

**COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND IMPROVED
BIOMASS COOKSTOVES IN LABORATORY AND FIELD-
PROTOCOLS AND STANDARDS**

RATNESH TIWARI



**CENTRE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT & TECHNOLOGY
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, DELHI
OCTOBER 2019**

© **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2019**

**COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND IMPROVED
BIOMASS COOKSTOVES IN LABORATORY AND FIELD-
PROTOCOLS AND STANDARDS**

by

RATNESH TIWARI

Centre for Rural Development & Technology

Submitted

In fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi

October, 2019

Dedicated to

My Grandfather

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Comparative Assessment of Traditional and Improved Biomass Cookstoves in Laboratory and Field- Protocols and Standards**” being submitted by **Mr. Ratnesh Tiwari** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** is a record of bonafide research work carried out by him. He has worked under our guidance and supervision, and has fulfilled the requirements for the submission of this thesis, which has attained the standard required for a Ph.D. degree of this Institute.

The results represented in this thesis have not been submitted elsewhere for the award of any degree or diploma.

Prof. Rajendra Prasad
Emeritus Professor
Centre for Rural Development and
Technology
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
Hauz Khas, New Delhi–110016, India

Prof. Virendra K. Vijay
Professor and Head
Centre for Rural Development and
Technology
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
Hauz Khas, New Delhi–110016, India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of this thesis has been one of the most significant academics challenges I have ever had to face. Without the support, patience and guidance of the following people, this study would not have been completed. I would like to express my sincere gratitude for the immense amount of encouragement. I have received from both of my research supervisors, Prof. Rajendra Prasad and Prof. Virendra Kumar Vijay. Their wisdom, knowledge and commitment to the highest standards inspired and motivated me.

I am highly obliged to the members of Student Research Committee (SRC), Prof. S. N. Naik (Chairman), Prof. Sangeeta Kohli (External Expert) and Prof. Anushree Malik (Internal Expert), who gave me technical suggestions and positive way of direction to my research work.

I am grateful to Dr Vivek Kumar and Dr. Ram Chandra for their valuable suggestions, encouragement and inspiring support during this work.

My special thanks to Mr. Amit Ranjan Verma, my colleague at Biomass cookstoves laboratory (CRDT) for helping me conducting laboratory and as well as field testing of biomass cookstoves.

I express my humble thanks to my staff mates(team members of field testing project) Mr. Krishna Singh, Mr. Ramesh Yadav, Mr. Birender Singh, Mr. Pratap Singh, Ms. Sushmita Dass, Ms. Manju Kumari for their continuous support and help to accomplish the goals. I am also grateful, to all those who in some way or other bestowed generosity upon me regarding this study.

Last but not the least, I would like to thank my grandfather, mother, father and elder brother for educating me with aspects from both arts and sciences, for unconditional support and encouragement to pursue my interests, for listening to my complaints and frustrations, and for believing in me.

Date:

Ratnesh Tiwari

ABSTRACT

Performance evaluation is an extremely important aspect to be dealt with for the success of Improved cookstoves (ICS). It can play key role by providing required information to the decision-makers and can also help in selection of the appropriate technology as per the requirement. A well-documented data on the performance evaluation of ICSs can also serve as very important input for global climate prediction models. The present study deals with performance evaluation of biomass cookstoves. The aim of this research work was to identify the main criticalities related to the testing and evaluation of biomass cookstoves and provide indications for a better testing approach.

The results of laboratory based comparative study of two protocols BIS and WBT shows that the thermal performance and emission performance results were found to be different between the two test methods. During testing with WBT, higher uncertainty in performance results were observed. Hence BIS protocol was selected for further testing of stoves in laboratory. Uncontrolled Cooking Test protocol was selected for field testing.

The study on impact of different parameters on performance of cookstoves shows that there is a significant impact of different operating parameters on cookstoves performance.

There were differences in performance across the locations in field, likely due to differences in cooking demands and fuel conditions. The suggested baseline from testing of traditional stoves in field in terms of specific fuel consumption (per kg of food cooked) is around 7.5 MJ. In simple word, we can say that, around half kg of fuelwood being consumed for cooking of 1 kg of food in traditional stoves. This led to emissions of around 95 g CO and around 9.5 mg PM_{2.5}. A good correlation was established between the laboratory and the field testing in terms of specific fuel consumption. One unit of food cooked in the field appeared to be equivalent to on an average 7 units of water boiled in the laboratory.

