Responses to the call for public inputs at EB 63 on SSC-I.K "Solar cookers for households"

0	1	2	3	4
#	**Comment author**	**Comment (including justification for change)**	**Proposed change (including proposed text)**	**SSC WG Responses**
1	PDF	Basing the threshold on rated capacity results in very low thresholds as we have experienced in the case of biogas cook stoves. The reason is that cook stoves are only going to be used a couple of hours per day, rather than 24 hours a day.	PDF requests that a usage rate factor (e.g. 20%) could be applied to the rated capacity, such as 45 MW thermal / 0.2 = 225 MW thermal.	It could not be accepted, because 1. In some cases (especially for box cookers) solar cookers will be used more than 4 hours a day, and even up to 8 or more hours if used for boiling water and baking. 2. It needs to be kept consistent with meths for other technologies such as lighting and efficient cookstoves which are also not used on a continuous basis. 3. The proposal is also not in compliance with the General Guidelines for SSC CDM methodologies where the rated capacity is used to demonstrate compliance with the SSC threshold.
2	PDF	Our experience has shown that monitoring can be expensive and resource-intensive in solar cooker projects. More standardized approaches to monitoring, so that daily reporting by sample group would not required, would greatly reduce the monitoring burden and facilitate the expansion and replication of solar cookers.		Firstly, the measurement campaign, used for determining both the baseline and project energy fuel consumption, is not necessarily calling for daily reporting. The reporting frequency will be prescribed in the sampling design in order to achieve statistically valid results. As indicated in the response to the first question, any potential standardized approach shall accommodate various types of solar cookers, e.g. parabolic type versus box cookers. The author is encouraged to submit a more concrete proposal to elaborate a standardized approach.

0	1	2	3	4
#	**Comment author**	**Comment (including justification for change)**	**Proposed change (including proposed text)**	**SSC WG Responses**
3.	Solar Household Energy		It would be more accurate to state that "The use of solar cookers will displace the use of some existing cookstoves and reduce the consumption of..."	Refined.
4.	Solar Household Energy		Correction: the aperture area of panel cookers such as the CooKit and HotPot reflector are less than 1 m2. I estimate the CooKit is about 0.3 m2. The largest area shown for the HotPot reflector is 0.49 m2. This size is sufficient for a small family. Panel cookers are in widespread use in the world. Small parabolics are also in use that have an area of about 0.3 m2.	The provision pertaining to the size of the project solar cooker is eliminated in order to not be too prescriptive.
5.	Solar Household Energy		replace "ensure" with "foster"	Language refined.

0	1	2	3	4
#	Comment author	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)	SSC WG Responses
6.	Solar Household Energy	The suggested method of monitoring could support encourage interactions between households on issues relating to solar cooking. Social mechanisms like responsible groups and peer monitoring have been used by Microfinance Institutions (MFIs) to increase access to finance and to encourage sound financial investments. User groups can be formed within communities targeted by solar cookstove programs and similar dynamics of peer monitoring can be employed to ensure households successfully adopt solar cookstoves. The implications could be even greater where solar cookstoves are financed by intermediaries. The returns from solar stoves are related positively with frequency of use. Assortative matching allows users that have higher application and users that have lower application of solar stoves to assemble into different groups. Assortative matching can reduce interest rates for all groups borrowing from financial intermediaries to purchase solar cookstoves. Further, for the lending agencies, group lending gives the opportunity to identify attributes of households most likely to use solar stoves. Groups of borrowers well informed of each other cannot only help in resolving adverse selection and in benefiting the financers but can also contribute to maintaining successful adoption(use) rate. This can help in creating positive perception of solar stoves during early	[See attached document for discussion of microfinancing options for solar cookers.]	The proposed methodology intends to provide simplified approaches to estimating emission reductions based on the difference between the fuel consumption in the baseline and during the project activity, while the monitoring requirement given in paragraph 18 is aimed at ensuring that the project solar cookers are still operating or are replaced by an equivalent in-service solar cooker. We agree that the various financial/business models for solar cooker dissemination that you have described above would indeed contribute to the sustainable operation of the cookers and would ensure stable emission reductions. However, the Group could not see how the present monitoring requirements as prescribed in the methodology would restrict, for example, the implementation of project activities using micro financing schemes.

0	1	2	3	4
#	Comment author	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)	SSC WG Responses
		stages of dissemination. In group lending schemes with joint liability, members of the groups can be expected to encourage each other to increase their frequency of use. In group liability schemes without joint liability but with group (public) meetings, borrowers sensitive to their reputation may choose to increase their use rate and thus their savings (returns) from solar stoves. In either case, the increase in use rate among the borrowers increases repayments by the borrowers. Adoption of solar stoves might depend as much on behavioral changes as it may depend on economic benefits. Under group lending schemes, the borrowers have sufficient incentives to monitor the cooking behavior of their peers such that their payoffs and that of the group as a whole increases. Therefore concerns of economic benefits among the borrowers can induce behavioral changes after financing of solar stoves. Projects relying on meeting carbon offset goals for financing may be able to develop innovative incentive structures if they engage in participatory monitoring. Finally, it is important to emphasize that the monitoring and evaluation objectives should support program objectives, rather than pursue their own methodological objectives. An example of counterproductive Monitoring and		

