

## **GS1205 Sustainable Energy for Development PoA, VPA 3: Improved Cook Stove Project in Brazzaville (GS2514)**

### ***Local Stakeholder Consultation Report Feedback under GS Version 2.2 VER***

#### **Information on the request**

<b>Requested by:</b>	<b>Initiative Development</b>
<b>Contact:</b>	<b>Olivier Lefebvre</b>
<b>Contact email:</b>	<b><a href="mailto:o.lefebvre@id-ong.org">o.lefebvre@id-ong.org</a>/<a href="mailto:carbhone@id-ong.org">carbhone@id-ong.org</a></b>
<b>Date of submission:</b>	<b>12/11/2013</b>
<b>Date of GS feedback – I round:</b>	<b>20/11/2013</b>
<b>Date of GS feedback – II round:</b>	<b>22/11/2013</b>

#### **Document (s) provided and reviewed (I round):**

- Draft VPA-DD (V01, 12/11/2013)
- Evidences

#### **Document (s) provided and reviewed (II round):**

- Draft VPA-DD (V02, 20/11/2013)

#### **Project summary**

The Project is VPA3 under the POA GS1205 Sustainable Energy for Development PoA. The proposed micro-scale VPA aims at creating and organizing a supply and distribution chain for improved cook stoves in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo. The improved cook stoves promoted can be used with both firewood and charcoal since those two fuels are widely used in Brazzaville.

The project proponent, Initiative Development (ID), helped firstly the creation of a design adapted to local practices. It then organizes the production and distribution by insuring quality and doing some marketing and advertising for the stoves. Two models have been designed: a big model for restaurants or large families and a smaller model targeting families. The project will target first restaurant owner in three neighbourhood of Brazzaville (Bacongo, Mougali and Poto-Poto) and then extend to all categories of users and to the whole municipality of Brazzaville.

The expected benefits of this project are essentially a decrease in wood and charcoal consumption in Brazzaville as well as the decrease of toxic fumes when cooking. From an economic point of view, users should also save money on fuel purchase.

<b>Project Size:</b>	<b>microscale</b>
<b>Start date of construction:</b>	<b>January 2014</b>
<b>LSC meeting date:</b>	<b>11 September 2013</b>

**SECTION A:**

1. The **CME** shall please clarify the start date and credit start date of the VPA. January 2013 was proposed for both dates, which are not reasonable.
2. By now, the boundary of VPA3 overlaps VPA2 and VPA4, the **CME** shall please provide more information of the VPAs, Any planning of total improved cook stoves to be distributed, How many cook stoves are planned for each VPA, How to differentiate each VPA, etc.

**Response by Project Proponent (round 1)**

- 1 There were a typo in the start date and credit start date. It should read January 2014. The reports has been updated.
- 2 At this early stage of the project (before the complete analysis of baseline survey results) it is difficult to know what is going to be the amount of VER per stove sold. It is also difficult to know in advance how many stove will be sold. So this section will be updated in time for project validation once the result of baseline survey will allow to estimate the number of stove that can be included into the project.  
Each VPA can be differentiated thanks to the project database of each VPA. Each stove has a unique serial number and the project database (updated continuously) will allow to know exactly which stoves are in which VPA

**Response by GS (round 2)**

**The Comment/Request is closed.**

**SECTION C:**

3. It is noted that only 2 out of 11 attendees are local stakeholders, the **CME** shall please make efforts encouraging more local stakeholders to attend any future stakeholder meeting as they are the final users.

**Response by Project Proponent (round 1)**

- 3 Efforts will be made to have more final users in future stakeholder meeting.

**Response by GS (round 2)**

**The Comment/Request is closed.**

**Editing and Other**

4. The CME shall please delete irrelevant information in Section A.1 of the VPA-DD.
5. The CME shall correct the name of the VPA in Registry in order to be consistent with name in the VPA-DD.

**Response by Project Proponent (round 1)**

- 4 The irrelevant information in Section A 1 has been removed.
- 5 The name of the project in the registry has been updated.

**Response by GS (round 2)**

The Comment/Request is closed.

---

***Conclusion: The GS opinion is that the project activity can be listed after the above clarifications and corrective actions have been taken care of in a satisfactory way.***