision to conduct the spot-check in accordance with paragraph 185 above, or the initiation of the spot-check by the AEP in accordance with paragraph 190 above, prepare a workplan (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-007) for the spot-check and submit it to the AEP for comments, based on the scope defined by the Supervisory Body or the AEP, as applicable. The AEP may provide comments on the workplan within five days of receipt of the workplan. The secretariat shall finalize the workplan within five days of the deadline for commenting by the AEP.

200. The secretariat shall provide the AT with:

- (a) All relevant information on the areas to be assessed;
- (b) The workplan for the assessment.

201. If the spot-check is to be conducted at an Article 6.4 project activity or PoA site, the secretariat shall:

- (a) Send a notification to the DOE and respective activity participants before the spot-check;
- (b) Request the DOE to coordinate necessary arrangements with activity participants.

11.3. Assessment by the AT

202. The AT shall review the documentation provided by the secretariat and prepare an assessment plan taking into account the scope of the spot-check.
203. After the completion of its assessment, the AT shall prepare a draft spot-check report using the relevant accreditation assessment form and non-conformity reports, as applicable, and make them available to the DOE for comments within seven days.
204. The DOE shall have five days to provide comments on the draft spot-check report and the non-conformity reports, as applicable.
205. The AT shall finalize the spot-check report within five days of the deadline for commenting by the DOE and submit it to the AEP together with the non-conformity reports, as applicable.

11.4. Consideration by the AEP

206. The AEP shall consider the spot-check reports, the non-conformity reports, as applicable, and the comments provided by the DOE, and, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, shall recommend to the Supervisory Body one of the following options:
 - (a) Confirm the accreditation of the DOE for all accredited sectoral scopes;
 - (b) Request the DOE to identify and implement corrective actions to address the identified NCs within a specified time frame. The implemented corrective actions shall be verified by the AT through a site visit or an off-site document review, as appropriate;
 - (c) Place the DOE under observation;
 - (d) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes;
 - (e) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
207. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 206(b)-(e) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 206(d) and (e) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 208 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.

11.5. Consideration by the Supervisory Body

208. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP together with the independent review report and the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, on one of the following options:
 - (a) Confirm the accreditation of the DOE for all accredited sectoral scopes;

- (b) Request the DOE to identify and implement corrective actions to address the identified NCs within a specified time frame. The implemented corrective actions shall be verified by the AT through a site visit or an off-site document review as appropriate;
 - (c) Place the DOE under observation;
 - (d) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes;
 - (e) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
209. The conditions of under-observation status, suspension and withdrawal of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure. The modalities for placing and/or lifting an under-observation status, a suspension and a withdrawal of accreditation are defined in section 12, section 13 and 14 below, respectively.
210. If the Supervisory Body decides to place the DOE under observation, or suspend or withdraw its accreditation, the secretariat shall promptly update the status of the DOE on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.

12. Under observation

211. The Supervisory Body may decide to place a DOE under observation for one or more sectoral scopes based on an AEP recommendation made in accordance with paragraphs 31, 121, 162, 177, 208 above, or 272 below.
212. The conditions of under-observation status are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure.
213. If the Supervisory Body decides to place a DOE under observation, it shall provide the reason for such action to the DOE, make publicly available the requirements regarding which such action was prompted, and indicate to the DOE the modalities for lifting such status, including:
- (a) If the under-observation status is triggered due to an open NC:
 - (i) Identification of the NC that shall be addressed;
 - (ii) Specification of a deadline for the DOE to present a root-cause analysis or propose corrective actions, propose revised corrective actions, or provide evidence of implementation of corrective actions to the NC, as applicable;
 - (iii) Type and modalities of the assessment to be carried out to assess the implementation of the corrective actions;
 - (b) If the under-observation status is triggered due to the recurrence of the same NC within a period of 12 months:
 - (i) Identification of the NC that recurred in the last 12 months;
 - (ii) Specification of a deadline for the DOE to present an analysis of the reason for, and preventive actions to address, the recurrence of the NC;
 - (iii) Type and modalities of the assessment to be carried out to assess the implementation of the preventive actions;

- (c) If the under-observation status is triggered due to the raising of a major NC:
 - (i) Identification of the major NC that shall be addressed;
 - (ii) Specification of a deadline for the DOE to present a root-cause analysis or propose corrective actions, propose revised corrective actions, or provide evidence of implementation of corrective actions to the NC, as applicable;
 - (iii) Type and modalities of the assessment to be carried out to assess the implementation of the corrective actions;
 - (d) If the under-observation status is triggered due to a failure to follow a provision in this procedure:
 - (i) Identification of the provision that the DOE failed to follow;
 - (ii) Specification of a deadline for the DOE to comply with the provision, or to present the reason for the failure to follow the provision and preventive actions to address the recurrence of such failure, as appropriate;
 - (iii) Type and modalities of the assessment to be carried out to assess the implementation of the preventive actions, as appropriate.
214. The same AT that had conducted the accreditation assessment that, through the AEP recommendation, led to the Supervisory Body's decision to place the DOE under observation shall conduct the assessment referred to in paragraph 214(a)(iii), (b)(iii) or (c)(iii) above.
215. The AT shall conduct the assessment in accordance with the modalities indicated by the Supervisory Body and submit a final assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013) to the AEP together with non-conformity reports.
216. The AEP shall consider the reports prepared by the AT and recommend to the Supervisory Body, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, one of the following options:
- (a) Lift the under-observation status of the DOE;
 - (b) Maintain the under-observation status of the DOE for some or all accredited sectoral scopes, and:
 - (i) Request the DOE to further define and implement revised and/or other corrective actions to resolve the NCs;
 - (ii) Conduct an additional assessment to assess the implementation of revised and/or new corrective actions;
 - (c) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
217. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 217(b) and (c) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP recommendation is the option referred to in paragraph 217(c) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 218 below shall take place only after the

Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.

218. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP together with the independent review report and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, on one of the following options:
- (a) Lift the under-observation status of the DOE;
 - (b) Maintain the under-observation status of the DOE and:
 - (i) Request the DOE to further define and implement revised and/or other corrective actions to resolve the NCs;
 - (ii) Conduct an additional assessment to assess the implementation of revised and/or new corrective actions;
 - (c) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes in accordance with section 13 below.
219. If the Supervisory Body decides to lift the under-observation status of the DOE, the secretariat shall promptly update the status on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.
220. If the Supervisory Body decides the option referred to in paragraph 219(b) above, the DOE, the AEP and the AT shall undertake further actions accordingly.

13. Suspension of accreditation

221. The Supervisory Body may decide to suspend the accreditation of a DOE for some or all sectoral scopes in accordance with paragraphs 27, 31, 121, 162, 177, 209, 218 above, or 272 below.
222. The conditions of suspension of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure.
223. If the Supervisory Body decides to suspend the accreditation of the DOE, it shall provide the reason for such action to the DOE, make publicly available the requirements regarding which such action was prompted, and indicate to the DOE the modalities for lifting such status, including:
- (a) Identification of the NCs that shall be addressed;
 - (b) Specification of a deadline for the DOE to present a root-cause analysis or propose corrective actions, propose revised corrective actions, or provide evidence of implementation of corrective actions to the NCs, as applicable. This deadline shall not exceed 12 months;
 - (c) Type and modalities of the assessment to be carried out to assess the implementation of the corrective actions.
224. If the DOE does not meet the deadline referred to in paragraph 224(b) above, the AEP shall recommend to the Supervisory Body that either the accreditation status of the DOE be withdrawn or its sectoral scopes of accreditation be reduced.

