



## PCIA Webinar: Innovations in Version 3 of the Gold Standard Methodology

### *Speaker*

Abhishek Goyal, Deputy Technical Director, The Gold Standard Foundation

### *Overall Reflections, Questions and Answers*

**Q1: Are all of the survey and monitoring procedures you presented included in the pre-feasibility assessment for Retroactive Project Cycles as well as new projects?**

A1: Project activities that are already operational or under construction or implementation at the time of first submission to the Gold Standard, shall go through the pre-feasibility assessment to be eligible for requesting registration with Gold Standard. At the pre-feasibility assessment stage, it is not mandatory to present the survey and monitoring procedures for review. However, if the project proponent is able to submit baseline and project surveys and monitoring procedures for retroactive project activities, the Gold Standard Secretariat can provide its feedback at the pre-feasibility assessment stage. For regular cycle projects, the survey and monitoring procedures described in the presentation are required, but the Gold Standard only reviews the Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC) report at time of listing. Hence, the survey and monitoring procedures are not required to be submitted for review for regular cycle projects at time of listing of activity.

**Q2: Commercial stoves are used for hours at a time and may produce lower levels of emissions, due to not having as many cold starts and spending less time to heat up, which is when emissions are highest. As such, household stoves produce higher emissions per unit of heat generated. Under carbon finance is it allowed to use data from a commercial stove as a baseline for a household stove or vice versa?**

A2: The baseline scenario for domestic and commercial stoves would ideally be different until it is clearly shown by credible evidence that the same fuel, stove etc. is used. In case the project proponent is able to justify the same baseline scenario for commercial and domestic stoves then the baseline fuel consumption (Kitchen Performance Test) will be based on a sample of cook stoves that will include both these stove types.

**Q3: Many households use a mix of fuels - how do you deal with this?**

A3: In such a scenario, where a mix of fuels is used, the methodology requires that these fuels are monitored separately and distinguished in the equations for baseline and project emission calculations. The other option is that the specific fuel savings applied in the equations for baseline and project emission are based on sub sum of all fuels and then other parameters like fuel specific emission factors, net calorific value, etc. shall be applied accordingly.

**Q4: Aging test - does it include emissions in the measurement as technologies, such as chimney stoves may block up and reduce efficiency of combustion?**

A4: Aging test is a standard test similar to Kitchen Performance Test, where the fuel consumption is measured.

**Q5: Do mechanisms for old technology displacement have to target 100% of old technology use, or can it target some smaller percent?**

A5: The GS expects that 100 percent of the inefficient old stoves are replaced to rule out the possibility of indoor air pollution by using old stoves since the indoor air pollution will not be addressed if people still use old stoves. However, the use of old technology in the project scenario depends on several factors like climatic conditions, living standard, and the availability of alternative technologies to meet the non-cooking baseline requirements in target area. Considering these limiting factors, the GS has approved activities that demonstrate up to 80% removal of the old stoves, and preferably to scale up to 100% displacement of old technology during the remaining crediting period.

**Q6: Can you please provide a resource for leakage assessments?**

A6: Please refer to section 6 of the methodology for detailed discussion on leakage assessment.

**Q7: Do Controlled Cooking Tests (CCTs) count as field tests?**

A7: The controlled cooking tests cannot be considered to replace the field tests.

**Q8: On average, what percent of Gold Standard payments acquired are invested in the infrastructure necessary to comply with Gold Standard requirements?**

A8: There are few essential requirements for the Gold Standard cookstove projects like baseline survey, performance test, management of project database, monitoring infrastructure, etc. The investment in these activities can vary significantly depending on availability of local skilled resources to carry out the studies and tests. The costs on percentage basis also vary significantly with project size.

**Q9: How do you ensure you have a representative non-renewable biomass (NRB) baseline? Can you use national values? What is the largest scale acceptable?**

A9: The NRB assessment shall be done at collection area level. However, if the required information is not available at the collection area level, the national values, which are the largest scale acceptable, can be applied.

**Q10: Are there default numbers for charcoal production/transportation?**

A10: For transportation, the CDM Executive Board tool on “Project and leakage emissions from road transportation of freight” may be followed. For charcoal production there are no specific defaults because it depends on technology used for charcoal production. Depending on available raw material and the charcoal production process, different technologies/processes are in use in different countries. For example in Africa, the field tests have been conducted for a group of countries, which have similar charcoal manufacturing processes to establish the emissions factor for charcoal production. The emission factors derived from these field tests can be applied in projects in these specific countries.

**Q11: Are there limits to the number of different non-CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse gases (GHGs) that can be included in charcoal production? Can you include non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHGs in the regular equations? If so, which ones?**

A11: Currently, the Gold Standard scope is limited to three greenhouse gases: carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide. Therefore only CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are included under the category of non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHGs.

