



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)

Date of SSC WG meeting:

24–27 February 2009, SSC WG 19

Title/Subject (give a small title or specify the subject of your submission, maximum 200 characters):

Clarification regarding lumen equivalence table and using information from baseline survey in AMS-II.J

Indicative methodology to which your submission relates (refer the items of Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures), if applicable.

AMS-II.J

Name of the authors of the query:

Alexandra Le Courtois / Monali Ranade

Institution: [Carbon Finance Team, The World Bank](#)

alecourtois@worldbank.org, mrnade@worldbank.org

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:

This refers to paragraph 2 and paragraph 16 (i) of the methodology AMS II.J (version 1 and 2).

Paragraph 2 of the methodology provides a lumen equivalence table for the baseline technology (incandescent bulbs) and requires it to be used as the minimum threshold for selection of the replacement technology (CFL). Can this be re-considered to be an indicative figure, allowing a range of lumen equivalence?

The ELI standard from which the said table was extracted contains another table which provides lumen efficiency specification (section 4.3, page 4, *ELI Voluntary Technical Specification for self-ballasted CFLs*).

Input Power of Lamp (W)	Initial Luminous Efficacy (lm/W)					
	Correlated Color Temperature (CCT)					
	6500K	5000K	4000K	3500K	3000K	2700K
≥ 5 to <9	46		50			
≥ 9 to <15	52		55			
≥ 15 to <25	57		60			
≥ 25 to ≤ 60	62		65			

As per this table, and considering that white and yellow lights are in the range of 3000-4000K, a 20W CFL will have the lumen output of 1200 lm. This is not in correspondence with the table in paragraph 2 of the methodology.

For example, if a 100W incandescent bulb is to be replaced, the CFL would have to be of a rating of 22.5W to ensure the minimum lumen level of 1350 by ELI standard, whereas the commonly available rating is 20W.

Conversely, a 20W CFL of lumen output of 1200lm will have to replace an incandescent bulb of 90W – a rating that is not commonly found in the market.

As the principle behind this requirement that of ensuring adequate service level is important, we would like to seek your advice on how to address this issue. A possible option could be to allow a range of -10%/+50% acceptable in terms of lumen levels, similar to AMS II.C or to only refer to the ELI guidelines as minimum technical specifications to be applied by the project.

The ELI technical document is attached for your easy reference.

Paragraph 16 (i) of the methodology provides guidance on the baseline survey. In practical application, the only information from this survey that is of direct use to calculation of energy savings is the “daily average lighting usage” (when considering a project activity). The other information regarding baseline technology and power rating is mainly for project design purposes as the energy savings are calculated from the *actual* equipment received from the customer and its power rating. We seek your feedback if this understanding is correct and use of the output of the survey, in single projects, can be restricted to the daily hours of usage of baseline technology.

Recommendation by the SSC WG:

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

Please refer to paragraph 11 of the meeting report of the SSC WG 19
(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 is considering revisions to the table in paragraph 2 and will be considering your input and those of others in proposing a possible modification at its next meeting.

Your interpretation concerning paragraph 16 (i) is generally correct and the SSC WG will consider modifications to this paragraph at a future meeting for clarification, or elimination in the case of the use of a default value for operating hours per day.



Signature of SSC WG Chair

(Hugh Sealy)

Date: 27/02/2009



Signature of SSC WG Vice-Chair

(Peer Stiansen)

Date: 27/02/2009

Information to be completed by the secretariat	
SSC-Submission number	SSC_284
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat	27 February 2009
Date of transmission to the EB	27 February 2009
Date of posting in the UNFCCC CDM web site	27 February 2009