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| **1** | **15** | **5** | **te** | **The model does not account for changes in SOC and only addresses DOM indirectly. How it can be considered conservative? Where in harvesting leads to forest degradation or deforestation.** | **The model must account for changes in SOC and DOM.** |  |
| **2** | **17** | **1** | **te** | **Wood consumed by formal and cottage industries as well as commercial establishments has not been considered by the model where in Asian Countries they are major consumers.**  | **Wood consumed by formal and cottage industries as well as commercial establishments shall be considered.** |  |
| **3** | **20** | **10** | **te** | **For this assessment, the likelihood of wood harvesting within protected areas was considered only 10% that of unprotected areas with similar terrain, which is not in realty because of uncontrolled encroachment in protected area has witnessed loss of tree cover throughout the last decade.** | **Must use proper survey data to consider wood harvesting within protected areas.** |  |
| **4** | **Quantifying consumption (Para 3, page 27)** | **1** | **te** | **The default value recommended by the UNFCCC for wood fuel projects, set at 0.4 tons of wood per capita p0er year, has been consistently applied in the entire simulation. However, it is important to note that both the Gold Standard threshold value and actual KPT data from numerous verified projects indicate that in traditional stoves, the value is considerably higher at 0.75 tons of wood per capita per year. Additionally, if we were to use the value of 0.4 tons of wood per capita, with a baseline stove efficiency of 15% and Improved Cook Stove (ICS) efficiency of 36.4%, the per capita wood consumption in ICS would be only 450 grams per capita per day. This figure is impractical given real-world circumstances.** | **A default value of 0.75 tons of wood per capita per year must be considered and fNRB values must be recalculated.** |  |
| **5** | **fNRB assessment for other regions (page 57)** |  | **te** | **The fNRB assessment for other regions appears to lack relevance, as it acknowledges that limitations in time and resources led to the calculation of values using a single pressure map based on 2010 demand, rather than employing annually updated maps and conducting multiple Monte Carlo simulations. This approach renders the calculated values unreliable and, therefore, they should not be included in the final report. Such inclusion could convey a negative message to potential investors, potentially discouraging their interest in supporting community projects such as cook stoves and water filters.** | **fNRB assessment for other regions shall be removed from the final document.** |  |