The emissions were much higher in the field than in laboratory. The CO and PM_{2.5} emissions rates were on an average 3-4 times and 8-10 times higher in the field respectively.

उन्नत चूल्हे (कुक्स्टोव) की सफलता के लिए प्रदर्शन मूल्यांकन एक अत्यंत महत्वपूर्ण पहलू है। यह निर्णय लेने वालों को आवश्यक जानकारी प्रदान करके मुख्य भूमिका निभा सकता है और आवश्यकता के अनुसार उपयुक्त प्रौद्योगिकी के चयन में भी मदद कर सकता है। उन्नत चूल्हे के प्रदर्शन मूल्यांकन पर एक अच्छी तरह से प्रलेखित डेटा भी वैश्विक जलवायु भविष्यवाणी मॉडल के लिए बहुत महत्वपूर्ण इनपुट के रूप में काम कर सकता है। यह शोध कार्य चूल्हे के प्रदर्शन मूल्यांकन से संबंधित है। इस शोध कार्य का उद्देश्य बायोमास चूल्हे के परीक्षण और मूल्यांकन से संबंधित मुख्य जटिलताओं की पहचान करना और बेहतर परीक्षण दृष्टिकोण के लिए संकेत प्रदान करना था।

दो प्रोटोकॉल भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (बीआईएस) और पानी उबलने का परीक्षण (डब्ल्यूबीटी) के प्रयोगशाला आधारित तुलनात्मक अध्ययन के परिणाम बताते हैं कि थर्मल परीक्षण और उत्सर्जन प्रदर्शन परिणाम दो परीक्षण विधियों के बीच भिन्न पाए गए थे। डब्ल्यूबीटी के साथ परीक्षण के दौरान, प्रदर्शन के परिणामों में उच्च अनिश्चितता देखी गई। इसलिए प्रयोगशाला में स्टोव के मूल्यांकन के लिए बीआईएस के प्रोटोकॉल का चयन किया गया था। क्षेत्र परीक्षण के लिए अनियंत्रित खाना पकाने के टेस्ट (यूसीटी) प्रोटोकॉल का चयन किया गया था।

चूल्हे के प्रदर्शन पर विभिन्न मापदंडों के प्रभाव पर अध्ययन से पता चलता है कि चूल्हे के प्रदर्शन पर विभिन्न ऑपरेटिंग मापदंडों का एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रभाव है।

खाना पकाने की मांगों और ईंधन की स्थिति में अंतर के कारण, क्षेत्र में प्रदर्शन के स्थानों में अंतर थे। विशिष्ट ईंधन खपत (पकाया भोजन प्रति किलो) के संदर्भ में पारंपरिक स्टोव के परीक्षण से सुझाई गई आधार रेखा लगभग 7.5 MJ है। सरल शब्दों में, हम कह सकते हैं कि, पारंपरिक चूल्हे में 1 किलो भोजन पकाने के लिए लगभग आधा किलो ईंधन की खपत होती है। इससे लगभग 95 ग्राम सीओ और लगभग 9.5 मिलीग्राम पीएम 2.5 का उत्सर्जन हुआ। विशिष्ट ईंधन खपत के संदर्भ में प्रयोगशाला और क्षेत्र परीक्षण के बीच एक अच्छा संबंध

स्थापित किया गया था। घरों में पकाए गए भोजन की एक इकाई प्रयोगशाला में उबलाए गए औसतन 7 यूनिट पानी के बराबर दिखाई देती है।

प्रयोगशाला की तुलना में इस क्षेत्र में उत्सर्जन बहुत अधिक था। सीओ और पीएम 2.5 की उत्सर्जन दर क्रमशः क्षेत्र में औसतन 3-4 और 8-10 गुना अधिक थी।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
	Certificate	i
	Acknowledgments	ii
	Abstract	iii-vi
	Contents	vi-xii
	List of Figures	xiii-xvi
	List of Tables	xvii-xviii
	Nomenclature	xix-xxi
Chapter - 1	Introduction	1 - 7
1.1	Background	3
1.2	Issues and challenges	4
1.3	Need of present work	5
1.4	Objectives	6
1.5	Layout of the thesis	6
Chapter - 2	Literature Review	8-32
2.1	Introduction	10
2.2	Need of cookstove testing	10
2.3	Types of testing	11
2.3.1	Laboratory testing	11
2.3.2	Field Testing	11
2.4	Performance Parameters	12
2.4.1	Thermal performance parameters	12
2.4.1.1	Power	12
2.4.1.2	Thermal efficiency and specific fuel consumption	13
2.4.1.3	Turn-down ratio	14
2.4.2	Emission performance parameters	14
2.4.3	Effect of operating parameters	14
2.5	Stove testing protocols	16
2.5.1	History and evolution of testing protocols	16

