



RECIPE FOR CHANGE GROUPED PROJECT

Document Prepared By

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.



Report ID	CCIPL2760/VCS/VER/RCGP/20250612
Project title	Recipe for Change Grouped Project
Project ID	2384
Verification period	01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025
Original date of issue	29–December-2025
Most recent date of issue	15–April-2026

Version	6.0
VCS Standard Version	4.7
Client	Wonderbag UK Limited
Prepared by	Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd.
Approved by	Amit Anand, CEO
Work carried out by	Pankaj Kumar (Team Leader/ Technical Expert) Nisha Jha (Trinee Assessor) Nadir Mazroy (Trinee Assessor) Aluwani Balebale - Local Expert Indumathi C. (Technical Reviewer)

Summary:

- **A brief description of the verification and the project**

Verification: Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. has been contracted by Wonderbag UK Limited/28/ the project proponent on 13-August-2025, to carry out the verification of voluntary greenhouse gas emission reductions generated by Nineteen Projects Activity Instances, Recipe for Change (RfC PA 01 to RfC PA 19) under the grouped project “Recipe for Change Grouped Project”. The verification is based on the desk review of the monitoring report/01/, registered VCS PD/04/ and the corresponding validation report/04/, supporting emission reduction calculation spread sheet/03/ and other relevant supporting documents made available to the verification team by the project proponent accompanied by on-site interviews. This verification involves the period from 01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025 (including both the days).

Project: The project “Recipe for Change Grouped Project” is a grouped project that employs CDM methodologies; AMS II C – “Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies” (Version 15.0)/B02/ and AMS-II.G. “Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass” (Version 11.1)/B02/. The project entails the distribution of fuel-efficient stoves throughout the Republic of South Africa. The project results in reducing the amount of fossil fuels, electricity and non-renewable biomass used for cooking. Through reduction in fossil fuel / electricity / biomass consumption, the programme will decrease greenhouse gas emissions.

- **The purpose and scope of verification**

Purpose: The purpose of the verification is to review the monitoring results and verify that monitoring methodology was implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring data, used to confirm the reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources are sufficient, definitive, and presented in a concise and transparent manner. Monitoring plan, monitoring report and project compliance with relevant VCS criteria are verified to confirm that the project has been implemented in accordance with previously registered design and conservative assumptions, as documented.

Scope: The scope of the verification is:

- To verify the project implementation and operation with respect to the registered VCS PD/04/.
- To verify the implemented monitoring plan with the registered VCS PD/04/ and applied baseline and monitoring methodology.
- To verify that the actual monitoring systems and procedures are in compliance with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence.

The verification shall ensure that the reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be certified.

- **The method and criteria used for verification**

(a) Desk review, involving:

- (i) Review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness;
- (ii) Review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures;
- (iii) Evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions;
- (b) On-site assessment involving:
 - (i) Assessment of the implementation and operation of the proposed VCS grouped project activity as per the registered VCS PD/04/;
 - (ii) Review of information flows for generating, aggregating, and reporting the monitoring parameters;
 - (iii) Interview with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the registered VCS PD/04/;
 - (iv) A cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as inventories, purchase records, or similar data sources.
 - (v) A check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the VCS PD/04/ and the selected methodology.
 - (vi) Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions.
 - (vii) Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters.

- **The number of findings raised during verification.**

A risk-based approach has been followed to perform this verification. During the course of this verification, a total of 21 findings were raised for current monitoring period, which includes:

08 Corrective Action Request (CAR); 13 Clarification Requests (CL); 00 Forward action requests (FAR)
06 FARs were raised during previous verification (MP 03).

- **Any uncertainties associated with the verification.**

The VCS MR/01/, emissions reduction calculation sheet/03/ along with the supporting documents provided are considered to be in line with all the VCS requirements /B01/. The verification team has detected no further uncertainties or quality restriction.