225. The same AT that had conducted the accreditation assessment that, through the AEP recommendation, led to the Supervisory Body's decision to suspend the accreditation of the DOE, shall conduct the assessment referred to in paragraph 224(c) above.
226. The AT shall conduct the assessment in accordance with the modalities indicated by the Supervisory Body and submit a final assessment report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013) to the AEP together with non-conformity reports.
227. The AEP shall consider the reports prepared by the AT and recommend to the Supervisory Body, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, one of the following options:
- (a) Lift the suspension of accreditation of the DOE;
 - (b) Lift the suspension of accreditation of the DOE and decide on an additional assessment to be performed to verify the effectiveness of the implemented corrective actions;
 - (c) Maintain the suspension of accreditation of the DOE for some or all accredited sectoral scopes, and:
 - (i) Request the DOE to further define and implement revised and/or other corrective actions to resolve the NCs;
 - (ii) Conduct an additional assessment to assess the implementation of revised and/or new corrective actions;
 - (d) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes in accordance with section 14.2 below.
228. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is one of the options referred to in paragraph 228(c) and (d) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP recommendation is the option referred to in paragraph 228(d) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 229 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.
229. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP together with the independent review report and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, on one of the following options:
- (a) Lift the suspension of accreditation of the DOE;
 - (b) Lift the suspension of accreditation of the DOE and decide on an additional assessment to be performed to verify the effectiveness of the implemented corrective actions;

- (c) Maintain the suspension of accreditation of the DOE for some or all accredited sectoral scopes, and:
 - (i) Request the DOE to further define and implement revised and/or other corrective actions to resolve the NCs;
 - (ii) Conduct an additional assessment to assess the implementation of revised and/or new corrective actions;
 - (d) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes in accordance with section 14.2 below.
230. If the Supervisory Body decides to lift the suspension of accreditation of the DOE, the secretariat shall promptly update the status on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.
231. If the Supervisory Body decides on the option referred to in paragraph 230(c) above, the DOE, the AEP and the AT shall undertake further actions accordingly.

14. Withdrawal of accreditation

14.1. Voluntary withdrawal

232. A DOE may withdraw its accreditation status for some or all accredited sectoral scopes any time by submitting a written notification to the secretariat.
233. The secretariat shall acknowledge receipt of the notification, promptly update the status of the entity on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above, and inform the Supervisory Body and the AEP of the withdrawal.
234. Upon receipt of the acknowledgement of receipt, the entity shall return the accreditation certificate referred to in paragraph 80 above to the secretariat and cease all validation and verification/certification activities for the sectoral scopes for which it withdrew its accreditation.
235. The DOE shall inform, if applicable, any affected clients of the withdrawal of its accreditation status.
236. The DOE shall settle all outstanding fees and costs to be paid to AT members for their assessment work for the DOE.

14.2. Withdrawal by the Supervisory Body

237. The Supervisory Body may decide to withdraw the accreditation of a DOE for some or all sectoral scopes based on an AEP recommendation made in accordance with paragraphs 27, 209, 229 above, 258 or 272 below.
238. The conditions of withdrawal of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure.
239. If the Supervisory Body's consideration on withdrawal is triggered in accordance with paragraph 27 above, the Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP, together with the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, on one of the following options:
- (a) Request the AEP to instruct the AT to resume the accreditation assessment;

- (b) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes;
 - (c) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
240. If the Supervisory Body's consideration on withdrawal is triggered in accordance with paragraphs 209, 229 above, 258 or 272 below, the Supervisory Body shall decide on one of the options listed in the same paragraph.
241. If the Supervisory Body decides to withdraw the accreditation of the DOE, it shall provide the reason for such action to the DOE and make publicly available the requirements regarding which such action was prompted.
242. Upon withdrawal of accreditation by the Supervisory Body, the entity shall return the accreditation certificate referred to in paragraph 80 above to the secretariat and cease all validation and verification/certification activities for the sectoral scopes for which the accreditation was withdrawn.
243. If the Supervisory Body decides to withdraw the accreditation of the DOE, the secretariat shall promptly update the status on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.
244. The DOE shall inform, if applicable, any affected clients of the withdrawal of its accreditation status.
245. The DOE shall settle all outstanding fees and costs to be paid to AT members for their assessment work for the DOE.

15. Expiry of accreditation

246. Upon expiry of accreditation of a DOE, the entity shall not continue any validation and verification/certification activities for the sectoral scopes for which the accreditation has expired.
247. The DOE shall inform, if applicable, any affected clients of the expiry of its accreditation status.

16. Transfer of accreditation to another entity

248. A DOE may submit to the secretariat a request for the transfer of its accreditation to another entity (succeeding entity) by providing information on, inter alia:
- (a) Requested date of transfer of accreditation, which shall be at least 90 days after the submission of the request;
 - (b) Reason for the request for the transfer of accreditation;
 - (c) Relationship between the DOE and the succeeding entity, including changes to ownership and/or shareholding, as appropriate;
 - (d) Financial stability and insurance coverage of the succeeding entity;
 - (e) Pending judicial processes that could affect the validation and verification/certification functions of the succeeding entity;

- (f) Impact on the validation and verification/certification functions, including changes to:
 - (i) Legal status and applicability of national laws and regulations;
 - (ii) Relevant policies, procedures and practices;
 - (iii) Relevant personnel;
 - (g) List of the ongoing validation and verification/certification activities and impact on them.
249. The secretariat shall undertake a completeness check of the request. If the information provided is found incomplete or insufficient, the secretariat shall inform the DOE of the missing elements within seven days of receipt of the request. Subsequent steps of the process shall only continue once all requested information has been received by the secretariat.
250. The secretariat, after receipt of all requested information, shall carry out and conclude a desk review of the request documentation within 10 days and submit the outcome to the AEP.
251. The desk review shall cover at minimum the following:
- (a) How the financial stability would be impacted due to the transfer;
 - (b) Whether any pending judicial processes could impede the succeeding entity from carrying out its validation and verification/certification functions;
 - (c) How the relevant policies, procedures and practices would be impacted due to the transfer;
 - (d) How the availability and competence of personnel involved in the validation and verification/certification functions would be impacted due to the transfer;
 - (e) How the ongoing validation and verification/certification activities would be impacted due to the transfer.
252. The AEP shall consider the request based on the outcome of the desk review and decide whether to request an AT or the secretariat to conduct a further assessment, and if so, the type and modalities of the assessment.
253. If the AEP decides to request an AT to conduct a further assessment, the appointment of the AT and the preparation of a workplan shall follow the provisions in paragraphs 129–135 above *mutatis mutandis*.
254. If the AEP decides to request an AT or the secretariat to conduct a further assessment, the AT or the secretariat shall conduct the further assessment in accordance with the type and modalities specified by the AEP.
255. The AEP shall, after the receipt of the outcome of the further assessment, as applicable, recommend to the Supervisory Body one of the following options:
- (a) Approve the transfer of accreditation;
 - (b) Reject the request for transfer of accreditation and:
 - (i) Maintain the accreditation of the DOE; or

