|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **0**  | **1**  | **2**  | **3**  | **4**  | **5**  | **6**  |
| **#**   | **Para No./** **Annex / Figure / Table**  | **Line Number**  | **Type of comment** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial   | **Comment** **(including justification for change)**  | **Proposed change** **(including proposed text)**  | **Assessment of comment** **(*to be completed by UNFCCC secretariat*)**  |
| **1**  | **43 & 45**  | **N/A**  | **te** | **Quantifying household wood fuel consumption:**In the context of the CLEAR methodology within the 4C framework, it is crucial to address the discrepancy in wood consumption data. The CLEAR methodology employs a figure of 0.8 tons per capita per year for regions outside Latin America, while the Gold Standard uses 0.9 tons per year. However, the current report references a value of 0.4 tons per capita per year, which does not accurately reflect the actual scenario. | **Calculation Example:**Scenario 1: Using 0.4 tons per capita per year (current report)Given:* fNRB of India = 6%
* Annual per capita wood consumption = 0.4 tons

Let's assume a population of 1,000,000 for easier calculation.1. Harvested biomass = 0.4 tons × 1,000,000 = 400,000 tons2. Using the fNRB formula: 0.06 = (400,000 - Renewable Biomass) / 400,0003. Solving for Renewable Biomass: Renewable Biomass = 400,000 - (0.06 × 400,000) = 376,000 tonsScenario 2: Using 0.8 tons per capita per year (CLEAR methodology)Given:* Annual per capita wood consumption = 0.8 tons
* Population = 1,000,000 (same as Scenario 1)
* Renewable Biomass = 376,000 tons (same as Scenario 1, assuming it doesn't change)

1. Harvested biomass = 0.8 tons × 1,000,000 = 800,000 tons2. Calculating new fNRB: fNRB = (800,000 - 376,000) / 800,000 = 0.53 or 53%**Analysis**1. When doubling the per capita wood consumption from 0.4 to 0.8 tons:* Harvested biomass doubles from 400,000 to 800,000 tons
* fNRB increases significantly from 6% to 53%

2. This demonstrates that the fNRB calculation is highly sensitive to the annual per capita wood consumption value used.Based on this analysis, it is crucial to use the most accurate and up-to-date wood consumption data available. The report should be updated to reflect either the CLEAR methodology value (0.8 tons per capita per year) or the Gold Standard value (0.9 tons per capita per year) for regions outside Latin America, rather than the current 0.4 tons per capita per year.It is strongly recommended to update the report with wood consumption data that more accurately represents the current situation, rather than relying on the default values provided by the CDM Tool. This update is essential for ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the fNRB calculations and subsequent policy decisions. |   |
| **2** | **48 (b)** |  | **te** | **Map fuel use among the population**“We define urban and rural areas by ranking all pixels from the WorldPop map by population density in descending order and defining a cutoff such that the cumulative sum of pixels in descending order equals UNDESA’s estimate of the country’s urban population in that base year. The pixels that add to the urban cut-off are defined as urban and the remaining pixels are defined as rural.” | The process outlined in the report is not viable as it does not account for the variability in impact across different countries. The degree of impact can significantly differ from one country to another, and this variation needs to be considered for a more accurate assessment. |  |
| **3** | **39 Table Note (d)**  | **N/A** | **te** | **Residential, commercial, and industrial woodfuel consumption**This report did not include commercial or industrial wood fuel consumption - only public institutions. | We suggest including wood fuel consumption for commercial purposes as well, as in many countries, this type of consumption is significantly high. Accounting for commercial use will provide a more accurate and comprehensive assessment. |  |
| **4** | **NA** | **N/A** | **ge** | Could you please clarify the rationale behind using 2010 as the base year for calculations, despite concerns about rapid population growth and urbanization since then? Would it be more accurate to utilize the most recent country-specific data instead? |  |  |
| **5** | **NA** | **N/A** | **ge** | The output value from the project implies that in most of countries, the clean cooking technology is not financially viable, in other words, clean cooking will not have significant impact in reducing the GHG emissions |  |  |
| **6** | **NA** | **N/A** | **ge** | Why is there a suggestion to include trees outside the forest from fNRB calculations? How might this inclusion impact rural communities that rely on wood sourced specifically from forests? |  |  |
| **7** | **NA** | **N/A** | **ge** | How can project participants more effectively estimate values without relying on default assumptions? Are there specific nationally available reports or data sources recommended for this purpose? |  |  |
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