- **Summary of the verification conclusion**

In Carbon Check 's opinion, the emission reductions reported for the "Recipe for Change Grouped Project" in the monitoring report/01/are fairly and correctly stated. Carbon Check is therefore able to certify that the emission reductions from the "Recipe for Change Grouped Project" during the period from 01-May-2023 to 31-July-2024, amount to 434,924 tCO_{2e} for this monitoring period. After adjusting

the over issued ERs 31,622 tCO_{2e} during MP 1, MP 2 and MP3, resulting total 403,302 tCO_{2e} emission reduction equivalent.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	8
1.1	Objective	8
1.2	Level of Assurance	10
1.3	Summary Description of the Project	10
2	VERIFICATION PROCESS.....	11
2.1	Method and Criteria	11
2.2	Document Review.....	11
2.3	Interviews	12
2.4	Site Visits	17
2.5	Resolution of Findings.....	17
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities.....	25
3	VALIDATION FINDINGS.....	27
3.1	Methodology Deviations	27
3.2	Project Description Deviations	28
3.3	New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects.....	28
3.4	Baseline Reassessment.....	28
4	VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	29
4.1	Project Details	29
4.2	Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement	31
4.3	Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations.....	41
4.4	Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals.....	72
4.5	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis	73
5	VERIFICATION OPINION.....	74
5.1	Verification Summary	74
5.2	Verification Conclusion.....	76
5.3	Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparison.....	78
	APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS.....	79
	APPENDIX 2: REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	81
	APPENDIX 3 : CERTIFICATE OF COMPETANCE	84

APPENDIX 4 : FINDING LOGS.....	90
---------------------------------------	-----------

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. has been contracted by Wonderbag UK Limited, the Project Proponent (PP)/28/ on 13-August-2025, to undertake the verification of the project titled “Recipe for Change Grouped Project” for the fourth monitoring period 01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025 (including both days). Through the verification activities, it is to be confirmed that:

- The project is implemented as described in the VCS Project Description document /04/;
- The monitoring system is implemented and fully functional to generate emission reductions without any double counting, and;
- The data reported are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent, and free of material error or omission by checking the monitoring records and the emissions reductions calculation.

The verification followed the requirements of the current version of the VCS Standard (Version 4.7) and VCS Program Guide (version 4.5)/B01/ to ensure the quality and consistency of the verification work and the report.

Scope and criteria of the verification

The verification of this project is based on the Monitoring Report of this monitoring period /01/, registered VCS PD /04/, Emission reduction calculation spreadsheets /03/, supporting documents made available to the verifier and information collected through performing on-site interviews. Furthermore, publicly available information was considered as far as available and required.

Carbon check has employed a risk-based approach in the verification, focusing on the identification of significant risks and reliability of project monitoring and generation of emission reductions.

The verification is carried out on basis of the following requirements, applicable for this project activity:

- VCS Standard (v4.7, dated 16-April-2024) /B01/.
- VCS Program Guide (v4.5, dated 29-August-2023) /B01/.
- VCS Validation and Verification Manual version (v3.2, dated 19-October-2016).
- Registration & Issuance Process (v4.4, dated 31-August-2023).
- VCS Program Definitions version (v4.4, dated 29-August-2023).
- AMS II C – “Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies” (Version 15.0) and AMS-II.G. “Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass” (Version 11.1).
- Other relevant rules, including the host country legislation.

The scope of this verification, by independent checking of objective evidence, is as follows:

- To verify that the project is implemented as described in the registered VCS PD/04/.
- To assess the project’s compliance with other relevant rules including the host country legislation.
- To confirm that the monitoring system is implemented and fully functional to generate voluntary emission reductions without any double counting.
- To establish that the data reported are accurate, complete, consistent, transparent, and free of material error or omission by checking the monitoring records and the emissions reduction calculation.
- To evaluate the GHG emission reduction data and express a conclusion with a reasonable level of assurance about whether the reported GHG emission reduction data is free from material misstatement.
- To verify that reported GHG emission data is sufficiently supported by evidence.
- The verification shall ensure that the reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in order to be certified.

The method and criteria used for verification consisted of the following phases:

1. Completeness check and desk review;
2. On-site interviews with stakeholders;
3. Resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of final verification report and applicable VCS verification deed of representation.

Carbon check conducts all its work under strict rules to safeguard impartiality and ensure the independence of the verification team. The verification team does not provide any consulting or recommendations for the client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the monitoring activities.