- (ii) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE in accordance with section 14.2 above.
- 256. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the recommendation of the AEP. If the AEP recommendation is the option referred to in paragraph 256(b) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP recommendation is the option referred to in paragraph 256(b)(ii) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 257 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.
- 257. The Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP, together with the independent review report and/or the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide on one of the following options:
 - (a) Approve the transfer of accreditation;
 - (b) Reject the request for transfer of accreditation and:
 - (i) Maintain the accreditation of the DOE; or
 - (ii) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE;
 - (c) Conduct an additional assessment.
- 258. If the Supervisory Body decides to approve the transfer of accreditation, the DOE shall transfer all records of past and ongoing validation and verification/certification activities to the succeeding entity, and the succeeding entity shall assume all responsibilities associated with those validation and verification/certification activities.
- 259. Upon the approval of transfer of accreditation, the DOE shall return the accreditation certificate referred to in paragraph 80 above to the secretariat and cease all validation and verification/certification activities. The secretariat shall promptly issue an accreditation certificate to the succeeding entity.
- 260. The conditions of withdrawal of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure. The modalities for placing a withdrawal of accreditation are defined in section 14 above.
- 261. If the Supervisory Body decides to approve the transfer of accreditation or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE, the secretariat shall promptly update the status on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.
- 262. The DOE shall inform, if applicable, any affected clients of the transfer of its accreditation.
- 263. If the Supervisory Body decides to reject the request for transfer of accreditation, it shall provide the reason for such action to the DOE. In this case, the DOE may voluntarily withdraw its accreditation in accordance with section 14.1 above, and the succeeding entity may apply for accreditation in accordance with section 6 above.
- 264. If the Supervisory Body decides to conduct an additional assessment, the AEP and the secretariat or the AT shall undertake further actions accordingly.

17. Notification of changes

265. An AE/DOE shall notify the secretariat, at least 90 days before its implementation, of a planned change in its legal, commercial or organizational status.
266. An AE/DOE shall inform the secretariat, at least 30 days before its implementation, of the following planned changes:
- (a) Change in the organizational structure and/or top management;
 - (b) Companies to which the DOE will outsource one or more validation and/or verification/certification functions.
267. If the AE/DOE does not notify the secretariat of changes referred to in paragraphs 266-267 above by the deadlines specified in these paragraphs, the AEP may recommend that the Supervisory Body initiate a spot-check or place the DOE under observation.
268. The AEP shall consider the notified change and decide whether to conduct a further assessment – for example, a document review and/or a site visit – on a case-by-case basis. In doing so, the AEP may decide not to conduct a specific assessment, but to assess the notified changes in a future regular on-site surveillance or reaccreditation assessment.
269. If the AEP decides to request an AT to conduct a further assessment, the appointment of the AT and the preparation of a workplan shall follow the provisions in paragraphs 129–135 above *mutatis mutandis*.
270. The AEP shall, based on the outcome of the further assessment, as applicable, decide on one of the following options:
- (a) Accept or reject the changes of the AE/DOE;
 - (b) Reject the changes of the AE and request the AT conducting the assessment for initial accreditation of the AE to take into account the changes;
 - (c) Recommend that the Supervisory Body place the DOE under observation;
 - (d) Recommend that the Supervisory Body suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes;
 - (e) Recommend that the Supervisory Body withdraw the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
271. The secretariat shall inform the DOE of the decision of the AEP. If the AEP decision is one of the options referred to in paragraph 270(b)-(e) above, the DOE may request an independent review of the AEP recommendation in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 to this procedure. If the AEP decision is one of the options referred to in paragraph 270(d) and (e) above, the DOE may also request a hearing before the Supervisory Body in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 8 to this procedure. In these cases, the consideration by the Supervisory Body on the AEP recommendation in accordance with paragraph 272 below shall take place only after the Supervisory Body has received the independent review report referred to in Appendix 5 to this procedure and decided on the review case, and only after the hearing has taken place, as applicable.

272. If the AEP submits a recommendation to the Supervisory Body in accordance with paragraph 270(c)-(e) above, the Supervisory Body shall consider the recommendation of the AEP, together with the independent review report and the hearing of the DOE, as applicable, and decide, based on the criteria contained in Appendix 3 to this procedure, on one of the following options:
- (a) Accept the changes of the DOE;
 - (b) Place the DOE under observation;
 - (c) Suspend the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes;
 - (d) Withdraw the accreditation of the DOE for some or all sectoral scopes.
273. The conditions of under-observation status, suspension and withdrawal of accreditation are given in Appendix 4 to this procedure. The modalities for placing and/or lifting an under-observation status, a suspension and a withdrawal of accreditation are defined in section 12, section 13 and section 14 above, respectively.
274. If the Supervisory Body decides to place the DOE under observation, or suspend or withdraw its accreditation, the secretariat shall promptly update the status of the DOE on the public list of DOEs referred to in paragraph 81 above.

18. Reporting of activities

275. A DOE shall submit an annual activity report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-022) to the secretariat by 30 September every year until its accreditation expires or is withdrawn.
276. The annual activity report shall cover the period from 1 July of the preceding year to 30 June of the current year.
277. The annual activity report shall be treated as confidential.
278. The annual activity report shall be signed by the chief executive officer of the DOE before submission to the secretariat.

Appendix 1. Documentation for accreditation assessments

1. For application for initial accreditation, extension of sectoral scopes or reaccreditation, the applicant entity (AE) or designated operational entity (DOE) shall provide an electronic version of the following documents, except for the completed application form (A6.4-FORM-ACCR-001), which shall be provided in hard copy, to the secretariat:

Table 1. Required documents for assessments for initial accreditation, extension of sectoral scopes, regular on-site surveillance and reaccreditation

Document	Initial accreditation and extension of sectoral scopes	Regular on-site surveillance	Reaccreditation
1. Completed application form (A6.4-FORM-ACCR-001)	X		X
2. Completed declaration form (A6.4-FORM-ACCR-002) of other offices and/or outsourced entities performing validation and verification/certification functions, clearly indicating functions undertaken at each office	X	X	X
3. Completed self-completeness check form (A6.4-FORM-ACCR-003), referring to specific documents, procedures and forms that address the Article 6.4 accreditation requirements, and all documents (e.g. manuals, procedures, forms) referred to in the A6.4-FORM-ACCR-003	X	X	X
4. Financial statements of the last three years and business plan or workplan or financial plan for the next three years. For newly established companies, any other relevant evidence such as shareholders' commitment and business plan or workplan or financial plan for the next three years	X	X	X
5. Documentation on its legal entity status (e.g. registration documents, memorandum, articles of association)	X	X	X
6. Names, qualifications, experience and terms of reference of senior management personnel such as the senior executive, board members, senior officers and other relevant personnel	X	X	X