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
2.6	Performance evaluation of biomass cookstoves	25
2.7	Uncertainty in testing	30
2.8	Summary of the literature	31
2.9	Scope of the present work	32
Chapter - 3	Laboratory Testing-Experimental Setup and Protocols	33-48
3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Experimental Setup	35
3.2.1	Instruments used for Testing of Cookstoves	36
3.2.2	Testing Protocol	38
3.2.2.1	BIS Protocol	39
3.2.2.2	WBT 4.2.3 Protocol	42
3.2.3	Comparative analysis of BIS and WBT 4.2.3 Protocol	45
Chapter - 4	Comparative Study- Using BIS, 2013 and Water Boiling Test (WBT 4.2.3) Protocols for Laboratory Testing	49-69
4.1	Introduction	51
4.2	Stoves selected	51
4.3	Testing by BIS, 2013 protocol	53
4.4	Testing by WBT 4.2.3 protocol	55
4.5	Comparison of the results using the two protocols	57
4.5.1	Firepower	57
4.5.2	Thermal Efficiency	58
4.5.3	Specific Fuel Consumption (g/kg of water boiled)	59
4.5.4	CO Emissions (g/MJdelivered)	61
4.5.5	PM2.5 Emissions (g/MJdelivered)	62
4.5.6	CO Emissions (g/min)	63
4.5.7	PM2.5 Emissions (mg/min)	64
4.6	Uncertainty/Error in Testing	65
4.6.1.	Uncertainty in BIS protocol	65
4.6.2	Uncertainty in WBT protocol	67
4.7	Conclusion	69

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
Chapter - 5	Parametric Study in Laboratory Using BIS protocol	70-99
5.1	Introduction	72
5.2	Rate of feeding	72
5.2.1	General	72
5.2.2	Experiment results	72
5.3	Residual heat (accounting char)	75
5.4.	Effect of moisture content of fuel	77
5.5.	Effect of amount of water in vessel	85
5.6.	Effect of lid on cooking vessel	92
Chapter - 6	Field Testing- Selection of Protocol and Experimental Setup	100-118
6.1	Introduction	102
6.1.1	Filed Testing Methods/Protocols	102
6.2	Selection of Protocol	103
6.3	Field Testing with UCT Protocol	104
6.3.1	Experimental Setup	106
6.3.2	Instrumentation	107
6.3.4	Fuel use and characteristics	109
6.3.5	Operational conditions	110
6.3.6	Sampling design	110
6.3.7	Quality control and assurance	111
	6.3.7.1. Equipment checks and calibration	111
	6.3.7.2. Quality control of data	112
6.3.8	Performance Parameters	112
	6.3.8.1 Fuel Performance	112
	6.3.8.2 Emissions Performance	114
Chapter - 7	Comparative Study of Traditional Stoves in Field and in Lab	119-155
7.1	Introduction	121
7.2	Field testing of traditional stoves	121

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
7.2.1	Study sites	121
7.2.2	Stoves tested	123
7.2.3	Community and participant selection	127
7.2.4	Sampling overview	128
7.2.5	Stove performance results	128
7.2.5.1	Fuel Efficiency performance	128
7.2.5.2	Emissions performance	132
7.2.5.2.1	Modified combustion efficiency (MCE)	132
7.2.5.2.2	Emissions factors	133
7.2.5.2.3	Emission rates	134
7.2.6	Analysis of distributions of key parameters	137
7.3	Laboratory Testing of Traditional Stoves	142
7.3.1	Stoves Studied	142
7.3.2.	Stove Performance Results	143
7.3.2.1	Firepower	143
7.3.2.2	Fuel Efficiency Performance	144
7.3.2.3	Thermal efficiency	145
7.3.2.4.	Emissions Performance	146
7.3.2.4.1	Modified Combustion Efficiency	146
7.3.2.4.2.	Emissions of PM2.5 and CO per Mega joule of Energy delivered	147
7.3.2.4.3.	Emissions rates, CO and PM2.5 (Indoor Air Pollution)	148
7.3.2.4.4.	Emissions Rates in terms of total cooking event	149
7.4	Comparison of field and laboratory test results	149
7.4.1.	Firepower:	149
7.4.2.	Modified Combustion Efficiency:	150
7.4.3	Emissions rates, CO and PM2.5 (Indoor Air Pollution):	151
7.5.	Key Findings	152
Chapter - 8	Comparative Study of Improved Stoves in Field and in Lab	156-177