1.2 Level of Assurance

The verification report is based on the Monitoring report/01/, registered VCS PD/04/, supporting documents, made available to the verifier and information collected through performing on-site interviews.

The verification has been planned and organised to achieve:

☒ Reasonable level of assurance as per VCS Standard (v4.7).

☐ Limited level of assurance.

The threshold for quantitative materiality with respect to the aggregate of errors, omissions, and misrepresentations, relative to the total reported GHG emission reductions and/or removals was limited to five percent, as required by section 4.1.10 (4) of the VCS Standard version 4.7/B01/.

1.3 Summary Description of the Project

The project “Recipe for Change Grouped Project” is a grouped project, which employs the CDM methodologies; AMS II C “Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies” (Version 15.0) and AMS-II.G. “Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass” (Version 11.1) /B02/. The grouped project involves distribution of heat retention cooking device in kitchens throughout Republic of South Africa. This grouped project comprises of nineteen project activity instances (RFC PA) and each project activity instance that contain a maximum of 20,000 bags each. As per monitoring report/01/, there are 355,930 Wonderbag active in the field in this monitoring period, all of these Wonderbag were distributed in previous monitoring periods, meaning that no new Wonderbag are included in this fourth monitoring period. The project reduces amount of fossil fuels, electricity and non-renewable biomass used for cooking. The start date for the grouped project and first project activity instance (RFC PA 1) is 15 March 2019, the start of Wonderbag distribution and the beginning of emission reductions.

The project proponent for the project activity is Wonderbag UK Limited owns the rights to VERs.

The total GHG emission reductions achieved from the nineteen small-scale Project activity instances are 434,924 tCO_{2e} for this monitoring period. After adjusting the over issued ERs 31,622 tCO_{2e} during MP 1, MP 2 and MP3, resulting total 403,302 tCO_{2e} emission reduction I current monitoring for this monitoring period.

The project activity has been implemented as described in the registered VCS PD/04/ and the emission reductions are calculated conservatively as per the applied methodologies/B02/.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

2.1 Method and Criteria

The method and criteria used for verification:

The verification consists of the following three phases:

1. Completeness check and desk review of the registered VCS PD, validation report/04/, monitoring plan, monitoring report, monitoring methodology, applicable tools in particular attention to the frequency of measurements, quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, QA/QC procedures and other relevant documents;

2. On-site interviews (including follow-up interviews with project stakeholders, when deemed necessary). The on-site interviews include the following:

- An assignment of implementation and operation of project activity with respect to validated VCS PD/04/.
- Review of information flows for generating, aggregating, and reporting the monitoring parameters.
- Interview with relevant personnel to determine whether the operational and data collection procedures are implemented and in accordance with the monitoring plan of the validated VCS PD/04/.
- Cross check of information and data provided in the monitoring report with purchase records or similar data sources.
- Review of assumptions made in calculating the emission reductions (if any);
- Implementation of QA/QC procedure in-line with the registered VCS PD/04/ and methodology requirements/B02/.

3. Resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the Final Verification Report and as applicable the VCS verification deed of representation.

2.2 Document Review

During the document review, Carbon Check has applied standard auditing techniques to assess the quality of information provided. The verification was performed primarily based on the review of the monitoring report/01/ and the supporting documentation. This process included:

- A review of data and information presented by the PP to verify their completeness.
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements and the QA/QC procedures and;
- An evaluation of data management and the QA/QC system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of ERs.

The monitoring report dated 15-April-2026/01/ was initially reviewed and Carbon Check requested the PP to present the supporting information and documents in Appendix 3. The documents were reviewed by Carbon Check.

The list of documents referred during the course of this verification has been provided in Appendix 3.

2.3 Interviews

The table below describes the on-site interview process and further identifies personnel, including their roles, who were interviewed and/or provided information additional to that provided in the project description, monitoring report /01/ and any supporting documents.