0	1	2	3	4
#	**Comment author**	**Comment (including justification for change)**	**Proposed change (including proposed text)**	**SSC WG Responses**
		Evaluation design would be to select program beneficiaries in a way prescribed by the methodology (randomize within an inappropriate sample universe) but not in a way that would support the program's desired impact (randomize within universe of potential users).		
7.	Solar Household Energy		To add: "and follow-up after 2-3 months, and again after 6 months to adjust the program as necessary."	Training for appropriate use of the type of solar cooker shall be provided at or before the time of distributing the solar cookers. And, A local organization shall be involved on an ongoing basis to assist in promoting and facilitating the continued use of the cookers.
8.	Solar Household Energy	The latest CDM Methodology I.K. –Solar Cookers for Household (Version 01) appears to have embraced the lessons from previous projects in determining emission factor values. A Clean Development Mechanism solar cookstove project in Indonesia has used measures of effective power and efficiency of replaced cookstove along with an approximation of time of cookstove operation. The emission factor used for computation in this project was 0.10963 kgCO2/MJ. This emission factor is based on the carbon emission factor of solid biomass (CDM, 2005). In other CDM solar cookstove projects carried out in China, an emission factor of coal at 0.0946 kgC02/MJ is used for computation (CDM,2006; CDM,2006a; CDM, 2006b).		The SSC WG failed to see the recommendation here.

0	1	2	3	4
#	**Comment author**	**Comment (including justification for change)**	**Proposed change (including proposed text)**	**SSC WG Responses**
9.	Solar Household Energy	The current I.K. methodology for Solar Cookers, relies on AMS I.E. Version 04 to establish an emission factor for non-renewable woody biomass at 0.0816 kgCO2/MJ. This approximation acknowledges solid biomass (coal), liquid fossil fuel (LPG) (kerosene), and gaseous fuel (LPG) as existing and possible substitutes for fuel wood. I.K. Version 01 is based on the premise that fuel wood will be replaced by coal (50%), kerosene (50%), or LPG (50%). This is questionable as many studies reveal that fuel wood is used for majority of cooking and households continue to depend on it. Additionally, no mention is made of transferring to solar cooking, which actually produces no emissions. Several studies reveal an emission factor of wood-burning cookstoves. Bhattacharya and Albina (2002) have carried out experiments with 24 wood burning cookstoves to determine the ratio of CO2 (in grams) over wood (in kgs). The following table summarizes the findings of this study.		The main reason for having a proxy EF for the EF for the biomass under AMS-I.E and AMS-II.G is underpinned in the COP/MOP discussions on whether the carbon from biomass should be credited under the CDM (restricted to afforestation/reforestation). The EF has been revised this year incorporating the concept of suppressed demand and not the carbon emissions from biomass.
10.	Solar Household Energy		Since not all cookers are sold on credit, this should be: "crediting period, if relevant, or a minimum of 15 days..."	This is a misunderstanding. The crediting period of the project activity has nothing to do with the crediting/selling of the appliances.

0	1	2	3	4
#	**Comment author**	**Comment (including justification for change)**	**Proposed change (including proposed text)**	**SSC WG Responses**
11.	Solar Household Energy	This comment is confusing. Project activities often must bring solar cookers for pilot activities, or as prototypes if the cookers are to be produced on site, or to distribute them to beneficiaries if there is no way to produce them on site (e.g. refugee camps).	Para. 14 should be deleted or this proviso added.	Clarity improved. The intent is to address used solar cookers transferred from other uses(ers) with para. 14, not new units.
12.	Solar Household Energy	Seasonal variations in usage are likely to be significant and will not be captured in a biennial inspection. Suggest spreading monitoring over a year with monthly contact, preferably with use of a local partner.		Seasonal variations in fuel use are addressed in para. 8a) - Ex-Post Measurement Campaign. The monitoring requirement in para. 19 is related to retention rates and not fuel consumption.
13.	Solar Household Energy	Monitoring and evaluation objectives should support program objectives, rather than methodological objectives. An example of counterproductive M&E design would be to select program beneficiaries in a way prescribed by the methodology (randomize within an inappropriate sample universe) but not in a way that would support the program's desired impact (randomize within universe of potential users).		The comment is not clear to the SSC WG. Random sampling according to the meth is carried out within the group of users of the solar cookers, not an ¨inappropriate sample universe. Sampling ¨within a universe of potential users¨ would not be appropriate in this case, unless it is for a control group. It should also be clarified that the requirement is related defining representative samples of the already selected participant users, and not to prescribe what shall be the characteristics of the participant universe.

0	1	2	3	4
#	Comment author	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)	SSC WG Responses
14.	Solar Household Energy	The suggested method of monitoring does not encourage interactions between households on issues relating to solar cooking. Social mechanisms like responsible groups and peer monitoring has been used by Microfinance Institutes (MFIs) to increase access to finance and to encourage sound financial investments. Such methods can encourage group monitoring of peers and improve user rates. Groups of borrowers well informed of each other can not only help in resolving adverse selection, but can also contribute to maintaining successful adoption(use) rate. This can help in creating positive perception of solar stoves during early stages of dissemination. See attached document for further explanation and examples. Projects relying on meeting carbon offset goals for financing may be able to develop innovative incentive structures if they engage in participatory monitoring.		The submission author is encourage to suggest a specific monitoring protocol based on their implementation strategy