Document	Initial accreditation and extension of sectoral scopes	Regular on-site surveillance	Reaccreditation
7. Organizational chart showing lines of authority, responsibility and allocation of functions	X	X	X
8. Quality assurance policy and procedures, including procedures and manuals on how the entity conducts validation and verification/certification activities	X	X	X
9. Administrative procedures, including safeguarding impartiality, information management, document control, record control, internal audit, corrective and preventive actions, and management review	X	X	X
10. Policy and procedures for the recruitment and training of AE/DOE personnel, for ensuring their competence for all necessary validation and verification/certification functions, and for monitoring their performance, including qualification procedures and competence matrix	X	X	X
11. Procedures for handling complaints, appeals and disputes	X	X	X
12. Declaration that the AE/DOE has no pending judicial processes for malpractice, fraud and/or other activity incompatible with its functions as a DOE	X	X	X
13. Statement that operations of the AE/DOE are in compliance with applicable national laws	X	X	X
14. If the AE/DOE is part of a larger organization and where parts of that organization are, or may become, involved in the identification, development or financing of any Article 6.4 project (A6.4 project) or Article 6.4 programme of activity (A6.4 PoA):			
(a) Declaration of all the organization's actual and planned involvement in A6.4 project or A6.4 PoA, if any, indicating which part of the organization is involved and in which particular A6.4 project or A6.4 PoA	X	X	X

Document	Initial accreditation and extension of sectoral scopes	Regular on-site surveillance	Reaccreditation
(b) Clear definition of links with other parts of the organization, demonstrating that no conflict of interest exists	X	X	X
(c) Demonstration that no conflict of interest exists between its functions as a DOE and any other functions that it may have, and how business is managed to minimize any identified risk to impartiality (The demonstration shall cover all sources of conflict of interest, whether they arise from within the AE or from the activities of related bodies)	X	X	X
(d) Demonstration that it, together with its senior management and staff, is not involved in any commercial, financial or other processes which might influence its judgement or endanger trust in its independence of judgement and integrity in relation to its activities, and that it complies with any rules applicable in this respect	X	X	X
15. Schedule of internal audits, management review meetings and impartiality committee meetings (indicating planned and completed activities)	X	X	X
16. List of project activities and PoAs completed and in progress for validation or verification/certification (indicating the status)		X	X
17. Summary of the changes since previous on-site assessment		X	X

2. For performance assessments, the DOE shall provide an electronic version of the following documents to the secretariat:

Table 2. Required documents for performance assessments

Document	Performance assessment on validation activity	Performance assessment on verification activity
1. Project design document for validation performance assessment	X ^(a)	X
2. Contract review documents and the signed contract	X	X
3. Conflict of interest analysis	X	X
4. Team competence justification with evidence	X	X
5. Monitoring report for verification performance assessment		X
6. Working spreadsheet (in Excel format)		X
7. Assessment plan	X ^(b)	X ^(b)
8. Information about the DOE team to visit the project site	X ^(b)	X ^(b)
9. Draft validation/verification report for internal technical review	X ^(c)	X ^(c)
10. Corrective Action Requests, Clarification Requests and Forward Action Requests	X ^(c)	X ^(c)
11. Any other documents requested by the Article 6.4 assessment team	X	X

^(a) All versions of the PDD.

^(b) If an on-site inspection is undertaken.

^(c) Documents shall be submitted after the on-site assessment. In the case where an on-site inspection is not conducted in accordance with the “Article 6.4 validation and verification standard for project activities” or the “Article 6.4 validation and verification standard for programmes of activities”, the documents to be submitted shall include all types of evidence that the verification team has verified.

Appendix 2. Forms used in the Article 6.4 accreditation process

1. The list below indicates the forms to be used in the Article 6.4 accreditation process conducted in accordance with this procedure. These forms are available on the UNFCCC Article 6.4 website.
 - (a) Application for accreditation and reaccreditation:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-001 (Application for accreditation);
 - (ii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-002 (Declaration of other offices performing validation and verification/certification functions);
 - (iii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-003 (Self completeness check);
 - (b) Article 6.4 assessment team establishment:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-004 (Confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration);
 - (ii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-005 (Fee agreement for AT member);
 - (iii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-006 (AT member performance monitoring report);
 - (c) Initial accreditation, reaccreditation:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-007 (Workplan for AT assessment);
 - (ii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-008 (Desk review report);
 - (iii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-009 (Agenda for opening and closing meetings);
 - (iv) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-010 (Attendance register for opening and closing meetings);
 - (v) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-011 (On-site assessment report);
 - (vi) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-012 (Non-conformity, corrective action and clearance report);
 - (vii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013(Final assessment report);
 - (d) Performance assessment on validation activity:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-014 (Performance assessment report on validation activity);
 - (ii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-023 (Performance assessment report on validation activity for afforestation and reforestation project activity);
 - (iii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-012 (Non-conformity, corrective action and clearance report);
 - (iv) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013 (Final assessment report);

- (e) Performance assessment on verification activity:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-009 (Agenda for opening and closing meetings);
 - (ii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-010 (Attendance register for opening and closing meetings);
 - (iii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-015 (Performance assessment report on verification and certification activity);
 - (iv) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-024 (Performance assessment report on verification and certification activity for afforestation and reforestation project activity);
 - (v) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-012 (Non-conformity, corrective action and clearance report);
 - (vi) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013 (Final assessment report);
- (f) Regular on-site surveillance:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-007 (Workplan for AT assessment);
 - (ii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-009 (Agenda for opening and closing meetings);
 - (iii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-010 (Attendance register for opening and closing meetings);
 - (iv) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-011 (On-site assessment report);
 - (v) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-012 (Non-conformity, corrective action and clearance report);
 - (vi) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-013 (Final assessment report);
- (g) Review of Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel recommendation, complaint against designated operational entities (DOEs), review of non-conformity:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-016 (Request for independent review of AEP recommendation);
 - (ii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-017 (Independent review report on AEP recommendation);
 - (iii) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-018 (Complaint against DOE);
 - (iv) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-019 (Complaint assessment report);
 - (v) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-020 (Request for review of non-conformity);
 - (vi) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-021 (Independent review report on non-conformity);
- (h) DOE annual activity reporting:
 - (i) A6.4-FORM-ACCR-022 (DOE annual activity report).

Appendix 3. Criteria for under-observation status, and suspension and withdrawal of accreditation

1. The following are criteria to be used by the Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel (AEP) to make a recommendation and by the Supervisory Body to make a decision on whether to place a designated operational entity (DOE) under observation or suspend its accreditation in accordance with a relevant provision of this procedure.
2. The criteria for placing a DOE under observation are as follows:
 - (a) There is an open non-conformity (NC) that is not referred to in paragraph 3(a) of this appendix; or
 - (b) There is an NC against the same Article 6.4 accreditation requirement raised for the DOE for a second time in the last 12 months; or
 - (c) The recommendation made by the AEP as referred to in paragraphs 27 and 28 of this procedure, or
 - (d) There is a failure on the part of the DOE to follow any provision in this procedure, such as:
 - (i) Failure to submit records, information, reports or other materials requested as deemed necessary to determine continued conformity with the accreditation requirements;
 - (ii) Failure to accommodate a request to undergo an assessment.
3. The criteria for suspending the accreditation of a DOE are as follows:
 - (a) There is an open NC that is at the system level and a significant shortcoming, not an isolated or sporadic lapse, by the DOE to meet an Article 6.4 accreditation requirement, and the continuation of the validation and/or verification/certification activities of the DOE would threaten the credibility the Article 6.4 accreditation system; or
 - (b) The DOE intentionally provided false information, intentionally omitted information that should have been provided, or deliberately violated any Article 6.4 accreditation requirement as referred to in paragraph 27 of this procedure, except for the case referred to in paragraph 4(a) of this appendix;
 - (c) The recommendation made by the AEP as referred to in paragraphs 27 and 28 of this procedure; or
 - (d) The DOE placed under observation fails to close an open NC within the pre-specified time frame.
4. The criteria for withdrawing the accreditation of a DOE are as follows:
 - (a) The DOE intentionally provided false information, intentionally omitted information that should have been provided, or deliberately violated any Article 6.4 accreditation requirement, and such actions were performed at the system level; or
 - (b) The DOE whose accreditation is suspended fails to close an open NC within the pre-specified time frame.