Sr. no	Date	Name	Organisation	Topic	Persons Interviewed
/01/	05-November-2025	Sarah Collins	Wonderbag UK Limited	• Project Design • Project Implementation status • Project start date and Project Location	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/02/	05-November-2025	Sharla Andhee	Wonderbag UK Limited	• Baseline Scenario • Baseline Identification and Additionality	
/03/	05-November-2025	Nikita Maharaj	Wonderbag UK Limited	• Qualification and Training • Monitoring and reporting documentation • Quality Assurance – Management and operating system • Social and Environmental Impacts • Local Stakeholders meeting process	

Sr. no	Date	Name	Organisation	Topic	Persons Interviewed
				- Compliance with relevant laws - Roles and responsibility	
/04/	05-November-2025	Olivia Tuchten	Promethium Carbon	- Project Design - Project Implementation status - Project start date and Project Location	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/05/	05-November-2025	Kenneth Slabert	Promethium Carbon	- Baseline Scenario - Baseline Identification and Additionality - Qualification and Training - Monitoring and reporting documentation - Quality Assurance – Management and operating system - Social and Environmental Impacts - Local Stakeholders meeting process - Compliance with relevant laws - Roles and responsibility	
/06/	05-November-2025	Godfrey Dlulane	Ayango	KPT Test	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/07/	05-November-2025	Martin Gowdshhidt	Wonderbag UK Limited	Monitoring Survey, Wonderbag distribution	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale

Sr. no	Date	Name	Organisation	Topic	Persons Interviewed
/08/	05-November-2025	Zamile Tnwala	Wonderbag UK Limited	Pilot Test	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/09/	05-November-2025	Zodwa	Wonderbag UK Limited	Pilot Test	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/10/	05-November-2025	Hlezipho Mhlenyama Wonderbag 1 ID: SAC 3334319 Wonderbag 2 ID: SAC 3950198	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/11/	05-November-2025	Ziningi Milliecent Zulu Wonderbag ID: SAC 3352821	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/12/	05-November-2025	Bongekile Nqoko Wonderbag 1 ID: SAC 3337105 Wonderbag 2 ID: SAC 3949979	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale

Sr. no	Date	Name	Organisation	Topic	Persons Interviewed
/13/	05-November-2025	Londiwe Xulu Wonderbag 1 ID: SAC 3874993 Wonderbag 2 ID: SAC 3371748	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/14/	05-November-2025	ZANDILE NXUMALO Wonderbag ID: SAC 3204903	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/15/	06-November-2025	Elizabeth Pillay Wonderbag ID: SAC 3692225	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/16/	06-November-2025	Them bani Ncanana Wonderbag ID: SAC3295120	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale

Sr. no	Date	Name	Organisation	Topic	Persons Interviewed
/17/	06-November-2025	Thembane Ncanyana Wonderbag ID: SAC3295120	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/18/	07-November-2025	Olivia Nkhoma Wonderbag ID: SAC 3819288	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/19/	07-November-2025	Annatoria Shwayimba Wonderbag ID: SAC3644928	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale
/20/	07-November-2025	Sibusisiwe Zulu Wonderbag ID: SAC 3328031	End user	Onsite interviews (Ex-post parameters) - To check Number of project devices operating during year y (Ny,j,j) - Monitoring parameters	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale

Sr. no	Date	Name	Organisation	Topic	Persons Interviewed
/21/	07-November-2025	Mbali Dube	Local supervisor (Wonder woman)	- Wonderbag distribution - Grievance redressal mechanism - Replacement policies	Pankaj Kumar, Nisha Jha, Aluwani Balebale

2.4 Site Visits

Carbon Check has conducted an on-site inspection from 05-November-2025 to 07-November-2025. In line with paragraph 26 of the Sampling Standard, the verification team has applied acceptance sampling approach through on-site interviews on the Wonderbag habit survey as part of verification. The project participant had applied sampling approach. A representative Monitoring survey/05/ was conducted by the representatives of Project participant. The verification team has chosen acceptance sampling in accordance with paragraph 28 of the sampling standard /B04/.

Applying paragraph 39 of the sampling standard, version 09.0/B04/, a sample size of 11 households was chosen. A sample size of 11 was determined, based on an AQL of 1.0% and UQL of 20%, producer risk 10% and consumer risk 10%. Acceptance number thus determined for the sample is 0.