**Q12: Page 4 of the methodologies, conditions 3: continued use of baseline technology. Footnote 5 says that with 3-stone fires in the baseline it is impractical to monitor this condition. What does this mean in practical terms? No need to monitor continued use of baseline technology, when 3-stone fire is in the baseline?**

A12: Although the removal and continued non-use of three stone fires and other easily constructed traditional devices is in many cases unlikely and impractical to monitor, it does not release the project proponent from the requirement of monitoring of incentive mechanism. Instead the methodology suggests that the Project Developer shall propose a practical monitoring approach; for example, interviews with a larger population of end users to confirm the discontinuity of old stoves.

**Q13: Page 11: could you please explain leakage a), b) and e) with regard to 3-stone fires in the baseline?**

A13: *a) The displaced baseline technologies are reused outside the project boundary in place of lower emitting technology or in a manner suggesting more usage than would have occurred in the absence of the project.*

It is unlikely that 3-stone fire would be re-used outside the project boundary given their no / zero market value and ease in building.

*b) The non-renewable biomass or fossil fuels saved under the project activity are used by non-project users who previously used lower emitting energy sources.*

It is likely that non-renewable biomass or fossil fuels become cheaper due to more availability in post-project scenario and their pricing is more attractive compared to fuels used by non-project users in pre-project scenario.

*e) By virtue of promotion and marketing of a new technology with high efficiency, the project stimulates substitution within households who commonly used a technology with relatively lower emissions, in cases where such a trend is not eligible as an evolving baseline.*

If the households outside of the project boundary used a renewable biomass (e.g., crop residue) in the pre-project scenario and after implementation of the project activity they switch to a non-renewable fuel (e.g., wood) which is more suitable for the efficient cookstove provided to the households in the project boundary, it would lead to leakage.

**Q14: How do I define a baseline scenario when primary and occasionally secondary fuels are used and what does this mean for the performance field test (for example, households use firewood and occasionally (once per week) charcoal in the baseline)? The project stove is an efficient wood stove. Households probably will continue occasional use of charcoal in a charcoal stove also when having the project stove. Is it legitimate to define the baseline scenario as households using firewood on a 3-stone fire neglecting the occasional use of charcoal? Is there a need for monitoring this with regard to leakage?**

A14: The occasional use of charcoal in the baseline cookstove doesn't represent the normal cooking conditions. It shall be neglected if charcoal is not used in the project cookstove. Leakage may or may not be relevant due to use of improved wood stove.

**Q15: When doing a paired field test for the baseline and project scenarios, how do you go about adjusting these values during monitoring where it is only necessary to measure project fuel consumption? What is the appropriate statistical approach for this?**

A15: The updated project fuel consumption data and original baseline fuel consumption data would be used to calculate the fuel savings using statistical analysis for Independent Sampling Approach.

**Q16: What is the difference between baseline studies and project studies; they seemed the same?**

A16: The objective of baseline studies is to capture data on the situation which includes fuel type used, the stove type, nature of cookstove use (i.e., commercial or domestic cooking etc.), whereas the project studies capture the information on similar aspects but after the distribution of cookstoves to estimate the fuel savings and corresponding emission reductions.

**Q17: As project developers, we face significant challenges to evaluate whether a baseline survey is elaborate enough to pass through the validation process or not. It would be very helpful to provide tools (e.g., survey templates) and guidance on number of samples/confidence interval etc.**

A17: In terms of these templates, we don't have any survey templates that are available publically. However, if you read carefully through this methodology and Version 2 of the "Improved Cookstove and Kitchen Regimes" methodology that was available from Gold Standard, the methodologies give sufficient details on what aspects have to be covered during these baseline surveys. In terms of sample size for Kitchen Surveys, please refer page 10 of the Gold Standard methodology on "Technologies and

Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption.” Guidelines are different for the field tests. Kitchen Performance Tests have different requirements of sample size and they have different objectives. So, again, the methodology in Annex 4 gives sufficient details on procedures to conduct Kitchen Performance Tests. We can look into, in the future, developing some example templates, which can be used for surveys and the field tests.

**Q18: Our general understanding is that the CDM approach produces higher non-renewable biomass estimates than the GS non-renewable biomass (NRB) approach. Is there a reason that project developers would choose the GS approach over the CDM approach?**

A18: If the correct data is used, fundamentally there is no reason why the CDM approach would produce higher non-renewable biomass fraction than that calculated using GS approach.

**Q19: Do you require that physical measurements of particulate matter, carbon monoxide or other indicators of smoke be made to demonstrate the project technology is reducing indoor air pollution?**

A19: The project activities, which involve the use of a new biomass fuel in the project situation, shall provide adequate evidence to demonstrate that indoor air pollution (IAP) levels are not worsened compared to the baseline. This can be demonstrated by providing protocols for comparative field tests, which credibly reflect baseline and project scenarios in respect to IAP and GHG levels.

**Q20: I want to find out, can neighborhood parks creation be considered for Gold Standard Certification? The parks with a lot of trees are meant to help with sequestration of carbon in the neighborhood.**

A20: These kinds of activities are not currently applicable under GS scope.

