Need for a global baseline, protection, and forward funding, for “family renewable biomass and improved stove” projects

By Anandi Sharan

Women for Sustainable Development (India)

Practitioners’ Workshop on AMS-I.E, AMS-II.G and AMS-I.C: CDM methodologies for household cooking energy supply
Date: 26th October 2009

Old wine in new bottles

- We have plenty of knowledge of improved stove projects from pre-UNFCCC days and outside the UNFCCC.

- The internal institutional knowledge of people-driven programmes, and the national budgets, are the foundation of the effort.

- But the UNFCCC process must give legitimacy to this sustainable development paradigm and provide the funds to ensure that this becomes the dominant mainstream energy policy globally.

- Practitioners must help by simplifying the carbon element: it is a “no-brainer” but its paperwork must be simplified.

Spreading the message

- We know that “family renewable biomass and improved stove” projects, save 3 tCO_2e per family per year.
- The potential emission reductions from half a billion stoves for the 7 years from 2013 to 2019 is 6 billion tCO_2e.
- “Family renewable biomass and improved stove” projects are the most urgently needed of all the RETs and give much more bang for the buck than say CCS.
- We need better legal policy frameworks for this sector.
- We need better rules.

Let us draft a common statement

on what we want as a concrete outcome for

stoves projects at Copenhagen

Demands to be made at this workshop

- The workshop should make three demands
  - Global Baseline
  - Protection for 6 billion tCO_2e to 2020
  - Compulsory Forward Funding

Prices will be better

The capital expenditure of mixed purpose fuel forests can be included in the up front CER price

The operating expenses of pellet making etc. can be included in an annual additional price.

Need 1:
Global baseline "family renewable biomass and improved stove" projects

- The NRB baseline is suitable for dryland areas such as Bagepalli, India.
- Other locations such as those with woody weeds on degraded land (Nagapattinam, India) or buffer zones of Conservation Areas (Silent Valley, India) must use Type I.C. (suppressed demand for Kerosene baseline).
- This leads to differentials between emission factors in different localities despite similar socioeconomics and massive time wasting whilst the baseline is determined.

Consequence:

A near-total absence of projects in potentially a huge sector with an urgent need

Need 1 (continued): Need for Global baseline

- Our campaign demand: a global baseline based on a political recognition of the socioeconomic value of stoves and not on technical quibbling.
- Suggestions:
  - An average energy supply of 14000 MJ per annum per family.
  - A baseline of 3 tCO_2e per family per year based on the average of 100% NRB and suppressed demand for Kerosene with average values of efficiencies of modern stoves

The standard emission reduction of 3 tCO_2e per family for any "family renewable biomass and certified improved stove" to be approved by the EB and the CoP/MoP.

Need 2 and 3.
Reservation and Forward Funding

- Because of the socioeconomic condition of the users, the lack of interest of mainstream players and complex methodologies, CDM has so far been next to useless for our sector.

Let us stipulate that unless the base line and committed financing for "family renewable biomass and improved stove" projects for reducing 6 billion tCO_2e have been set up, NO other large scale CDM projects can be started.

The committed financing must ensure upfront payment of CERs with suitable insurance schemes.

Need 2 + 3. “family renewable biomass and improved stove” projects

- By demanding special status for “renewable biomass and improved stove” projects we create protection for the most vulnerable people.
- We can sell our carbon credit at a price that will cover not only stoves but also planting trees.

This will break the vicious circle:

No stove projects as carbon prices are too low → SO
No money for planting renewable biomass → SO
We cannot switch to renewable biomass → SO
NO STOVE PROJECTS.

Need 2+3: will result in better "family renewable biomass and improved stove" projects

- Better projects with certified stoves and planting technologies will emerge
- Comparison with family biogas (2-3 m^3 digester):
  - A stove plus a half acre of renewable biomass for more sustainable development co-benefits.
  - No problem of fodder.
  - Benefit of milk to be examined locally
  - Location specific preference may emerge
  - National governments to allocate land for landless.

Make standardised "family renewable biomass and improved stove" technology packages available for global dissemination in both forested and dry areas.

Conclusion

- Whether or not the incremental cost approach stays, we need ABSOLUTE PRIORITISATION of this sector, under NAMAs or CDM.

We may have to go back to go forward:

Mixed funding may be needed for these high priority projects: poverty eradication / adaptation funds in addition to CDM / NAMA (ODA conditionality may be abolished).

Implementation must ensure that no matter what the funding modality, the projects get funds easily and simply without hassles

→ In this way the easiest possible mitigation technology with maximum sustainable development benefit is prioritized.