



## CDM: Recommendation form for Small Scale Methodologies (Version 01.1)

*(To be used for presenting questions/proposals/amendments to the simplified methodologies for small-scale CDM project activity categories)*

<b>Date of SSC WG meeting:</b>	05–08 March 2012, SSC WG 37
<b>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</b>	Revision of AMS-III.AR to allow exemptions for battery certification requirements
<b>Indicative methodology to which your submission relates</b> <i>(refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable:</i>	AMS-III.AR “Substituting fossil fuel based lighting with LED/CFL lighting systems”
<b>Name of the authors of the query:</b>	Simon Glossop Institution: ToughStuff International <a href="mailto:simon.glossop@toughstuffonline.com">simon.glossop@toughstuffonline.com</a>

### **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:

The baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-III.AR provides in paragraph 3 that the project proponent shall have to prove that the:

“Rated average life is the life certified by the manufacturer or responsible vendor as being the time at which the lamp’s initial light output will decline by no more than 30%. In addition, the manufacturer shall certify that the Project Lamp’s battery charging circuit efficiency, at the time of purchase, is at least 50%.”

The revision request seeks to exclude the requirement of manufacturer certification of battery charging circuit efficiency at the time of purchase be at least 50% from project lamps which are charged by renewable energy systems as defined in paragraph 2 a “Charged by a renewable energy system included as part of the Project Lamp (e.g. a photovoltaic system or mechanical system such as a hand crank charger);” for the following reasons:

1. This requirement is an additional encumbrance on the part of the proponent introducing project lamps charged by renewable energy systems e.g. solar PV or hand cranks. The requirement therefore does not have a clear purpose in so far as the other testing procedures already test:
  - Rated average life – Paragraph 3 as well as the preceding statement to the testing requirement which the proponent seeks to have omitted from the methodology i.e. “Rated average life is the life certified by the manufacturer or responsible vendor as being the time at which the lamp’s initial light output will decline by no more than 30%.”
  - Light Output: Paragraph 5 a
  - Run Time and Battery Capacity: Paragraph 5 b
2. The value is only applicable in calculating the project emissions for Project lamps charged under the methods established in Paragraphs 2 b and 2 c:
  - 2 b Charged by a standalone distributed generation system (e.g. a diesel generator set) or a mini-grid, i.e. that is not connected to a national or regional grid; ( as read with paragraph 17 b “ Paragraph 2 (b) if the mini grid or distributed generation system is not entirely powered by renewable energy generation unit(s))

- 2 c Charged by a grid that is connected to regional/national grid.

The proponent agrees that the requirement for manufacturer certification of the project lamps is necessary in so far as the value derived is used in calculating Project emissions. However the proponent contends the current position that the methodology prescribes such certification as a necessary requirement for all project lamps installed despite the charging method used. The proponent therefore would request a revision that limits the scope of Paragraph 3 of the methodology as applicable only to project lamps charged under the options defined in Paragraphs 2 b ( in so far as the mini grid or distributed generation system is not entirely powered by renewable energy generation units) and 2 c.

#### **Recommendation by the SSC WG:**

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

Please refer to paragraph 13 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 37  
<[http://cdm.unfccc.int/Panels/ssc\\_wg](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.

The SSC WG agreed to recommend a revision of AMS-III.AR "Substituting fossil fuel based lighting with LED/CFL lighting systems", as contained in annex 6 of the SSC WG 37 meeting report.

Signature of SSC WG Chair: Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 08/06/2012

Signature of SSC WG Vice-Chair: Ms. Fatou Gaye

Date: 08/06/2012

#### **SECTION TO BE FILLED IN BY THE UNFCCC SECRETARIAT**

<b>SSC-Submission number:</b>	SSC_623
<b>Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat:</b>	08 June 2012
<b>Date of transmission to the EB:</b>	08 June 2012
<b>Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site:</b>	08 June 2012

-----

#### **History of the document**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Nature of revision(s)</b>
01.1	12 April 2012	Editorial changes to include new logo and other improvements.
01.0	2005	Initial publication.
<b>Decision Class:</b> Regulatory <b>Document Type:</b> Form <b>Business Function:</b> Methodology		