**Q21: If dissemination of cookstoves is already financially supported with Official Development Assistance (ODA) money, can the emission reduction achieved through these same stoves be sold?**

A21: There are two aspects to be taken care of in this situation. Regarding the ODA money, Gold Standard allows that ODA money can be used in the activity, but it has to be justified that in view of this ODA money, the credits from the project activity are not being transferred to the donor country. Now, even if project activity is financially supported, the project proponent has an option to still demonstrate additionality by justifying that the project faces significant barriers. It needs to be justified that project activity needs carbon finance and cannot be implemented without carbon finance.

**Q22: How does PCIA relate to/how is it different from the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves? What government agencies are involved in this effort?**

A22: The Partnership for Clean Indoor Air (PCIA) was launched as a public-private partnership at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), World Health Organization, Shell Foundation, Winrock International and a handful of other organizations. As the host of PCIA, USEPA has been searching for a new host organization for the past few years who can conduct the fund raising and advocacy needed to support the cook stove community. To this end, USEPA worked with the U.S. Department of State, the United Nations Foundation (UNF) and others to launch in 2010 the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves (GACC), which is housed at UNF. PCIA is in the process of integrating activities with the GACC as it rolls out its strategy and approach for

meeting its goal of 100 million stoves by 2020. GACC will rely on many implementation partners, including many PCIA Partners, to reach that goal.

**Q23: To introduce LPG in an area without any infrastructure for it, doesn't all of the infrastructure development and importation process need to be included in leakage?**

A23: In such case, where LPG transportation and other infrastructure are developed because of the cookstove project activity, the emissions shall be included in leakage.

**Q24: Regarding the baseline scenario, can the same baseline scenario be used in different geographic areas of one country if the target population is the same?**

A24: The project developer can have the same baseline scenario across different geographic areas of one or more countries, but it has to be clearly justified that the households in target area have similar fuel consumption, similar baseline technology, similar cooking practice etc.

**Q25: We have been certified under a different version of GS. What steps do we need to take to be able to take advantage of these new aspects in V3 such as the 90-30 rule?**

A25: The project developer should apply to the Gold Standard for a request for deviation, which includes the aspects of the new methodology that the project developer would like to incorporate. The GS Secretariat will decide based on request of deviation that what aspects of new methodology can be allowed for use for an already registered activity with a previous version of the methodology.

**Q26: Can you please tell if there has been a better understanding of what is meant to happen with all the old stoves?**

A26: According to GS understanding the old cookstoves shall be scraped so that they are not used within or outside the project boundary.

**Q27: Could the fuel briquettes from waste paper and sawdust be considered for the GS methodology?**

A27: Yes, the fuel derived from organic waste e.g., waste paper and sawdust is eligible under the new methodology but project developers must comply with additional eligibility criteria, consider potential additional leakages, account for project emissions associated with the production of the briquettes and conduct specific additional monitoring as required.

**Q28: At present forestry companies take about 50% of the tree mass from the plantation or forest and the other 50% remains on the floor. In many cases this is raked into rows and burned under supervision. This generates a great deal of PM and gas emissions. If it is not burned, it rots to methane and CO2. If we have a project that will convert wood wastes into charcoal for sale as fuel from that leftover 50% can we apply for methane and PM offsets? It is presumed that the conversion process would be a modern one which burns the charring gases to CO2 rather than to methane (charcoal making procures lots of CO and methane and PM, normally).**

A28: No, only CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are eligible GHG gases under Gold Standard rules; PM is not an eligible GHG. In addition, the GS methodology "Technologies and Practices to Displace Decentralized Thermal Energy Consumption" (TPDDTEC) is not suitable for the activity as defined, although small scale CDM

methodology AMS III.K may be appropriate. This project activity, using methodology AMS III.K., would be applicable for Gold Standard only if 100% renewable biomass is used as feedstock for manufacturing charcoal and the associated gases from charcoaling process are combusted and used for energy generation. For definition of renewable biomass please see:  
[http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/Meetings/023/eb23\\_repan18.pdf](http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/Meetings/023/eb23_repan18.pdf)

**Q29: Charcoal production and methane: Will improved charcoal production methods, which reduce or eliminate methane, be creditable?**

A29: The emission avoidance from improved charcoal production process is not applicable under this methodology. The project developer can refer to other CDM methodologies for example: "AMS III.K Avoidance of methane release from charcoal production by shifting from traditional open-ended methods to mechanized charcoaling process" and "AM 0041 Mitigation of Methane Emissions in the Wood Carbonization Activity for Charcoal Production."

**Q30: Regarding the safe water supply applicability, could you please explain how in the project scenario "the safer water boiled" should be measured and quantified?**

A30: In the project scenario "the safe water boiled" is measured and quantified through quantitative surveys, which should meet the requirements of Kitchen Performance Tests.