Appendix 4. Conditions of under-observation status, and suspension and withdrawal of accreditation

Table. Conditions of under-observation status, and suspension and withdrawal of accreditation

Name of the measure		Under observation	Suspension of accreditation	Withdrawal of accreditation
Designated operational entity activity	Responding to the secretariat's and the Supervisory Body's requests for clarification/review on requests for registration or issuance already submitted	Allowed	Allowed	Prohibited
	Continuing validation or verification activities under existing contracts for which request for registration or issuance is not submitted	Allowed	Allowed	Prohibited
	Signing contracts for and undertaking new validations or verifications	Allowed	Prohibited	Prohibited
	Notification of site inspection by the DOE for requests for registration or renewal or request for issuance	Allowed	Prohibited	Prohibited
	Finalizing and issuing any validation or verification opinion and reports	Allowed	Prohibited	Prohibited
	Submitting requests for registration/issuance/renewal, inclusion of component activities (CAs) in a programme of activities (PoAs), requests for approval of post-registration changes of both project activities and PoAs under the prior-approval track, and notifications of changes to CAs	Allowed	Prohibited	Prohibited
Public notification of the measure		Yes	Yes	Yes

Appendix 5. Independent review of Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel recommendations

1. Definitions applicable to this appendix

1. An “adverse recommendation” is a recommendation by the Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel (AEP) to the Supervisory Body that, if adopted as a decision by the Supervisory Body pursuant to this procedure, would affect the accreditation status of a designated operational entity (DOE) or constitute an obstacle to maintaining or extending accreditation by DOE, or to obtaining accreditation by an applicant entity (AE), made in accordance with the relevant provisions of this procedure.
2. A “request for independent review” means a request from an AE or DOE to the Supervisory Body to appoint an independent panel of experts to conduct a review of an adverse recommendation where the AE/DOE considers the adverse recommendation to be in breach of the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or this procedure.

2. Submission of a request for independent review

3. An AE/DOE may submit to the secretariat a request for independent review of an adverse recommendation of the AEP, using the relevant form (A6.4-FORM-ACCR-016), within seven days of being informed of the adverse recommendation. The submission shall include evidence of the payment of the fee referred to in paragraph 5 of this appendix.
4. The AE/DOE shall specify the particular provisions of the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or this procedure that it considers the adverse recommendation breaches and shall provide justification and evidence to support its view.
5. A fee of USD 2,000 shall be payable by the AE/DOE upon submission of the request.

3. Completeness check of the request for independent review

6. Upon receipt of the request for independent review, the secretariat shall acknowledge the receipt promptly.
7. The secretariat shall, within seven days of receipt of the request for independent review, undertake a completeness check to confirm that the request for independent review has been duly submitted and includes all relevant documents to carry out a preliminary assessment, including evidence of payment of the fee. The secretariat may request the AE/DOE to submit further relevant information. The AE/DOE shall submit such information within seven days or explain why such information cannot be submitted. If no response is received from the AE/DOE within this time frame, the secretariat shall cease the completeness check and inform the AE/DOE of the closure of the request for independent review.

4. Preliminary assessment of the request for independent review

8. The secretariat, after receipt of the request for independent review or further information or explanation if requested in accordance with paragraph 7 of this appendix, shall carry out and conclude a preliminary assessment of the request for independent review within 10 days.

9. The preliminary assessment shall cover as a minimum the following:
 - (a) Whether the request for independent review was submitted by the deadline referred to in paragraph 3 of this appendix;
 - (b) Whether the request for independent review relates to an adverse recommendation;
 - (c) Whether specific provisions of the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or this procedure have been identified.
10. If the preliminary assessment reveals that the request for independent review does not meet all the conditions referred to in paragraph 9 of this appendix, the secretariat shall cease the preliminary assessment and inform the AE/DOE of the closure of the request for independent review.
11. If the preliminary assessment reveals that the request for independent review meets all the conditions referred to in paragraph 9 of this appendix, the secretariat shall inform the AEP and the Supervisory Body of the request for independent review.

5. Assessment of the request for independent review

12. The secretariat shall, within five days of successful conclusion of the preliminary assessment, provide the AEP and the Supervisory Body with the request for independent review and all supporting documentation received from the AE/DOE or prepared by the secretariat.
13. The secretariat shall, within the same five days of successful conclusion of the preliminary assessment, also prepare a list of five experts, selecting from the Accreditation Roster of Experts, the Methodologies Roster of Experts or the Registration and Issuance Team, as candidates for an independent panel to conduct an independent review of the adverse recommendation, and send the list to the AE/DOE.
14. The AE/DOE may object, in writing or by email within five days, to the selection of any expert on the list on the basis of conflict of interest by identifying such conflict of interest.
15. If the AE/DOE objects to the selection of an expert, the secretariat shall, within five days, consider modifying the list of experts. If the secretariat considers the objection unjustified, or the AE/DOE does not object to the selection of any expert within the time frame referred to in paragraph 14 of this appendix, the list of experts shall be deemed accepted. If the secretariat considers the objection justified and modifies the list of experts, it shall send the modified list to the AE/DOE within the same five days. After this, the same steps in paragraphs 14 and 15 of this appendix shall repeat until the list of experts is deemed accepted.
16. At the earliest possible Supervisory Body meeting taking place after the list of experts is deemed accepted, the secretariat shall submit to the Supervisory Body the list of experts. The Supervisory Body shall, at that meeting, establish the independent panel, by appointing up to three experts from the list submitted by the secretariat, and request the independent panel to prepare a report. The secretariat shall inform the DOE and AEP of the names of the appointed experts.
17. Once the Supervisory Body establishes the independent panel, the appointed experts shall sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-004).

18. The secretariat shall promptly forward the request for independent review and all supporting documentation to the independent panel.

