



**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>	20–23 March 2012, SSC WG 36
<i>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</i>	Revision of AMS-III.AR taking into account the guidelines on the consideration of suppressed demand
<i>Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (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 lighting systems”
<i>Name of the authors of the query:</i>	Nathan Gachugi / Dan Kuipers Institution: Viability Africa, LLC <a href="mailto:nathan.gachugi@viabilityafrica.com">nathan.gachugi@viabilityafrica.com</a> , <a href="mailto:dan.kuipers@sef-llc.com">dan.kuipers@sef-llc.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

Response to CDM SSC WG to previous submission titled “Revision request to account for the situation of suppressed demand taking into account the guidelines on the consideration of suppressed demand in the approved SSC baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-III.AR.”

The project proponent welcomes the decision of the SSC WG to include ,and upon approval hold to be universally applicable, the proposed step-wise methodological approach to identify the baseline technology considering suppressed demand , as well as the service level that would satisfy the suppressed demand scenario shall be included in the form of the revised draft methodology.

The major item for clarification however from the response provided from the SSC WG is the applicability of the minimum level of service identified (i.e. 250 KWh electricity equivalent and more specifically 2 CFL lamps for domestic lighting) to the baseline technology selected of a glass covered hurricane lamp.

Pursuant to the guidance from the SSC WG the proponent has considered the use the default factors provided in Annex 5 of the Rationale for default factors used in the proposed methodology SSC-I.L Electrification of rural communities using renewable energy at the 35<sup>th</sup> Meeting Report of the SSC WG .

At the time of drafting the Suppressed Demand argument attached to the first revision request the Project Proponent only considered the relative cost of the Pressurized lamp against the lumen output it would provide. In a bid to be as conservative as possible the proponent accordingly removed this option by having considered the technology as beyond the reasonable or practicable access of the user identified as the household in Ethiopia.

However an analysis of the Default Values provided shows that this analysis was flawed in that it failed to account for the true cost analysis which is not necessarily the price of purchase of the pressurized kerosene lamp but rather the recurrent cost of purchasing kerosene for the lamp. The analysis provided by the SSC WG in Rationale for default factors used in the proposed methodology SSC-I.L Electrification of rural communities using renewable energy clearly shows that kerosene consumption of 1 high pressure

kerosene lamp is equivalent to a range of typical kerosene consumption amongst developing countries (Mills 2005) .

Therefore to clarify this matter the technology identified to meet the minimum level service of 55 KWh/year is the high pressure kerosene lamp. The same argument has been modified in the revised Step by Step procedure for the application of Suppressed Demand to baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-III.AR.

**Additional clarification requested 21-Feb-12:**

You have mentioned in your submission below that a Step by Step procedure for the application of Suppressed Demand in AMS-III.AR is now included; but the draft revised methodology you had attached below does not reflect such --- it just corresponds to the original version you had submitted before. Please confirm.

**Response from Stakeholder submitted 23-Feb-12:**

Please note that the revisions to the methodology remain the same. What does change however is the identified baseline technology. The original step by step analysis reflected the use of the glass covered hurricane lamp however in version 2 of the document (attached in the last message to the secretariat) the baseline technology has now been changed to the high pressure kerosene lamp to reflect a minimum service level of 55 KWh/yr in accordance with the provisions of the “Guidelines on the consideration of suppressed demand in CDM methodologies”. The rationale for a number of default factors used in the methodology which is universally applicable and contained in annex 5 of the thirty-fifth meeting of the SSC WG.

The correction therefore for which the proponent submitted in its last message was with regard to the identified baseline technology and not the methodology.

**Recommendation by the SSC WG:**

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

Please refer to paragraph 15 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 36  
<[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 that modifications as suggested by the author of the query need further analysis since AMS-I.L is related to installation of renewable energy electricity generating systems and accounts for baseline emissions on a household basis; whereas AMS-III.AR is related to distribution of lamps and accounts for baseline emissions on a per lamp basis. The SSC WG has agreed to recommend changes to AMS-III.AR to account for suppressed demand in a manner that is consistent with the calculation approaches included in the methodology. Doing so, the SSC WG will take into account any further inputs that will be provided by the authors of the query.

Signed by the Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 23/03/2012

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Ms. Fatou Gaye

Date: 23/03/2012

Information to be completed by the secretariat	
SSC-Submission number	SSC_620
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	23 March 2012
Date of transmission to the EB	23 March 2012
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	23 March 2012