The information provided in the User habit survey data/05/, has been cross checked during the on-site interviews conducted. As a part of acceptance sampling, the verification team could confirm the User habit survey data with no discrepant records. Thus, PP's set of records has been accepted in line with § 33 of the sampling standard, version 09/B04/.

The verification team carried out on-site interviews with representatives of PP in order to assess the information included in the project documentation and to gain additional information regarding the compliance of the project with the relevant criteria applicable for the VCS.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

Carbon Check, during this verification, identified issues related to the monitoring, implementation or operation of the VCS project that could impair the capacity of the proposed VCS project to achieve project emission reductions or influence the reporting of emission reductions. Carbon Check has identified, discussed these issues within the Verification report in Appendix 4.

- Clarification requests (CLs): Project reporting lacks transparency and further information is needed to determine if a material discrepancy is present.
- Corrective action requests (CARs): The VVB has identified a material discrepancy or non-conformance that the project proponent must address.

The verification team identified 08 CARs and 13 CLs. And 06 FARs were raised during previous verification (MP 03). All CAR and CLs raised by Carbon Check during this verification have been successfully resolved by the PP. If this was not completed, the ERs cannot be certified and recommended for issuance to the VCS Registry.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

06 Forward Action Request (FAR) is to be raised in last monitoring period. Six FARs were raised during the 3rd verification. The table below outlines the FARs and compliance with the requirements.

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
FAR-01 With reference to finding #1(2) raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2; for all the future verifications, the verifying VVB shall ensure that PP has established the following through surveys: 1. Duration of cooking food on	The User Habit Survey conducted for the current (4th) monitoring period included these questions and are reflected in as follows in the User Habit Survey 4 Analysis Excel, within the respective tabs titled 'Firewood', 'Gas' and 'Electricity': 1. Duration of cooking food on baseline stove before placing it in Wonderbag: column BU 2. How the end-user determines that the food is ready to be transferred into the Wonderbag: column BV 3. If the end-users cook entirely on the baseline stove and use Wonderbag just to keep the food warm throughout the day: column BX The results from the survey questions above are consolidated in the tab titled 'Raw'. The results are incorporated as follows into the ex post ER calculations:	VVB has assessed the User Habit Survey conducted during the current monitoring period (21 July 2025 to 09 September 2025)/05/ and confirms that the Project Proponent (PP) included all three questions referenced in FAR#1(2). A total of 601 users were interviewed, as reported in Section 4.3 of the updated Monitoring Report (MR). The survey results indicate that, on average, food is kept on the stove for about 30 minutes before being transferred to the Wonderbag. The majority of users (91%) reported using the Wonderbag both

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
baseline stove before placing it in Wonderbag. 2. How the end-user determines that the food is ready to be transferred into the Wonderbag. 3. If the end-users cook entirely on the baseline stove and use Wonderbag just to keep the food warm throughout the day.	- Duration of cooking food on baseline stove before placing it in Wonderbag: used to calculate project emissions associated with the project stove, where these project stoves are either electric or LPG. - If the end-users cook entirely on the baseline stove and use Wonderbag just to keep the food warm throughout the day: users who reported that they only use the Wonderbag to keep food warm, i.e. do not use the bags as intended for actual cooking purposes, were recorded as 'non-users'. Accordingly, these inputs reduce the total usage rates.	for continued cooking and keeping food warm, while 8% use it only for keeping food warm and 1% do not use it for warming purposes. Detailed analysis of the survey assessment is provided in Appendix 4 of the FVR.