6. Independent panel review of the adverse recommendation

19. The independent panel may, within seven days of receipt of the request for independent review and all related documentation, request further information from the AEP and/or AE/DOE. The AEP and/or AE/DOE shall submit such information or explain why such information cannot be submitted within seven days of receipt of such request. If the AE/DOE fails to do so, the independent panel shall conduct and finalize the review based on the available information in accordance with paragraph 20 of this appendix.
20. The independent panel shall review the case based on the documentation provided to it, and by no later than 15 days from the appointment of the experts shall submit an independent review report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-017) to the secretariat, including a summary of the adverse recommendation, an assessment of whether the particular provisions of the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” or this procedure have been breached, and a recommendation to the Supervisory Body on whether to follow the original recommendation of the AEP.
21. The secretariat shall submit the independent review report and all related documentation to the Supervisory Body, the AEP and the AE/DOE within five days of receipt of the independent review report.

7. Decision by the Supervisory Body

22. The Supervisory Body shall, at the earliest possible meeting taking place after the receipt of the independent review report, consider the request for independent review with all supporting documentation submitted by the AE/DOE, the adverse recommendation, the independent review report, and any other relevant documentation, and decide on one of the following options:
 - (a) The adverse recommendation was not in breach of the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or this procedure. In this case, the Supervisory Body shall consider the adverse recommendation in accordance with the relevant provisions of this procedure; or
 - (b) The adverse recommendation was in breach of the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or this procedure. In this case, the Supervisory Body shall either request the AEP to reconsider the adverse recommendation or take other action in accordance with the relevant provisions of this procedure. The secretariat shall reimburse the fee referred to in paragraph 5 of this appendix to the AE/DOE in full.
23. If the adverse recommendation is to suspend or withdraw accreditation of the DOE and where the DOE has requested a hearing in accordance with the relevant provisions of this procedure, such hearing shall be held at the same meeting and in conjunction with the Supervisory Body’s consideration pursuant to paragraph 22 of this appendix.
24. The secretariat shall promptly inform the DOE and the AEP of the Supervisory Body’s decision.
25. The decision of the Supervisory Body on the request for independent review shall not be subject to further review under this procedure.

Appendix 6. Review of complaints against designated operational entities

1. Definitions applicable to this appendix

1. A “complaint” is a written communication addressed to the Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel (AEP) expressing a view that a designated operational entity (DOE) has breached a specific provision of the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or any relevant procedure under the Article 6.4.
2. A “complainant” is, for the purpose of this procedure, restricted to the following:
 - (a) An entity or organization with a contractual relationship with the DOE for the validation or verification/certification of the particular Article 6.4 project (A6.4 project) or programme of activities (A6.4 PoA) in respect of which the complaint is made; or
 - (b) An entity, organization or person that submitted comments during the global stakeholder consultation process for an A6.4 project or A6.4 PoA that were not taken into consideration by the DOE in the final validation report.

2. Submission of a complaint

3. Only a complainant as defined in paragraph 2 of this appendix may submit a complaint.
4. A complainant shall submit a complaint to the secretariat using the relevant form (A6.4-FORM-ACCR-018) and providing all supporting documentation. The complainant shall describe the specific conduct of the DOE that is alleged to be in breach of the “A6.4 accreditation standard” or this procedure and provide evidence. All documentation submitted by the complainant to support the complaint may be treated as non-confidential by the secretariat in order that such information may be forwarded to the DOE in accordance with paragraph 11 of this appendix.
5. The complainant shall also provide evidence that it has exhausted the internal procedures of the DOE for handling complaints or that the DOE has breached its internal procedures for handling complaints.

3. Completeness check of the complaint

6. Upon receipt of a complaint in accordance with paragraph 4 of this appendix, the secretariat shall acknowledge receipt promptly.
7. The secretariat shall, within seven days of receipt of the complaint, undertake a completeness check to confirm that the complaint has been duly submitted. The secretariat may request the complainant to submit further information. The complainant shall submit such information within five days or explain why such information cannot be submitted. If no response is received from the complainant within this time frame, the secretariat shall cease the completeness check and inform the complainant of the closure of the complaint.

4. Preliminary assessment of the complaint

8. The secretariat, after receipt of the complaint or further documentation or explanation if requested pursuant to paragraph 7 of this appendix, shall carry out and conclude a preliminary assessment of the complaint within 10 days.
9. The preliminary assessment shall cover as a minimum the following:
 - (a) Whether the submitter is a complainant;
 - (b) Whether the complainant has identified specific conduct of the DOE that the complainant considers to be in breach of the "Article 6.4 accreditation standard" and/or any relevant procedure under the Article 6.4;
 - (c) Whether the complainant referred to in paragraph 2(a) of this appendix has exhausted the internal procedures of the DOE for handling complaints or provided evidence that the DOE has breached its internal procedures for handling complaints.
10. If the preliminary assessment reveals that the complaint does not meet all the conditions referred to in paragraph 9 of this appendix, the secretariat shall cease the preliminary assessment and inform the complainant of the closure of the complaint.
11. Where the preliminary assessment reveals that the complaint meets all the conditions referred to in paragraph 9 of this appendix, the secretariat shall inform the DOE of the complaint and shall provide the DOE with the complaint and the supporting documentation received from the complainant.
12. The DOE shall have seven days from the receipt of the complaint from the secretariat to provide a response to the complaint and shall submit the response to the secretariat with all necessary supporting documentation.

5. Assessment of the complaint

13. The secretariat shall prepare an assessment report on the substance of the complaint (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-019) and submit it to the AEP within 30 days of the deadline referred to in paragraph 12 of this appendix, including a summary of the complaint, an assessment of whether the particular provisions of the "Article 6.4 accreditation standard" or this procedure have been breached, and a recommendation to the AEP as to whether the complaint is substantiated.
14. The secretariat may, during the preparation of the assessment report, request the complainant and/or the DOE to provide further information. The complainant and/or the DOE shall submit such information within seven days of receipt of such request. If no response is received from the complainant and/or the DOE within this time frame, the secretariat shall note so in its assessment report.

6. Decision by the AEP

15. The AEP shall consider the complaint with all supporting documentation submitted by the complainant, the assessment report prepared by the secretariat, and any other relevant documentation, and decide on one of the following options:
 - (a) A complaint is considered substantiated if the AEP concludes, based on the documentation available to it in relation to the complaint, that the DOE has

- breached a specific requirement set out in the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or this procedure;
- (b) A complaint is not considered substantiated if the AEP concludes, based on the documentation available to it in relation to the complaint, that the DOE has not breached a specific requirement set out in the “Article 6.4 accreditation standard” and/or this procedure, or that the complainant has not sufficiently demonstrated that such a breach has occurred.
16. If the AEP concludes that the complaint is substantiated, it shall specify aspects of the system of the DOE that shall be assessed in a future accreditation assessment of the DOE.
17. If the AEP concludes that the complaint is not substantiated, no further action shall be taken as a result of the complaint.
18. The secretariat shall inform the complainant and the DOE of the AEP decision on the complaint.
19. The decision of the AEP on the complaint shall not be subject to further review under this procedure.

Appendix 7. Review of non-conformities raised by Article 6.4 Assessment Team

1. Definitions applicable to this appendix

1. A “request for review of an NC” is a written communication from an applicant entity (AE) or a designated operational entity (DOE) addressed to the Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel (AEP), expressing disagreement with an Article 6.4 assessment team (AT) on a non-conformity (NC) raised during an accreditation assessment and requesting a review by the AEP on the NC in accordance with the relevant provisions of this procedure.

