



atmosfair gGmbH
Ms. Katrin Wolf
Zossener Str 55.58
10961 Berlin

Date: 13 February 2015
Reference: 2015-380-S, INQ-02675
Direct line: +49 228 815 1669

Sent by e-mail: wolf@atmosfair.de

Re.: Request of clarifications regarding section 4.8, 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 of the General Guidelines for SSC CDM methodologies, version 21.0, (CDM-EB81-A35). The clarifications are relevant for our Nigeria cookstove PoA 5067 and in general for other similar projects

Dear Ms. Wolf,

On behalf of the Chair of the CDM Executive Board, I would like to thank you for your letter of 22 January 2015, requesting clarifications regarding sections 4.8, 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 of the General Guidelines for SSC CDM methodologies, version 21.0, (CDM-EB81-A35). Your letter has been made available to the CDM Executive Board (the Board).

Please find below the responses for each of the questions:


1. The guidelines allow, in the referred paragraph, for the survey results to be used for the period 12 months after the survey date (the date on which the data collection starts) on top of using the results for the period prior to the survey date. This results in up to 24 months period to which the survey results may be applied irrespective of when the monitoring reports are uploaded on the UNFCCC CDM website. In your example, the survey results may be applied for both monitoring periods, irrespective of when the monitoring reports are uploaded. The guidelines envisage that in order to apply the survey results for the monitoring period after the survey date the requirements of biennial sampling should be met, i.e. survey results show the confidence/precision of 95/10. In case that the registered monitoring plan has not included biennial option, a post-registration change would be required to include it in the monitoring plan.
2. The provisions in the guidelines are applicable only if the applied methodology allows for biennial monitoring. If CMEs/PPs choose to switch from annual monitoring to biennial monitoring to apply the provisions in the guidelines, confidence/precision requirements of biennial monitoring stipulated in the applied methodology should be met, i.e. survey results show the confidence/precision of 95/10.
3. There was an editorial oversight in numbering of paragraphs in the draft document you referred to (CDM-EB81-A35). Correct reference has been made in the final document available at https://cdm.unfccc.int/sunsetcms/storage/contents/stored-file-20141205093825155/MethSSC_guid25.pdf.



4. Although different terminology was used in the same paragraph referred by you, the intent of the Board regarding these terms was the same. Therefore, 'lifespan' and 'lifetime' have the same meaning in the guidelines.
5. There is a need for the technology provider to follow the industry standard. Furthermore, figures need to be confirmed "e.g. previous experience with similar technologies or manufacturer or the elements of the project design, in order to assure that the local conditions are unlikely to result in premature failure of the technology". On top of that, validating/verifying Designated Operational Entities (DOEs) conduct checks. These may be sufficient safeguards; however, we take note of your pertinent suggestions.
6. As per paragraph 18 (b), the simplified requirements may also be applicable to other parameters than failure rates. However, provisions in paragraphs 22 and 23 are only for failure rate. The small-scale working group may consider providing further guidance on the application of these simplified requirements to other parameters in the future. Your inputs would be welcome in this regard.
7. In order to verify compliance with the conditions set in paragraphs 22 and 23, on-site visit by DOEs may not be required. Instead, the DOE may conduct a desk review to verify the evidences. However, please note that the SSC guidelines do not provide specific guidance on on-site visits. Therefore, as per paragraph 272 of the CDM validation and verification standard (version 7.0), it is the responsibility of DOEs to decide on the need for verification by means of an on-site visit, and justify the rationale of the decision if they decide not to conduct an on-site visit. Therefore, although paragraphs 22 and 23 do not require it, they do not prevent a DOE from undertaking site visits when deemed necessary.

I hope that this response has addressed your questions.

Yours sincerely,



Rajesh Sethi

Secretary to the CDM Executive Board