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
8.1.	Introduction	158
8.2.	Field Testing of Improved Stoves	158
8.2.1.	Stoves Tested	158
8.2.2	.Study Sites	158
8.2.3.	Community and Participant Selection	161
8.2.4.	Sampling overview	161
8.2.5	Stove Performance Results	162
	8.2.5.1. Firepower	162
	8.2.5.2. Specific Fuel Consumption	163
	8.2.5.3. Emissions	164
8.3	Laboratory Testing of Improved Stoves	167
8.3.1.	Firepower:	167
8.3.2.	Specific Fuel Consumption	168
8.3.3.	Thermal efficiency:	169
8.3.4.	Modified Combustion Efficiency(MCE):	170
8.3.5.	Emissions Rates (CO and PM2.5):	171
8.3.6.	Emissions Rates in terms of total cooking event:	172
8.4.	Comparison of field and laboratory test results	173
8.4.1.	Firepower:	173
8.4.2	Modified Combustion Efficiency:	174
8.4.3	Emissions Rates, CO and PM2.5(Indoor Air Pollution):	174
8.4.4.	CO and PM2.5 Emissions in terms of cooking events:	175
8.5	Key Findings	176
Chapter - 9	Conclusions and Future Scope of Work	178-184
	References	185-199
	Annexures	200-212
	Brief Bio-data of the Author	213
	Publications	214-215

LIST OF FIGURES

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 1.1	Chronology of protocols development	5
Figure 1.2	A Greenway Jumbo, B. Environfit C. Supernova cookstoves.	8
Figure 1.3	TLUD cookstoves A.Servals B. Champion	8
Figure 1.4	A Philips, B. Mimi Moto, C. TERI SPT 0610.	9
Figure 1.5	A. BioLite Home Stove, B.TERI Annapurna.	10
Figure 2.1	Chronology of protocols development	18
Figure. 2.2	Coefficients of variation for WBT and EPTP	31
Figure 3.1	Schematic diagram of the experimental facility at lab	35
Figure 3.2	(a) Duct of Hood (The probe of Gas Analyzer is attached) (b) Multi-gas analyzer Unit(c) Stack Monitoring System (Mono block pump for suction and microprocessor unit) (d) Stack Monitoring System Setup (e) Digital Moisture meter (f) Microbalance (g) Bomb Calorimeter Unit	38
Figure 3.3	Temperature during the three phases of the water boiling test	42
Figure 3.4	Scheme of the WBT 4.2.3 procedure.	46
Figure 3.5	Scheme of the BIS procedure	46
Figure 4.1	Traditional Indian cookstove; B. Traditional cookstove simulated in the lab with six bricks	51
Figure 4.2	Variation in firepower of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	58
Figure 4.3	Variation in thermal efficiency of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	59
Figure 4.4	Variation in specific fuel consumption of three cookstoves while testing	60
Figure 4.5	Variation in CO(g/MJdelivered) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	61
Figure 4.6	Variation in PM _{2.5} (g/MJdelivered) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	62
Figure 4.7	Variation in CO(g/min) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	64
Figure 4.8	Variation in PM _{2.5} (g/min) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	65
Figure 5.1	Effect of rate of feeding (number of batches) on Thermal Performance of three different types of stoves	73
Figure 5.2 (A&B)	Effect of rate of feeding (number of batches) on Emission Performance (CO and PM _{2.5}) of three different types of stoves	74
Figure 5.3	Effect of rate of Residual heat (accounting char) on Thermal Performance of three different types of stoves	75

