



**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>	16–19 August 2010, SSC WG 27
<i>Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):</i>	Clarification on Lamp failure rate (LFR) as determined under methodology AMS-II.J
<i>Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.</i>	AMS-II.J “Demand-side activities for efficient lighting technologies”
<i>Name of the authors of the query:</i>	Sachin Gupta Institution: Zeroemissions Technologies S.A. <a href="mailto:sachin.gupta@zeroemissions.abengoa.com">sachin.gupta@zeroemissions.abengoa.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:

PP would like to clarify if the following could be acceptable wrt a project under this methodology:

Background:

Clause 17 (C) of the methodology AMS II J ver.4 explains, “The surveys will consist of identifying CFLs, marked per paragraph 6, that are installed and operating. Only CFLs with an original marking can be counted as installed. While CFLs replaced as part of a regular maintenance or warranty program can be counted as operating, cannot be replaced as part of this monitoring survey process and counted as operating for the purposes of determining *QPJ*,i. “

And

Clause 18 (b) of the methodology AMS II J ver.4 explains, “If the *ex post* monitoring surveys indicate that the failure rate is equal to or less than the  $LFR_{i,y}$  value indicated using equation (3) with *ex ante* or prior year, *ex post* monitoring values, for subsequent years  $LFR_{i,y}$  shall continue to be determined using Equation (3) and the established Average Life values for  $L_i$ .”

Project Design:

The project under this methodology is expected to distribute efficient lighting equipments i.e., CFLs and replace incandescent lamps (ICLs) only once during the implementation of the project activity and CERs can be claimed till the Average life of the project CFLs (clause 10) i.e., till the length of time during which 50% of the lamps reach the end of their individual life.

However, the PP plans to add another warranty in the “project CFLs” apart from Manufacturer’s that, it will replace any of the distributed “project CFL” which fails at any time during the project crediting period of 10 years. A proper monitoring procedure will be established to record all such replacements during the whole project crediting period.

The PP thus seeks to clarify, if they can achieve this virtual “zero” LFR after ensuring 100% operational CFLs during the whole project crediting period of 10 years?

**Recommendation by the SSC WG:**

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

Please refer to paragraph 21 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 27 ([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 believes that AMS-II.J contains several simplifying assumptions, and monitoring the effectiveness of a warranty program (which also requires actions by the project participants to return failed CFLs) would require much more extensive monitoring than what is currently envisaged under AMS-II.J. The SSC WG thus agreed not to recommend changes to AMS-II.J. The group agreed to confirm though that, as per paragraph 17 (c) of the methodology, CFLs replaced as part of a warranty program can be counted as operating. However, per paragraph 18 (b) of the methodology that states “ if the *ex post* monitoring surveys indicate that the failure rate is equal to or less than the  $LFR_{i,y}$  value indicated using equation (3) with *ex ante* or prior year, *ex post* monitoring values, for subsequent years  $LFR_{i,y}$  shall continue to be determined using Equation (3) and the established Average Life values for  $L_i$ .” The SSC WG is therefore of the opinion that the existing monitoring procedure of the methodology does not allow 100% operational CFLs during the entire potential project crediting period of 10 years.

Signed by the Chair, Mr. Peer Stiansen

Date: 19/08/2010

Signed by the Vice-Chair, Mr. Hugh Sealy

Date: 19/08/2010

**Information to be completed by the secretariat**

SSC-Submission number	SSC_444
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	19 August 2010
Date of transmission to the EB	19 August 2010
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	19 August 2010