



CALL FOR INPUT

Name of submitter	AFOLU
Affiliated organization of submitter	AFOLU
Email of submitter	afolu@protonmail.com
Date of submission	10/07/2026

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)

Draft mechanism methodology: Energy efficiency measures in household cooking (version 2.0).

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	5. Activity Boundary	Table 1	GHG emissions from fuel transport are excluded for simplification. "For simplification" is not a valid justification. Excluded emissions may be significant.	Provide a valid justification for excluding emissions from fuel transport or include them. Applies both to baseline and project scenario. Exclusion of GHG emissions from project scenario may breach environmental integrity of the methodology.
2	5. Activity Boundary	Para 21	The physical, geographical sites where the project cookstoves operate are different from the location(s) in which the fuels used by the user households are produced or from where they are collected in the baseline and activity scenario In rural areas the physical, geographical sites where the project cookstoves operate may not necessary be different from the location(s) in which the fuels used by the user households are produced or from where they are collected in the baseline and activity scenario. The fuel may be collected from the most proximate forest. A clear definition of the term "different" is necessary.	Explain what does it mean that The physical, geographical sites where the project cookstoves operate are "different" from the location(s) in which the fuels used by the user households are produced or from where they are collected in the baseline and activity scenario
3	5. Activity Boundary	Para 23	The geographic limits of the activity boundary related to fuel wood refers to the availability of data and not availability of information on from where the fuelwood is collected.	Refer to availability of information on from where the fuelwood is collected

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)**Draft mechanism methodology: Energy efficiency measures in household cooking (version 2.0).**

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	5. Activity Boundary	Para 24	Para 24 incorrectly refers to para 22 (a) (ii))	Correct the reference
5	7. Baseline scenario	Table 3	0.49 tonnes of fuelwood - this number refers to dry or wet fuelwood?	Refer to dry or wet fuelwood.
6	7. Baseline scenario	60	It is not true that " non-CO2 (CH4 and N2O) emissions that are not subject to reversal risk from direct combustion of fuelwood and artisanal charcoal". If these emissions are calculated in proportion to carbon, or energy delivered by burning carbon, they will behave exactly the same as CO2 - i.e., they are subject to reversal. Fuel saved by project activity, if burned in reversal, will release CO2 and non-CO2 gases as well.	Correct calculation of baseline emissions (refers to numerous equations in the baseline section)
7	7. Baseline scenario	Equations 6 and 7	Outcome of equations 6 and 7 has unit TJ/year and not TJ	Change unit and propagate it through all affected equations or change unit of relevant variables in these equations
8	7. Baseline scenario	Equation 16	Equation 16 does not take into account that the last year needs not to be the entire calendar year. In fact, it makes last but one DAY applicable to the last year.	Correct equation 16
9	7. Baseline scenario	Equations 22 and 23	See my comment on equations 6 and 7	See my comment on equations 6 and 7
10	8. Activity scenario	Equation 28	$AECO2,j,y$ - index j is not necessary	Delete index j
11	8. Activity scenario	Equations 29 and 30	$AEnonCO2,i,y$ - index i is not necessary $AEnonCO2,j,y$ - index j is not necessary	Delete indexes as proposed above
12	8. Activity scenario	Equation 31 and 32	See my comment on equations 6 and 7	See my comment on equations 6 and 7
13	9. Leakage	Equation 35	Variables are not explained	Explain variables

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)**Draft mechanism methodology: Energy efficiency measures in household cooking (version 2.0).**

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)
14	10. Non-permanence provisions	para 114	It is not true that: All A6.4ERs contributed to the reversal risk buffer pool account under this mechanism methodology shall immediately be cancelled by the Mechanism Registry Administrator for the purpose of remediating future reversals. Credits in buffer account are not tradable hence, cancelling them or not has no environmental effect. If these credits are not cancelled than their impact on environmental integrity of a project would be the same.	Provide logically correct justification for relation between canceling buffer credits and remediating future reversals. Note that the recent California studies indicate that carbon losses frequently exceed buffer contributions.
15	10. Non-permanence provisions	Equation 36	$F_{buffer,i,t}$ = The fraction of the A6.4ERs with respect to the GHG reservoir aboveground woody biomass in landscape and for the period of time covered by a monitoring report t that is to be contributed to the reversal risk buffer pool account for fuel i (per cent) $F_{buffer,i,t}$ is inconsistent with $(ECBL_{i,adj,y} - ECproj_{i,y})$	Refer $F_{buffer,i,t}$ to year, or $(ECBL_{i,adj,y} - ECproj_{i,y})$ to the period of time covered by a monitoring report t
16	Appendix 7. Demonstration of requirement...	Para 19	paragraphs 65 and 66 of version 01.0 of the “Standard: Setting the baseline in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-004) refer to project specific conditions and not to methodology. Para 66: Such exemptions shall only apply to baselines based on BAT or ambitious benchmarks. Economic viability could be a consideration for exemptions, for example, where the application of a downward adjustment may result in no calculated emission reductions or net removals clearly refers to project conditions because methodology is not able to assess whether downward adjustment may result in no calculated emission reductions or net removals because to assess it project specific data are necessary Para 20 of Appendix 7 refers to the exemption provided on the grounds that this mechanism methodology provides significant benefits to communities with the lowest income but the project monetary benefits will not go to local communities but to project developers.	Provide approach allowing to check whether conditions of para 66 of the “Standard: Setting the baseline in mechanism methodologies” (A6.4-STAN-METH-004) are met.