EPA Official Record

Mail ID: OF148E1D38.DE1CD643-ON85257B09.004F62E5-85257B09.005B6BCD

From: Mitchell, John

To: rvanderplas@yahoo.com

Copy To: xia@energyforall.info; heike.volkmer@giz.de; christa-roth@foodandfuel.info; rchiang@cleancookstoves.org; Jetter, James

Delivered Date: 02/05/2013 11:38 AM EST

Subject: ISO Guidelines and the WBT 4.1.2

Robert,

I am writing to reach out to you to try to quickly address the misinformation in your email below (which was forwarded to me). I am not sure how these ideas spread, but thought it best to respond directly to you. If you want to talk about it, please call me at your convenience at +1-202-343-9031.

First, the IWA & ISO approach will not be abandoned - nor could a decision of this type be taken at ETHOS. For an example of the importance of the IWA to the cookstove community and the GACC, please read the January 31, 2013 press release found at: http://www.cleancookstoves.org/media-and-events/press/clinton-announces-new-commitments-and-partnerships-in-support-of-global-alliance-for-clean-cookstoves.html

Secondly, the ISO IWA did not accept the Water Boiling Test 4.1.2 as the standard testing method, in fact, the second sentence in the IWA scope states *"Rather than select a single laboratory protocol to determine cookstove performance, this International Workshop Agreement will enable stove testers to utilize laboratory protocols most appropriate for the stove and performance indicator being tested. Tiers of performance for each protocol will chart all stove test results on the same page in order to ensure equivalent results regardless of protocol used."*

In addition, the IWA participants further discussed the protocol issue in more detail in the IWA Resolution #1 - below:

Resolution 1
The International Workshop on Cookstoves recognizes that the VITA WBT 4.1.2 protocol referenced in this document is not the only valid protocol for rating cookstove performance in the laboratory.

As such, the International Workshop on Cookstoves recommends that:

a. *New protocols be developed and/or current protocols be updated to more adequately address all stove and fuel types (e.g. cooking stoves used for heating, plancha/griddle stoves, batch-fed stoves, charcoal stoves, double pot stoves, and solar cookers);*
b. *Tier level equivalence to those used in the IWA for the VITA WBT 4.1.2 protocol be developed for any protocols created or adapted (such as the Beijing City Local Standard DB11/T 540-2008 – General technical specification of domestic biomass stove/boiler and associated protocols, and the Indian "Solid Bio-Mass Chulha - Specification" (IS 13152));*
c. *Research be conducted for high priority initiatives such as coupling lab and field testing; improving indoor emissions protocols; climate change impacts; and developing a pool of resources for testing stoves.*
d. *All protocols be rigorously evaluated by an independent, technically qualified group; and*
e. *The acceptability of a protocol for a particular stove and tier designation be determined by the ability of the test procedure to repeat the performance metric within one-third of the distance between tiers, under conditions that are consistent with the test specification.*

Some background:

1. The WBT protocol was used to develop tiers of performance in the IWA because that is the protocol for which the cookstove community has the most published (and unpublished) test results; and
2. That prior to the IWA meeting, outreach included six webinars, a public comment period on the PCIA website, and an in-person presentation at ETHOS 2012. During this outreach, the idea of using a Rosetta Stone approach was discussed at length - that means not picking a single protocol to use, but enabling multiple protocols to be used to determine tiers of performance in the IWA and developing a way to translate between protocols. This idea was then incorporated in both the Scope and Resolutions of the IWA -- see above.

In addition, like with any protocol, the WBT has been revised over time as more information is learned, and yes, if calculation errors are discovered. The attachment from Crispin was in response to a solicitation by PCIA for comments on the WBT in an effort to update it. The review committee reviewed each comment received and suggested changes to the protocol where appropriate, and created a laundry list of areas that the community needed more research if/when funds became available; many of Crispin's thoughts fell into "more research needed."

I participated in the ETHOS session where Professor Harold Annegarn presented. The suggestion of using common terminology and developing a common lexicon could build on the definitions in the IWA. However, I am not sure where the idea that "SETAR convincingly presented a better approach and GACC accepted to follow this" came from as no discussion of that sort took place.

I hope that you plan to participate in the upcoming cookstove community Forum in Cambodia that the GACC is organizing. If so, I look forward to talking to you more about the IWA specifically and protocol development generally. You should know that the PCIA previously, and now the GACC is working very hard to include all voices in stove testing and protocol development discussions and I hope that you can join us.

All the best,

John

_____

John Mitchell
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Cookstoves and Indoor Air Pollution

Tel: +1 202 343 9031
Fax: +1 202 343 2393

-----Ursprüngliche Nachricht-----
Von: Robert [mailto:rvanderplas@yahoo.com]
Gesendet: Mittwoch, 30. Januar 2013 07:32
An: Volkmer, Heike GIZ; Lara Born; Xia Zuzhang
Betreff: Fwd: GACC

FYI

This week at the ETHOS conference in the USA, which is for stove scientists, some fundamental changes were agreed to the proposed stove testing

methodology for GACC. The IWA & ISO approach will be abandoned and a Wiki-type approach will be started soon. Excellent news!.

As you may know, GACC accepted the Water Boiling Tests 4.1.2 as their standard testing method, without allowing this to be independently verified, or even thoroughly commented on by others. Many of the EU members were not pleased, but also not worried enough to complain harder. A careful review found >120 errors in the spreadsheet alone!
Moreover, it doesn't really measure all that is needed for a proper analysis, and the proposed Pems Hood equipment doesn't give replicable or even reproducible results. All stove carbon credits are based on this method.....

Professor Harold Arnegan of SA University and Director of the stove testing center in Joburg, SETAR convincingly presented a better approach and GACC accepted to follow this. Attached is the PPT that formed the basis for the discussion, and the text document that was made public in
2009 already explained some of the problems with the WBT, but was successfully ignored by GACC.

--Robert

_____