



CALL FOR INPUT

Name of submitter	Annelise Gill-Wiehl
Affiliated organization of submitter	Columbia University
Email of submitter	ag5050@cumc.columbia.edu
Date of submission	15/05/2026

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020) Draft mechanism methodology: Energy efficiency measures in household cooking (version 01.0)				
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	I just wanted to first note that this is a continuation of my comments. My other submission is part 1; this is part 2.	-
2	APPENDIX 1	Activity Information Cover Sheet	The Activity Information Cover Sheet is well-designed and comprehensive. It appropriately captures all key activity parameters in a standardised format that will support consistent validation and verification across activities.	No change proposed. Commend this design.
3	APPENDIX 2	Waiver Certificate	These are typically not included in methodologies so I typically do not comment on them. However, in academia, institutional review boards have tried to move towards using extremely simple language to explain programs to participants. Imagine, you are living below the poverty line in rural sub-Saharan Africa – they have no idea what a carbon credit is, let alone what it means to give up their rights to it, or to claim credits from another program. I have helped on KPT programs and so many users consented but asked why we had to come weigh the fuels. It wasn't easy but we were able to use simple language to explain.	Consider providing more resources to clearly, in very simple terms, explain carbon credits to the participant and what it means for them to sign the waiver.

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)**Draft mechanism methodology: Energy efficiency measures in household cooking (version 01.0)**

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)
4	APPENDIX 3	Para. 5 (Enumerator independence)	Appreciate the guidance that enumerators should not be in a customer-facing role for the activity proponent. This is an important safeguard for survey data integrity.	Consider strengthening from 'best practice' to a mandatory requirement ('shall'), given the potential for enumerator bias to materially affect usage and household size parameter estimates.
5	APPENDIX 3	Para. 17(e) (Pre-activity survey parameters) / Table 16	As noted above on Para. 33(d), the pre-activity survey should capture household consumption expenditure rather than (or in addition to) income, for the reasons stated above.	Add 'daily household consumption expenditure per capita' as a required parameter in the pre-activity survey, to complement or replace income data for demonstrating poverty eligibility.
6	APPENDIX 5	Para. 9 (Fuel provision)	The guidance on fuel provision during KPTs raises legitimate concerns about measurement bias. However, the proposed alternative of excluding households that cannot self-supply fuel may itself bias the sample towards wealthier or better-resourced households. A cleaner approach would be to use the weight-addition method (recording the weight of fuel added to the cookstove directly) rather than household fuel storage as the measurement basis, which avoids both provision bias and sample exclusion.	Add the weight-addition method (weighing fuel added at each cooking event) as a preferred protocol for households unable to store a full day's fuel, before resorting to fuel provision or sample exclusion. This approach is well-established in KPT methodology and avoids the behavioural distortions associated with external fuel provision.
7	APPENDIX 7	Para. 32 (Leakage assessment)	Paragraph 32 notes that neighbouring households generally experience no change in or also decrease their own biomass use following efficient cooking interventions. The language should be control household or neighbor households.	Revise para. 32 to read: '...neighbouring or control households'
8	APPENDIX 7	Para. 40 (Table reference)	Note: Para. 40 contains a missing table reference ('[Table J]'). This appears to be a drafting gap where the specific table number referencing the GHG reservoirs has not yet been inserted.	Insert the correct table reference (Table X) before finalization.