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| **1** | **Para No. 7b** | **3-4** | **ge** | **"*However, we discovered that this led to growth rates that observed standing stocks of biomass in two of the 680 land-cover categories*." This sentence does not make sense, and it is very important to understanding the change. Please clarify.** |  |  |
| **2** | **Para No. 9** | **5-6** | **ge** | **"*Employing decadal intervals to report data is a conservative approach (towards higher values of fNRB)..."* - a conservative approach in the CDM context would be tending toward LOWER values of fNRB. Clarify - does employing decadal intervals, as has been done, tend toward higher or lower fNRB values? I.e. is the method applied unconservative, or conservative?** |  |  |
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| **9** | **Para No. 70 & 71** |  | **ge** | **The model assumes wood for charcoal comes from areas with high-fNRB. However, it seems likely that wood for charcoal would come from locations the optimally combine accessibility with wood availability (e.g. ample supply), and it is not self-evident that those would be the same locations as "high-fNRB administrative units in rural areas". Recommend re-evaluating this assumption and determine whether another set of criteria could be more accurate for the assumption on the source of charcoal used in urban areas and the urban fNRB, for example distance to urban demand center for charcoal and availability of biomass.** |  |  |
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| **11** | **Section 3.4 Paras 98-93** |  | **ge** | **It would be interesting to see the variability of outcomes if fuelwood harvest is varied. I.e. given that for example 0.4 t/p\*year seems a little low for SSA, it would be interesting to see how much fNRB varies if values closer to observed averages are applied in the model.** |  |  |