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 5.4 (A&B)	Effect of Residual heat (accounting char) on Emission Performance (CO and PM _{2.5}) of three different types of stoves	77
Figure 5.5	Effect of moisture content on Thermal Performance of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M Stove	81
Figure 5.6	Effect of moisture content on CO emissions of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M Stove	83
Figure 5.7	Effect of moisture content on PM emissions of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M Stove	84
Figure 5.8	Effect of amount of water in vessel on Thermal Performance of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M	87
Figure 5.9	Effect of amount of water in vessel on CO emissions of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M Stove	89
Figure 5.10	Effect of amount of water in vessel on PM emissions of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M Stove	90
Figure 5.11	Effect of lid on cooking vessel on Thermal Performance of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M	94
Figure 5.12	Effect of lid on cooking vessel on CO emissions of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M Stove	95
Figure 5.13	Effect of lid on cooking vessel on CO emissions of three different types of stoves (A) TC Stove (B) GW Stove and (C)FD-M Stove	97
Figure 6.1	Emissions sampling setup with traditional stove at Uttar Pradesh site location	106
Figure 6.2	Photographs of the instruments: (a) Gas Analyzer (b) Sampling Pump Unit(c) SAMO PM2.5 Monitor (d) Rotameter (e) Filter cassettes (f)	109
Figure 7.1	Map of Kandhamal District with project site location star marked	122
Figure 7.2	Map of Kalahandi District with project site location star marked	122
Figure 7.3	Location of Jashpur district in Chhattisgarh state	123
Figure 7.4	Map of Jashpur District with project site location star marked	123
Figure 7.5	A typical picture of traditional single pot biomass cookstove in the Odisha state	126
Figure 7.6	A typical picture of traditional double pot biomass cookstove in the Odisha state	126
Figure 7.7	Mean specific fuel consumption estimates of traditional cookstoves normalized by the number of people (MJ/person-meal)	129
Figure 7.8	Mean specific fuel consumption estimates of traditional cookstoves normalized by the quantity of food cooked (MJ/kg food cooked).	130
Figure 7.9	Mean specific fuel consumption estimates of traditional stoves normalized by the quantity of food cooked (g fuel wood/kg food	130
Figure 7.10	Mean combustion efficiency estimates of traditional stoves, measured as modified combustion efficiency (molar ratio of (CO ₂ /CO ₂ +CO) during	132
Figure 7.11	PM _{2.5} emission rates per minute are presented along the X-axis and CO along the	134

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 7.12	PM2.5 emissions per kg food cooked are presented along the X-axis and CO along the y-axis,	136
Figure 7.13	Variation in moisture content present in fuel used in traditional cookstoves.	138
Figure 7.14	Variation in moisture content present in fuel used in traditional cookstoves.	139
Figure 7.15	Variation in moisture content present in fuel used in traditional cookstoves	141
Figure 7.16	Cooking time variations of all traditional biomass cookstoves	142
Figure 7.17	Actual pictures of all four cookstoves tested in the laboratory at IIT Delhi	143
Figure 7.18	Firepower of traditional cookstoves in laboratory	144
Figure 7.19	Mean specific fuel consumption of traditional stoves in lab normalized by the quantity of water boiled (MJ/kg of water boiled).	144
Figure 7.20	Thermal efficiency of traditional stoves in lab	145
Figure 7.21	Mean combustion efficiency, measured as modified combustion efficiency (molar ratio of (CO ₂ /CO ₂ +CO) during the stove use events.	146
Figure 7.22	Particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) emissions in milligram per Mega joule of Energy delivered to pot	147
Figure 7.23	PM _{2.5} emission rates per minute are presented along the X-axis and CO along the y-axis	148
Figure 7.24	Particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) emission rates per Kg of water boiled are presented along the X-axis and CO along the y-axis	149
Figure 7.25	Firepower-Comparison of laboratory and field performance of traditional stoves. Each bar represents a mean result.	150
Figure 7.26	Modified Combustion Efficiency-Comparison of laboratory and field performance of traditional stoves. Each bar represents a mean result	151
Figure 7.27	Emission rates (CO (g/min and PM (mg/min))- : Comparison of laboratory and field performance.	151
Figure 7.28	CO and PM emissions per kg of cooking event- Comparison of laboratory and field performance.	152
Figure 8.1 A	Odisha project site location.	159
Figure 8.1 B	Odisha project site location.	159
Figure 8.2	First site location in Fatehpur district of Uttar Pradesh.	160
Figure 8.3	Second site location in Kanpur district of Uttar Pradesh	161
Figure 8.4	Firepower of cookstoves in field	163
Figure 8.5	Mean specific fuel consumption estimates of cookstoves (MJ/kg of food cooked)	164
Figure 8.6	Modified combustion efficiency of different cookstoves in field	165

