



CALL FOR INPUT

Name of submitter	Laurent Perrinjaquet
Affiliated organization of submitter	BURN Manufacturing
Email of submitter	laurent.perrinjaquet@burnmfg.com
Date of submission	24/07/2026

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020) Draft methodological tool: Sampling and surveys (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	-	"Section 5, para 16-18 (Sampling for programmes of activities)"	The tool allows one common sampling plan to cover several projects, but only for component projects within a single programme of activities, and only where they are "sufficiently homogeneous" (para 17), a term the tool does not define. In practice our activities in different programmes or registrations often use the same stove, the same fuel and the same type of household. Requiring a separate sample for each adds cost without adding accuracy.	"Allow one common sampling plan to cover several Article 6.4 activities (projects and/or programmes) that share the same technology, the same fuel and the same target population, not only component projects within a single programme. Replace the undefined term ""sufficiently homogeneous"" with clear, objective criteria (for example: same stove type, same fuel, same baseline, and comparable region) that qualify activities to be sampled together."
2	5. Methodological approaches	"Section 5.4.4, para 56 (box) and para 63 (Cluster and multi-stage sampling)"	Cluster and multi-stage sampling are well suited to cookstove activities, where households are spread over large areas, and they help keep monitoring affordable. The tool permits them but only where the methodology "explicitly allows" it (para 63), and the panel has asked whether these methods are appropriate (box after para 56).	Confirm that cluster and multi-stage sampling are available for cookstove activities, and remove the condition in para 63 that a methodology must explicitly allow them (or treat reference to this tool as providing that permission).

Document reference number and title: (Recommendation from the MEP to SBM020)**Draft methodological tool: Sampling and surveys (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)
3	5. Methodological approaches	"Section 5.6, para 76 (Choice of measurement method)"	Para 76 treats physical on-site surveys as "preferred" and other methods as lower precision. Continuous digital measurement from stove-use monitors and metered stoves is often more accurate and more objective than an occasional site visit. Ranking physical methods above digital measurement is not justified.	"Remove the general preference for physical methods and choose the method on the basis of demonstrated accuracy. Recognise validated digital measurement (stove-use monitors and metered stoves, including data downloaded locally, for example by Bluetooth) as equal to physical measurement, and accept its data directly."
4	5. Methodological approaches	"Section 5.6.2, para 82 (Remote surveys)"	Remote surveys that collect answers from people by telephone, SMS, e-mail or post (para 82) are, as the tool itself notes, prone to bias and low response rates. In our view they are not reliable enough to determine emission reductions. This is different from digital measurement by sensors or meters, which we support (see comment 3).	Do not permit remote surveys (telephone, SMS, email or post) as a method for collecting survey data used in emission reduction calculations. Retain physical surveys and validated digital measurement as the recognised methods.
5	5. Methodological approaches	"Section 5.6.3, para 85 (Use of survey data with sensors)"	Para 85 states that sensor data "may be complemented by data obtained through surveys". We are concerned this could be read as a requirement to run a survey in order to confirm digital data. Validated digital measurement should be able to stand on its own.	Clarify that a supporting survey is optional, not required. Where a stove-use monitor or metered stove has been validated, its data should be accepted without a mandatory confirming survey.
6	5. Methodological approaches	"Section 5.6.1, para 79 (Kitchen Performance Tests)"	Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) provide a direct, in-home measurement of household fuel use and are, in our experience, the most reliable basis for cookstove activities. The tool describes physical surveys in general but does not mention KPTs.	Recognise Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) explicitly as a preferred physical measurement method for fuel consumption in cookstove activities, and encourage their use alongside validated digital measurement.