

SCHEDULE 3
(Regulation 21(c))

**TECHNICAL GUIDELINE FOR
ACCREDITATION METHODOLOGY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Interpretation
3. Evaluation process
4. Outcomes

1. Introduction

This Guideline is the technical guideline for accreditation of a POS or E-SDC.

The Commissioner accredits the brand, model and specification of each POS or E-SDC supplied by a supplier. The Commissioner accredits each POS and E-SDC of an EFD developed, installed and implemented by a taxpayer. This is done to ensure that EFDs for taxpayers' businesses are operating in accordance with these Regulations.

2. Interpretation

In this Guideline:

“application” means an application for accreditation under regulation 8 or 9; “applicant” means a supplier or taxpayer who makes an application.

3. Evaluation process

The evaluation process commences when the Commissioner receives an application for accreditation of a POS or E-SDC.

The evaluation process consists of an administrative review and a technical review of the working processes of the applicant's POS and E-SDC together as an EFD or a POS or E-SDC as a separate component.

The Commissioner evaluates the POS or E-SDC by testing the applicant's internal procedures. The purpose is to check that the applicant is complying with all administrative and technical requirements and to test and verify all deliverables.

For administrative review, the Commissioner evaluates documentation by cross-examining functionality stated in the user manual and other documentation to ensure described implemented functions; including the applicant's valid business license (be it license issued by the Commissioner or issued in country of residence of the applicant).

The technical review identifies whether there are any of the following type of issues:

1. Non-compliance: represents a deviation of the expected output, and must be solved by the applicant;
2. Bug: represents a failure, flaw or fault in software that produces incorrect or unexpected results, and must be solved by the applicant;
3. Doubt: represents uncertainty due to misinterpretation and is resolved by investigation and clarification by the applicant;
4. Observation: represents minor faults, mainly in documentation or sample appearance; these issues shall contain sub-class mandatory or voluntary which will reflect the applicant's level of obligation to solve;

5. Improvement: represents proposal to improve functionality, which the applicant may solve or not.

The Commissioner writes test reports about technical review findings and specifies issues.

All issues that are non-compliance, bugs, doubts and observations with mandatory sub-class must be solved before accreditation is granted.

The applicant responds to each issue identified by preparing and finalising deliverables for resolving the issue and updating the testing report with answer and version number.

Communication between the Commissioner and applicant is open, honest and co-operative in dealing with each issue.

Possible difficulties arising during the evaluation process are:

1. the applicant's delays preparing the required deliverables for resolving issues identified during the evaluation process;
2. necessity for numerous testing reports containing problems and questions which are found during evaluation;
3. mis-interpretation of the requirements.

The Commissioner may allow the applicant additional time to respond to issues and finalise deliverables.

4. Outcomes

When the issues are resolved and finalised to the satisfaction of the Commissioner and applicant, the Commissioner writes the accreditation report describing the evaluation process and the outcome of the process and making recommendation for or against accreditation.

If the outcome of the evaluation process indicates that the applicant's administrative and technical processes comply with these Regulations, the Commissioner accredits the POS or E-SDC.

The Commissioner refuses to accredit the applicant if applicant is unable to prepare and finalise deliverables for resolving issues identified during the evaluation process with the effect that the applicant's administrative and technical processes do not comply with these Regulations.
