



CDM: Recommendation Form for Small Scale Methodologies (version 01)
(To be used for presenting questions/proposals/amendments to the simplified methodologies for small-scale CDM project activity categories)

<i>Date of SSC WG meeting:</i>	22–25 August 2011, SSC WG 33
<i>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</i>	Clarification on the conservativeness factor to account for uncertainties under AMS-I.I
<i>Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.</i>	AMS-I.I “Biogas/biomass thermal applications for households/small users”
<i>Name of the authors of the query:</i>	Naoki Matsuo Institution: Climate Experts, Ltd. n_matsuo@climate-experts.info

Summary of the query:

Please use the space below to summarize the query related to SSC methodologies/categories SSC Modalities and Procedures provide recommendation/analysis of the SSC WG.

Original text from PP

AMS-I.I includes conservativeness factors associated with some uncertainties.

For Option 1, Method (a), Option (ii), it says that “the value obtained is multiplied by 0.89 to account for uncertainties” for baseline and “multiplied by 1.12 to account for uncertainties” for project.

It is not clear for us what “uncertainties” are accounted for.

The footnote 6 said that “To account for uncertainties of the method, estimated to be in the range 30–50% (see “Annex III Table of conservativeness factors”, page 24, FCCC/SBSTA/2003/10/Add.2)”. Therefore, I guess that the SSC WG evaluate the uncertainties to be in the range of 30–50%. How to evaluate them? Expert judgement? If so, by whom?

And as the word “uncertainties” is plural, I guess it includes several uncertainties. What are they?

On the other hand, since we do not find such factors in other methodologies or other options in the same methodology, the uncertainties should be specific to Option 1, Method (a), Option (ii).

I guess that the uncertainties include that of statistical sampling method. If not, I would ask the SSC WG to prepare the method to calculate combined uncertainties by using the error propagation formula. For application of the formula, we need to know the characteristics of each uncertainty.

If there is no objective reason and explanation of the uncertainties specific to this option (i.e., such uncertainties shall not be present in other options/methodologies), such conservativeness factor shall be deleted.

In general, I hope that the SSC WG or the Meth Panel will prepare consistent treatment guidelines of uncertainties in CDM with theoretical background. For example, relationship between accuracy and conservativeness is not clear.

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

Please use the space below to provide amendments/change (in your expert view, if necessary).

Please refer to paragraph 29 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 33
<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Panels/ssc_wg>.

Answer to authors of query by the SSC WG:

Please use the space below to provide answer to the authors of the above query.

The small-scale working group of the CDM Executive Board would like to thank the author for the submission.

As stated in the methodology, the conservativeness factor shall be multiplied (1.12 for project and 0.89 for baseline) to account for uncertainties ONLY IF Option (ii) under paragraph 10(a) is chosen. The group agreed to clarify that this uncertainty factor has not meant the uncertainty which arises from statistical/sampling approaches, but rather meant the uncertainty of the method itself. As opposed to actual measurement in Option (i) under paragraph 10(a), the group is of the opinion that the survey method in Option (ii) could lead to over- or under- estimation of the value, for example, because the data obtained through the questionnaire survey on historic and current fuel usage at the households is not as precise as the metered values of Option (i). Since the parameter (i.e. consumption data) is very subject to non-sampling errors, the group agreed to recommend to maintain the conservativeness factor in the methodology to address/minimize negative effects (non-conservativeness) caused by such non-sampling errors.

Signed by the Chair, Ms. Fatou Gaye

Date: 25/08/2011

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 25/08/2011

Information to be completed by the secretariat

SSC-Submission number	SSC_553
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	25 August 2011
Date of transmission to the EB	25 August 2011
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	25 August 2011