Sl. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 8.7	Emission rates of different cookstoves in field	166
Figure 8.8	Emission factors of different cookstoves in field	167
Figure 8.9	Firepower of improved cookstoves in laboratory	168
Figure 8.10	Mean specific fuel consumption of different stoves in lab normalized by the quantity of water boiled (MJ/kg of water boiled).	169
Figure 8.11	Thermal efficiency of different stoves in laboratory	170
Figure 8.12	Mean combustion efficiency, measured as modified combustion efficiency (molar ratio of (CO ₂ /CO ₂ +CO) of stoves in laboratory	171
Figure 8.13	Emission rates of different cookstoves in laboratory	172
Figure 8.14	Emission factors of different cookstoves in laboratory	173
Figure 8.15	Firepower-Comparison of laboratory and field performance of traditional stoves. Each bar represents a mean result.	173
Figure 8.16	Modified Combustion Efficiency-Comparison of laboratory and field performance of traditional stoves	174
Figure 8.17	Emission rates (CO(g/min and PM (mg/min))- : Comparison of laboratory and field performance.	175
Figure 8.18	CO and PM emissions per kg of cooking event- Comparison of laboratory and field performance.	176

LIST OF TABLES

S. No	Title	Page No.
Table 2.1	Parameters used for evaluation of cookstoves and its influencing	12
Table 2.2	Summary of some cook stove laboratory testing protocols.	19
Table 2.3	Summary of some cook stove field testing protocols.	23
Table 3.1	Instruments used for testing the cookstoves	36
Table 4.1	Specifications of the stoves selected.	52
Table 4.2	Experimental details when stoves were tested with BIS protocol	53
Table 4.3	Experiment details when stoves were tested with WBT protocol	56
Table 4.4	Variation in firepower of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	57
Table 4.5	Variation in thermal efficiency of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	59
Figure 4.6	Variation in specific fuel consumption of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols.	60
Table 4.7	Variation in CO (g/MJdelivered) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	61
Table 4.8	Variation in PM2.5 (g/MJdelivered) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols.	62
Table 4.9	Variation in CO (g/min) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	63
Table 4.10	Variation in PM2.5(g/min) of three cookstoves while testing according to BIS, 2013 and WBT 4.2.3 protocols	64
Table 4.11	Systematic and random uncertainties in variables used in BIS protocol	66
Table 4.12	Systematic and random uncertainties in variables used in WBT protocol	68
Table 5.1	Combination of experiments for CCD analysis	85
Table 6.1	List of instruments used in field	107
Table 6.2	Sample size table for cross-sectional study design (Edwards et al., 2007).	111
Table 7.1	Dimensions and specific details of biomass cookstoves.	124
Table 7.2	Number of samples collected across location for each stove type	128
Table 7.3	Fuel and cooked food Based Emission Factors for Traditional Cookstoves	133
Table 7.4	Distributions of key parameters	137

Table 7.5	BIS limits for natural draft cookstoves.	147
Table 8.1	List of different local partner at different geographical locations	161
Table 8.2	Number of samples collected across location for each stove type.	162
Table 8.3	Firepower of cookstoves in field	162
Table 8.4	Mean specific fuel consumption estimates of cookstoves (MJ/kg of food cooked)	163
Table 8.5	Modified combustion efficiency of different cookstoves in field	164
Table 8.6	Emission rates (CO and PM) of different cookstoves in field	165
Table 8.7	Emission factors (CO and PM) of different cookstoves in field	166
Table 8.8	Firepower of different cookstoves in laboratory	168
Table 8.9	Specific fuel consumption of different cookstoves in laboratory	168
Table 8.10	Thermal Efficiency of different cookstoves in laboratory	170
Table 8.11	Modified Combustion efficiency of different cookstoves in laboratory	170
Table 8.12	Emission rates of different cookstoves in laboratory	171
Table 8.13	Emission factors of different cookstoves in laboratory	172