2. Submission of a request for review of a non-conformity

2. An AE or a DOE may submit a request for review of an NC to the secretariat within seven days of receipt of the non-conformity report through which the NC was raised by an AT, using the relevant form (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-020) and providing all supporting documentation. The submission shall include evidence of payment of the fee referred to in paragraph 4 of this appendix.
3. The AE/DOE may submit to the secretariat more than one request for review of an NC at the same time, each covering one NC. In this case, each request shall be deemed a separate request.
4. A fee of USD 1,000 per request for review of an NC shall be payable by the AE/DOE upon submission of the request.

3. Completeness check of the request for review of a non-conformity

5. Upon receipt of the request for review of an NC in accordance with paragraph 2 of this appendix, the secretariat shall acknowledge the receipt promptly.
6. The secretariat shall, within seven days of receipt of the request for review of an NC, undertake a completeness check to confirm that the request has been duly submitted. The secretariat may request the AE/DOE to submit further information. The AE/DOE shall submit such information within seven days or explain why such information cannot be submitted. If no response is received, the secretariat shall cease the completeness check and inform the AE/DOE of the closure of the request for independent review.

4. Preliminary assessment of the request for review of a non-conformity

7. The secretariat, after receipt of the request for review of an NC or further information or explanation, if requested in accordance with paragraph 6 of this appendix, shall carry out and conclude a preliminary assessment of the request for review of an NC within 10 days.
8. The preliminary assessment shall cover as a minimum the following:
 - (a) Whether the request for review of an NC was submitted by the deadline referred to in paragraph 2 of this appendix;
 - (b) Whether the request for review of an NC is related to the interpretation of an Article 6.4 accreditation requirement, not a procedural matter;

- (c) Whether the AE/DOE has provided a reason, and supporting documentation as appropriate, for the disagreement with the AT on the NC.
- 9. If the preliminary assessment reveals that the request for review of an NC does not meet all the conditions mentioned in paragraph 8 of this appendix, the secretariat shall cease the preliminary assessment and inform the AE/DOE of the closure of the request for review of an NC.
- 10. If the preliminary assessment reveals that the request for review of an NC meets all the conditions referred to in paragraph 8 of this appendix, the secretariat shall inform the AEP, AT and the AE/DOE of the request accordingly.

5. Assessment of the request for review of a non-conformity

- 11. The AT may provide any information related to the NC, in addition to the submitted on-site assessment report and non-conformity reports, for the purpose of the review. The information shall be submitted within five days of the successful conclusion of the preliminary assessment.
- 12. The secretariat shall, within ten days of successful conclusion of the preliminary assessment, provide the AEP with the request for review of an NC and all supporting documentation received from the AE/DOE, any information from the AT in addition to the submitted on-site assessment report and non-conformity report, and the result of the preliminary assessment conducted by the secretariat.
- 13. The AEP shall consider the request for review of an NC and decide on one of the following options:
 - (a) Establish an independent panel of experts to conduct a review of the NC;
 - (b) Not to establish an independent panel and process the case in accordance with section 7 of this appendix.
- 14. If the AEP decides to establish an independent panel, the secretariat shall, within five days of the AEP decision, prepare a list of three experts, selecting from the Accreditation Roster of Experts, the Methodologies Roster of Experts or the Registration and Issuance Team, as candidates for the independent panel, and send the list to the AE/DOE.
- 15. The AE/DOE may object, in writing or by email within five days, to the selection of any expert on the list on the basis of conflict of interest by identifying such conflict of interest.
- 16. If the AE/DOE objects to the selection of an expert, the secretariat shall, within five days, consider modifying the list of experts. If the secretariat considers the objection unjustified, or the AE/DOE does not object to the selection of any expert within the time frame referred to in paragraph 15 of this appendix, the list of experts shall be deemed accepted. If the secretariat considers the objection justified and modifies the list of experts, it shall send the modified list to the AE/DOE within the same five days. After this, the same steps in paragraphs 15 and 16 of this appendix shall repeat until the list of experts is deemed accepted.
- 17. The secretariat shall submit to the AEP the list of experts within five days of the list being deemed accepted. The AEP shall establish the independent panel, by appointing up to two experts from the list submitted by the secretariat, and request the independent panel to prepare a report. The secretariat shall inform the AE/DOE of the names of the appointed experts.

18. Once the AEP establishes the independent panel, the appointed experts shall sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-004).
19. The secretariat shall promptly forward the request for review of an NC and all supporting documentation submitted from the AE/DOE to the independent panel. The case shall then be processed in accordance with sections 6 and 7 of this appendix.

6. Independent panel review of the non-conformity

20. The independent panel may, within seven days of receipt of the request for review of an NC and all supporting documentation submitted from the AT and/or the AE/DOE, request further information from the AT and/or the AE/DOE. The AT and/or the AE/DOE shall submit such information or explain why such information cannot be submitted within seven days of receipt of such request. If the AT and/or the AE/DOE fails to do so, the independent panel shall conduct and finalize the review based on the available information in accordance with paragraph 21 of this appendix.
21. The independent panel shall review the case based on the documentation provided to it, and by no later than 10 days from the appointment of the experts shall submit an independent review report (form A6.4-FORM-ACCR-021) to the secretariat, including a summary of the views of the AT, the AE/DOE and the independent panel on the NC.
22. The secretariat shall submit the independent review report and all related documentation to the AEP, the AT and the AE/DOE within five days of receipt of the independent review report.

7. Decision by the AEP

23. The AEP shall consider the request for review of an NC with all supporting documentation submitted by the AE/DOE, the non-conformity report on the NC prepared by the AT, the independent review report, as applicable, and any other relevant documentation, and decide on one of the following options:
 - (a) The NC shall be maintained. In this case, the AE/DOE shall provide the AT with a written acceptance of the NC and the accreditation assessment regarding the NC shall resume from the applicable paragraph of this procedure; or
 - (b) The NC shall be dropped. In this case, the AEP shall request the AT to drop the NC. The secretariat shall reimburse the fee referred to in paragraph 4 of this appendix to the AE/DOE in full.
24. The secretariat shall promptly inform the AE/DOE and the AT of the AEP decision.
25. The decision of the AEP on the request for review of an NC shall not be subject to further review under this procedure.

Appendix 8. Modalities of hearing from designated operational entities

1. Definitions applicable to this appendix

1. A “hearing” is an administrative process under which a designated operational entity (DOE) expresses its view before the Supervisory Body in relation to the recommendation of the Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel (AEP) that the Supervisory Body suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE.
2. “Relevant information” means all information that forms part of the accreditation assessment based on which the AEP decided to recommend that the Supervisory Body suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE; consideration by the AEP; the independent review report prepared in accordance with the provisions contained in Appendix 5 and/or Appendix 7 to this procedure, as applicable; other information relating to the relevant accreditation assessment, if any; and any further information that the DOE provides in accordance with this appendix.

2. Request for a hearing

3. A DOE may make a request to the secretariat for a hearing within seven days of being notified of the recommendation of the AEP that the Supervisory Body suspend or withdraw the accreditation of the DOE.
4. The secretariat shall, as soon as possible, notify the DOE of the date of the hearing.
5. The DOE shall, as soon as possible, inform the secretariat whether it will attend the hearing in person, by telephone, or through the internet.

