

Gold Standard clarifications to atmosfair re Suppressed Demand and application of investigator (Berkeley Air Monitoring Group) recommendations

From: Owen Hewlett <owen.hewlett@goldstandard.org>

Date : mercredi, 23 novembre 2016 14:34

To : Dietrich Brockhagen <brockhagen@atmosfair.de>

Cc : Abhishek Goyal <abhishek@cdmgoldstandard.org>

Subject: Re: Call about GS 886

Dear Dietrich, following up on my email below and suggestion that we respond by email to your queries to Marion concerning Suppressed Demand and application of BAMG recommendations. These are summarized below though we would still be happy to have a call (and would propose Abhishek join us as he was at GS at the time and has closer working knowledge).

Reviewing correspondence of the time it appears the key decision points were communicated with the NGO Supporters who had raised concerns. We do recognize however that the opportunity to comment on decisions is less well defined as this is a fine line for us to tread. We are reviewing our certification procedures under our new standard with this in mind. It is important to note however that GS TAC has final decision in all certification matters and their independence and absence of conflict of interest is vital in this sense.

Suppressed Demand: Regarding your concerns that an inappropriate suppressed demand baseline as applied we would note that this project was actually Registered in early 2011. This meant that an earlier version of cookstove methodology was applicable and this did not include any specific guidance on accounting for alternate technologies that may be in use / would have been used to treat water apart from boiling. Instead, to address the review referred to Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2008-2009 published in June 2010, which stated that penetration of chlorine in rural Kenya was 17%. Accordingly, the PP was required to apply a discount factor of 0.8 on total project population eligible for GSVER calculation.

Although the applied version of the methodology did not require application of any such discount, this has been applied in all the issuances for this project. The revised version of TPDDTEC meth released in 2014 is more clear on this issue of accounting of actual / expected use of alternate technology in place of boiling. GS typically seeks not to retrospectively apply new requirements as this can cause instability and risk to developers. It is therefore important to judge the Registered baseline on the basis of requirements applicable at that time.

Application of BAMG recommendations: We were a little unclear still on exactly what is referred to here but we have cross-checked the 3rd MP verification report and BAMG recommendation. The DOE states in the verification report that:

"Based on the recommendations from the BAMG report /35/, Vestergaard validated a new

Gold Standard

compendium of questions with the independent group and with the Gold Standard Foundation that were used in the VF-MR3-Survey. ERM CVS has confirmed that the questions used in the VF MR3 survey and the EXP survey are in line with the recommendations from the BAMG report."

We also note that concerns raised were actually FARs highlighted by DOE and review for next monitoring period, which never was submitted for issuance. Also, the values for the key parameters for which the DOE raised FARs for next verification were sourced from the third party survey report not from VF survey results following the conservativeness principle. For example-

DOE report highlighted that the EXP survey values were 67% of what VF survey resulted (as mentioned in the letter), whereas in the same section DOE also mentioned that

"Lb,l,y - *The calculated values according to the VF-MR3-Survey and EXP survey are 3.6161 and 2.4409 respectively. 2.4409 was taken for the final VER calculation, which is conservative."*

This is perhaps a confusion over the next Monitoring Report which has not yet proceeded but if you could let us know if we've misinterpreted we can quickly review again.

We would again note that this project appears unlikely to pursue further issuance at this time but will of course be closely reviewed if it does proceed.

Many thanks for your ongoing consideration and support of GS,

Owen Hewlett
Chief Technical Officer

The Gold Standard Foundation
Geneva, Switzerland
Email: owen.hewlett@standard.org
www.goldstandard.org