Nomenclature

Symbols and abbreviations

%	= Percent
/	= Per
<	= Lower than
>	= Greater than
0	= Degree
⁰ C	= Degree celsius
A	= Pre-exponential factor
A	= Area
A/F	= Air-to-fuel ratio
A _{cc}	= The cross sectional area of the combustion chamber
ASTRA	= Application of Science and Technology for Rural Areas
B	= Combustion value of fuel
BIS	= Bureau of Indian Standards
BR	= Bihar
C	= Carbon
CAD	= Computer Aided Design
CCT	= Controlled Cooking Test
CH ₄	= Methane
cm	= Centimetre
CNG	= Compressed Natural Gas
CO	= Carbon monoxide
CO ₂	= Carbon dioxide
Conc.	= Concentration
C _p	= Heat capacity at constant pressure
d	= Gap between the pan bottom and the top plate
db	= Dry basis
DC	= Direct Current
E	= Activation energy
FD-D	= Forced Draft -Domestic
FD-I	= Forced Draft -Institution
FDM	= Forced Draft Metal
FD-M	= Forced Draft- Medium
FDP	= Forced Draft Pellet
FD-TEG	= Forced Draft -Thermo Electric Genetor
g	= Gram
GACC	= Global alliance for clean cookstoves
GIZ	= Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GJ	= Giga joule
h	= Hour
H	= Hydrogen
H ₂ O	= Water
H _{cc1}	= Height of combustion chamber occupied by the fuelbed where charcoal burns and the pyrolysis take place
H _{cc2}	= Height of combustion chamber occupied by the flames

HH	= Household
I	= Current
ICS	= Improved Cookstove Stove
IIT	= Indian Institute of Technology
IMPMUD	= Improved Mud
IQR	= Interquartile range
ISO	= International Organization for Standardization
ITDG	= Intermediate Technology Development Group
IWA	= International Workshop Agreement
K	= Kelvin temperature
kg	= Kilo gram
kJ	= Kilo joule
KPT	= Kitchen Performance Test
kW	= Kilo watt
kW-h	= Kilo watt hour
L	= Litre
LPG	= Liquefied Petroleum Gas
M	= Mass of volatiles produced
<i>m</i>	= Fuel burning rate (kg/h)
m	= Meter
M Pa	= Mega pascal
m ³	= Cubic metre
mc	= Moisture content
MCE	= Modified Combustion Efficiency
mg	= Milli gram
MJ	= Mega joule
MJ _d	= Megajoule of energy delivered
mm	= Milli metre
MNES	= Ministry of Non-Conventional Energy Sources
MNRE	= Ministry of New and Renewable Energy
MP	= Madhya Pradesh
MW	= Mega watt
ND-D	= Natural Draft -Domestic
NPIC	= National Program on Improved Chulha
O ₂	= Oxygen
OD	= Odisha
P	= Power
PIC	= Products of Incomplete Combustion
PM _{2.5}	= Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
ppm	= Parts per million
R	= Ideal gas constant
R1	= Rocket 1
R2	= Rocket 2
rpm	= Revolution per minute
R _{specific}	= Specific gas constant for dry air
s	= Second
SA	= Standard Adult
SO _x	= Sulphur dioxides
STP	= Standard temperature and pressure
St. Dev	= Standard Deviation

CoV	Coefficient of Variation
CE	combustion efficiency
t	= Time
T	= Absolute temperature
TC	= Traditional chulha
TLUD	= Top Lit Up Draft
TPM	= Total Particulate Matter
TPM stove	= Two-Pot Mud stove
UCT	= Uncontrolled Cooking Test
UN	= United Nations
UP	= Uttar Pradesh
V	= Volume
v	Velocity
V	= Voltage
VITA	= Volunteers In Technical Assistance
W	= Fan power
W	= Watt
WB	= West Bengal
WBT	= Water Boiling Test
WSG	= Woodburning Stove Group
yr	= Year

Greek symbols

$\emptyset$	= Diameter (m)
α	= Fraction of mass
δ	= Gap between the pan and the shield
ε	= Emissivity
η	= Efficiency (%)
λ	= Excess air factor
μ	= Viscosity (Pa-s)
ρ	= Density (kg/m ³)
σ	= Stephan- Boltzman constant (W/m ² K ⁴)
υ	= Volatile fraction
φ	= Equivalence ratio
χ	= Packing density
ω	= Fire penetration rate (kJ/h)

Subscripts

c	= Charcoal
cc	= Combustion chamber
des	= Design
max	= Maximum
n	= Normal
d	= Deliver