3. Exchange of relevant information

6. The DOE shall provide the secretariat with all information that it wishes to be considered in the context of the hearing as soon as possible and no less than 14 days prior to the date of the hearing. The secretariat shall promptly forward such information to the Supervisory Body.
7. The secretariat shall forward to the DOE all relevant information that has not yet been provided to the DOE or that is not within the DOE’s possession as soon as possible and no less than 14 days prior to the date of the hearing.

4. Representation

8. The DOE may attend the hearing with its representatives, including external personnel.

5. Hearing

9. The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Supervisory Body shall manage the hearing.
10. The DOE shall have the opportunity to present its view to the Supervisory Body and ask questions of the Supervisory Body. The Supervisory Body shall have the opportunity to ask questions of the DOE.

11. The information and discussion in the hearing shall be considered by the Supervisory Body in reaching its decision in accordance with the relevant paragraph of this procedure.

Appendix 9. Fees and costs

1. Application fees for accreditation, reaccreditation and extension of accreditation for additional sectoral scopes

1. The fee for application for accreditation or reaccreditation is USD 15,000. If an applicant entity (AE) or designated operational entity (DOE) decides to withdraw its application for accreditation, reaccreditation or extension of accreditation for additional sectoral scopes before all appointed Article 6.4 assessment team (AT) members sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration in accordance with the relevant paragraphs of this procedure, the application fee shall be reimbursed in full; otherwise it shall be non-reimbursable.
2. An AE or DOE shall pay the application fee for accreditation, reaccreditation or extension of sectoral scopes as follows:
 - (a) One payment of USD 7,500 at the time of the application for accreditation, reaccreditation or extension of sectoral scopes and a second payment of USD 7,500 within one year after obtaining accreditation, reaccreditation or extension of sectoral scopes; or
 - (b) One payment of USD 15,000 at the time of the application for accreditation, reaccreditation or extension of sectoral scopes.

2. Fees and costs for accreditation assessments by the ATs

3. For any type of accreditation assessment that involves work by an AT conducted in accordance with this procedure,¹ the AE/DOE shall pay for the following items directly to each AT member:
 - (a) Airfare for the AT member to travel to the sites specified in the workplan or by the Supervisory Body, which is of business class for the flights of nine hours or more including transit time, or of economy class otherwise (for assessments that involve on-site assessment only);²
 - (b) Applicable United Nations daily subsistence allowance (for assessments that involve on-site assessments only);
 - (c) The fee for the work provided by the AT member calculated in accordance with section 3 of this appendix.
4. For the payment of the items referred to in paragraph 3(b) and (c) of this appendix, the secretariat shall provide the AE/DOE with a payment instruction and pre-filled receipt for each AT member indicating the number of days of work.
5. Conducting an assessment that involves a site visit may depend on the payment in advance of the fees and costs indicated in paragraph 3 of this appendix. In the case of a spot-check, if the DOE does not pay the fee within 30 days of receipt of the pre-filled

¹ This appendix does not cover the fees and costs for handling requests for review of Article 6.4 Accreditation Panel (AEP) recommendations and for handling requests for review of non-conformities raised by a AT, which are specified in Appendix 5 and Appendix 7 to this Procedure, respectively.

² For AT members from the secretariat, United Nations rules and regulations shall apply.

receipt referred to in paragraph 4 of this appendix, the secretariat shall inform the Supervisory Body accordingly, and the Supervisory Body shall immediately suspend its accreditation until the DOE makes the payment. In all other cases, if the AE/DOE does not pay the fee within 30 days of receipt of the pre-filled receipt, the secretariat shall inform the Supervisory Body and the AEP accordingly, and the accreditation process for the AE shall be immediately suspended, or the Supervisory Body shall immediately place the DOE under observation, until the AE/DOE makes the payment.

3. Indicative level of fees for the AT members

6. The following table provides the standard person-days, the number of AT members participating in the task and the consequent total fees to be provided by the AE/DOE for each type of accreditation assessment. The secretariat may adjust the number of team members involved in each task and/or the person-days for the team leader or team members.

Table. Indicative level of fees for the AT members

Type of accreditation assessment	Activity	AT team leader (person-days)	AT member (person-days)	Number of AT members participating in the task	Number of days times daily fee ^(a) = total cost (USD)
Initial accreditation; Reaccreditation; Extension of accreditation for additional sectoral scopes	Desk review ^(b)	2	1	2	2,000
	On-site assessment ^(c)	3	2	2	3,500
	Verification of implementation of corrective actions	1	1	2	1,500
	Preparation of final assessment report	2	1	2	2,000
Performance assessment	Desk review and/or on-site assessment	2	2	1	2,000
	Verification of implementation of corrective actions	1	1	1	1,000
	Preparation of final assessment report	2	1	1	1,500
Regular on-site surveillance	On-site assessment	3	2	1	2,500
	Verification of implementation of corrective actions	1	1	1	1,000
	Preparation of final assessment report	2	1	1	1,500
Spot-check	On-site assessment	3	2	1	2,500

Type of accreditation assessment	Activity	AT team leader (person-days)	AT member (person-days)	Number of AT members participating in the task	Number of days times daily fee ^(a) = total cost (USD)
	Verification of implementation of corrective actions	1	1	1	1,000
	Preparation of final assessment report	2	1	1	1,500
Transfer of accreditation; Notification of changes	Involvement of AT, type and modalities of work to be decided on a case-by-case basis				
Other assessments (e.g. assessment for lifting under-observation status, assessment for lifting suspension status, additional desk reviews)	Type and modalities of the assessment by AT to be decided on a case-by-case basis				

^(a) The level of fee is presently set at USD 500 per day. If the assessment is less than one day, then the level of fee is counted as one day.

^(b) The fee for desk review is included in the application fee.

^(c) May be exempted for applications for extension of accreditation for up to three sectoral scopes.

7. For initial accreditation and reaccreditation, if an AE/DOE notifies the secretariat of the following changes in its application before all appointed AT members sign a confidentiality agreement and conflict of interest declaration, no additional fee shall be charged to the AE/DOE. If the AE/DOE notifies the secretariat of the changes after all appointed AT members have signed a confidentiality and non-disclosure agreement but before the coordination of the on-site assessment, an additional fee of two person-days for the AT leader shall be charged to the AE/DOE for the leader undertaking an additional desk review. If the AE/DOE notifies the secretariat of the changes after the coordination of the on-site assessment, the case shall be considered as a new application and the AE/DOE shall pay another application fee referred to in paragraph 1 of this appendix:

(a) Addition to the list of sectoral scopes applied for;

(b) Substantial changes in documentation.

8. The AT members shall send the original receipts of fee payment signed by respective AT members to the AE/DOE and submit an electronic copy of them to the secretariat.

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.1	27 May 2024	Editorial revision to align the abbreviations of AEP and ATs, as well as the symbol numbers of accreditation-related forms.
01.0	2 November 2023	SB 008, Annex 12. Initial adoption.

Decision Class: Regulatory
Document Type: Procedure
Business Function: Accreditation
Keywords: Article 6.4 mechanism, DOE, accreditation procedure, accrediting operational entities