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| 1 | Pg 5 | Para 15 | ge | Appendix 2 provides clear arguments why SOC is not included in the assessment, both due to lack of data but also lack of evidence that this is a significant issue for fNRB. | Suggest this is reflected in any summaries of the method (such as para 15), as otherwise seems like a significant gap. |  |
| 2 | Pg 6 | Para 17 | ge | Important to note that while ‘cottage’ industry and commercial use of wood fuel is not included, production of charcoal (destined for residential use) surely is included. | Suggest this is reflected in the summary (Para 17), as otherwise seems an important piece of information. |  |
| 3 | Pg 6 | Para 18 | ge | The explanation on how the friction maps are derived could be improved. | How the friction maps are used should be made clear. Suggest including a slightly elaborated version as for the Pressure Maps in Annex 2, and then a concise version in the summary (Para 18). |  |
| 4 | Appendix 1, Pg. 11, 12 & 13, Table 1, 2 and 3 |  | ge | The revisions to fNRB values and its approval by the UN/CDM EB will amplify the cherry-picking by developers. This will exacerbate existing disparities in finance for clean cooking (and other) access. Studies already show limited/concentrated funding for clean cooking as it is. <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/16/16/5992> | Project developers could be encouraged to consider including areas with lower fNRB for the other SDG benefits that may arise and promote these to credit buyers.  Importantly, funders that are not primarily focused on GHG emissions should consider focusing attention on the regions with lower fNRB. |  |
| 5 | Appendix 2, Pg 25 | Footnote 2 | te | Given that the literature suggests a high stacking rate, what is the significance of not including this if it affects the fNRB. Presumably the lack of inclusion of stacking will be reducing the projected demand for wood fuels, which will therefore lead to conservative fNRB. Maybe it is possible to check scenarios for countries where stove and fuel stacking data are available. | Model scenarios for countries with reliable stove and fuel stacking data and compare the differences. If inclusion of stacking is shown to have significant effect, then the methodology adopted should allow project developers to include evidence on stacking in their project areas, and then adjust the fNRB by an appropriate factor. |  |
| 6 | Appendix 2, Pg 26 & 27, Table 2 and Figure 3 |  | te | 0.4 tonnes per capita per year may not reflect the significant diversions in some countries, also between rural and urban locations. Analysis of data from cooking trials and studies in MECS programme has shown that differences in diet lead to significant regional differences in energy consumption: e.g., SSA cooks use almost twice the amount of charcoal to cook the same dishes as cooks in South Asia (consistent with the PDD data shown in Table 2, Pg 26). | Model scenarios to look at the effect of varying the consumption values, e.g., by rural/urban, and by regions, to see the effect of the differentiation in consumption values used to generate fNRB.  If such differentiation in consumption values is shown to have significant effect, then the methodology adopted should allow project developers use specific values in their project areas, and then adjust the fNRB by an appropriate factor. |  |
| 7 | Appendix 2, Pg 29 and 30 | 1st Para | ge | If the urban/rural classification has a substantive effect on the final fNRB values, then it is important that the modelling captures the effect of urbanisation expected over the modelling period. Note 5 implies this is not done. | The modelling already estimates the population growth per pixel, so can the allocation as rural or urban be updated, e.g., if a pixel area passes the population density threshold to be classified as urban? |  |
| 9 | Appendix 2, Pg 35 | 1st Para after Eq. 2 | ed | The use of “in” in “k in an …” is a typo. | Replace “in” with “is”. |  |
| 10 | Appendix 2, Pg 35 | 3rd Para after Eq. 2 | ed | In the definition of C as wood fuel consumption, in the sentence “deforestation events driven by factors agricultural expansion or other factors”. | Replace with “deforestation events driven by agricultural expansion or other similar factors”. |  |
| 11 | Appendix 2, Pg 38 | 2nd Para of “Results” | te | The MoFuSS web-platform says its “under construction”. This is a bit confusing – and also checked that not all the features are accessible e.g., IDW and WCT. | Remove the “under construction” and include accessibility to all the features. |  |
| 13 | Appendix 2, Pg 39 | 2nd Para | ed | “for” is missing in the sentence “Table 3 shows a summary of national wood fuel sustainability variables SSA,“ | Include for such as “Table 3 shows a summary of national wood fuel sustainability variables ***for*** SSA.” |  |
| 14 | Appendix 2, Pg 41, Table 3 |  | ge | fNRB results are given for different time periods. This is potentially confusing, and more guidance is needed to their meaning. | Suggest adding to the text explanation of results to give examples of appropriate use of the different time periods of fNRB results, e.g., as they relate to a carbon credit project that starts at x date and runs for y years. Another consideration could be to relate with the NDC updates – every five years. |  |
| 16 | Appendix 2, Pg 34 | 2nd para | ge | The text says the method used leads to lower fNRB than TOOL30. It would be helpful to briefly explain the difference. | Add brief explanation of how the method differs from that in TOOL30, resulting in lower fNRB values. |  |
| 15 | Appendix 2, Pg 49 | 1st Para | ge | Inclusion of this section on proposed changes to TOOL30 is confusing: Is the purpose of the new work with MoFuSS not intended as a replacement for TOOL30? | Clarify the purpose of this section on TOOL30 (e.g., perhaps it is that if the MoFuSS work is not adopted, these are changes recommended to TOOL30 ?) |  |
| 17 | Appendix 2, Pg 50 | 3rd Para | ed | In the last para, “sued” is a typo. | Replace with “used”. |  |
| 18 | Appendix 2, Pg 58 | 4th Para | ed | “There is there is” is repeated – in the para preceding Table 5. | Remove “there is” |  |
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