



CALL FOR INPUT

Name of submitter	Elisa Derby
Affiliated organization of submitter	Clean Cooking and Climate Consortium (4C)
Email of submitter	EDerby@cleancooking.org
Date of submission	20/08/2026

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020) Draft mechanism methodology: Cooking energy transition				
Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
1	Cover note	General	The terms cookstove “phenotype”, “model”, “type” or similar are used throughout.	Either use only one term and be consistent throughout the methodology or define each term in the glossary and make sure each one is used appropriately throughout.
2	7. Baseline scenario	Paragraph 101, pg. 45	We recommend adding (possibly as a footnote) that 1 kWh = 0.0000036 TJ to make the formula also explicitly applicable for electric cookstoves.	See above
3	Appendix 7. Demonstration of requirement...	2.1 (f)	Subsection 2.1 of Appendix 7 notes that “[...] at least three cooking devices per vintage randomly sampled from activity households, should be tested [...].” It would be helpful to define “vintage” in the glossary or in a footnote in Appendix 7.	Include a definition of “vintage” in the glossary or in a footnote in Appendix 7.
4	Cover note	General	4C recommends clarifying how the different survey types and sampling requirements relate to one another. Throughout the methodology, the terms “Baseline scenario survey,” “Baseline survey,” “KPT surveys,” and “Usage survey,” are used. There are also many instances where it only says “survey.” In some cases, it is not obvious which survey the text is referring to.	Define all the different survey types, use survey-related terminology more consistently, and explicitly identify which survey is being referenced in each case.

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)**Draft mechanism methodology: Cooking energy transition**

Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
5	Appendix 7. Demonstration of requirement...	Appendix 7, 2.2. Selection of cooks	Appendix 7 of the draft UNFCCC methodology requires that at least three local cooks be recruited for CCT testing. This is consistent with the current CLEAR CCT Appendix. However, 4C has recently discovered this error; we intended for the CLEAR methodology to require a minimum of five cooks for CCT testing. For CTEC projects using the CCT-based back-calculation approach, the CCT-derived specific energy consumption ratio is used to estimate displaced baseline energy consumption from continuously monitored project energy consumption. Given the importance of this parameter to the overall emission reduction calculation, 4C considers testing with only three cooks insufficient to adequately capture variability in cooking practices. A larger number of cooks would provide a more robust and representative estimate. 4C therefore plans to revise the CLEAR methodology and CLEAR Appendix 8 on CCTs to require a minimum of 15 CCT replicates per cookstove model/type, conducted by five different cooks, with three replicates per cook (5 cooks × 3 replicates). The standalone CCT protocol will retain its general minimum requirement of three cooks and nine test replicates (3 cooks × 3 replicates). However, where CCTs are conducted for purposes of applying this and the CLEAR methodology, the more stringent methodology-specific requirement of five cooks should apply. 4C also plans to add more prescriptive guidance to both CLEAR and the CCT protocol to ensure that the meal selected for the CCT is representative of cooking practices in the project area.	Revise the A6.4-MEP015-A01 methodology and its CCT appendix to require a minimum of five cooks and 15 CCT replicates per cookstove model/type (three replicates per cook). The standalone CCT protocol will retain three cooks as its minimum, but the methodology-specific five-cook requirement should take precedence for activities applying this methodology.

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)**Draft mechanism methodology: Cooking energy transition**

Item	Section no. (as indicated in the document)	Paragraph/Table/Figure no. (as indicated in the document)	Comment (including justification for change)	Proposed change (including proposed text)
6	5. Activity Boundary	Paragraph 22.a, pg. 28	The MEP proposes a set of rules to determine the geographic boundary of projects targeting charcoal from non-renewable projects that include multi-national, national, and sub-national values. To our knowledge, the data required to apply either multi-national or sub-national values: - for multi-national values, import volumes including undocumented trade - for sub-national values, the specific source of the charcoal and harvested biomass with applicable kml files AND the source is located entirely within one subnational jurisdiction. does not exist in any official form. There may be anecdotal information about cross-border trade or charcoal originating from certain provinces or counties, but it is unlikely to be rigorously vetted. Moreover, charcoal production tends to be transient, so even if reliable data exists, circumstances may change within a crediting period. Therefore, if UNFCCC wishes to include these options, then the methodology needs to include guidelines concerning acceptable sources of data and frequency of data validation. Barring this, we suggest omitting multi-national and sub-national options.	Omit options 22.a.i and ii