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
FAR-02 During the next monitoring survey, PP shall demonstrate compliance with monitoring requirements with respect to 'operational hours' set out in §40 of the applied methodology AMS-II.C version 15.	Verra has granted an allowance for FAR-02 (see file titled 'VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025' which is publicly available on the Verra website). This FAR was deferred on the condition that a direct monitoring pilot study be conducted in the current monitoring period. The direct monitoring pilot study was conducted, the results of which can be seen in the file '2025-09-11 Community Kitchen Cooking'. Verra specified various requirements when conducting the direct monitoring pilot study. Accordingly, the below section 3.2.1 of this monitoring report expands on the following Verra requirements, under a subheading titled 'DEVIATIONS APPLIED FOR IN THIS MONITORING PERIOD': • An outline of the data recording method and calibration practices for the selected monitoring method • Data obtained during the pilot survey • Analysis of pilot survey data. In summary of the analysis of pilot survey data: As per FAR-06 below, the data results from the direct measurement pilot survey were compared to the values established through the latest User Habit Survey conducted for the fourth monitoring period. The values established through direct measurement	VVB has assessed the allowance granted by Verra (refer file titled 'VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025')/11/ , the PP conducted a direct monitoring pilot study, as described in Section 3.1 of the Monitoring Report (MR). The PP also performed a controlled cooking demonstration using an electric heater and Wonderbag at the manufacturing facility. The detailed assessment and analysis are provided in Appendix 4 of the FVR.

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
	were found to be higher than the values established in the latest user habit survey. Accordingly, no retroactive application to the emission reduction calculations is required, because it has been demonstrated that no over-issuance of VCU's has occurred with respect to the past or present assumptions used to calculate the emission reductions from the use of Wonderbags in households that use electric project stoves.	
FAR-03 With reference to finding #3(3) raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2, for the next monitoring survey, verifying VVB shall ensure that PP demonstrates compliance with § 18(a) of CDM Survey Sampling Standard, version 8, in case of survey results not meeting the minimum required	Compliance with this FAR has been demonstrated, as indicated in the tab titled 'Analysis', in the User Habit Survey 4 analysis Excel. The minimum precision threshold of 10% has been met for all three fuels surveyed in the 4th monitoring period as follows: - Electricity precision: 7.73% - Gas precision: 8.49% - Wood precision: 4.12% A confidence factor of approximately 1.96 was applied, corresponding to a 95% confidence level. This is consistent with the requirements of the CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of v4, which requires the application of statistically appropriate confidence factors when determining confidence intervals. Furthermore, the use of the normal distribution value ($z \approx 1.96$) is appropriate given the large sample sizes, in line with CDM Guideline: Sampling and	VVB has reviewed the sampling analysis in the 2025-11-24 Wonderbag Database v2/05/ submitted by the Project Participant (PP), including the calculations of mean values, standard deviation, standard error, confidence factor, and precision. VVB confirms that the applied confidence factor (~ 1.96) represents a 95% confidence level and is consistent with the CDM Sampling and Survey Guidelines. VVB also confirms that the achieved precision levels for all monitored parameters (Electricity: 7.73%, Gas: 8.49%, Wood: 4.12%) meet the minimum precision requirement specified in §12 of the CDM Survey & Sampling

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
precision level.	surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of v4.	Standard v9. The sample size of 601 households is considered sufficient to meet the required precision, in line with §18(a) of the CDM Standard v9. Based on this review, the sampling approach and results are considered acceptable. Detailed analysis is provided in Appendix 4 of the FVR.
FAR-04 With reference to finding #1(1) raised by VERRA during PRR round 2, for the next periodic verification, the verifying VVB shall ensure that the grouped project seeks project deviation either through revision of applied methodologies or through the	Verra has granted an allowance for FAR-02 (see file titled 'VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025' which is publicly available on the Verra website) as the revision to VM0050 is underway. No new project activity instances have been included in this monitoring period.	VVB reviewed the updated MR and ER sheet and Verra email /12/ and found that Verra has deferred this FAR for the 4th monitoring period as the revision to VM0050 is underway. From MR and PP responses no new instance are added.

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
use of a new methodology entirely before the next verification of the project. Before the deviation is finalised, the project cannot add any new project instance or new Wonder Bag sales to the database of the existing instances.		
FAR-05 With reference to finding #2(2) raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2, for the next periodic verification, the user habit survey shall be carried to determine different types of stoves used by wonderbag	The determination of stove type, time of use and capacity was added to the user habit survey for the 4th verification. In addition, measurements were conducted for the other fuels. Please refer to tabs titled 'Firewood', 'Gas' and 'Electricity' in the User Habit Survey 4 analysis Excel. The relevant columns in each tab are: • Stove type: BQ • Capacity: BS • Cooking time: BU The results from the tabs above were consolidated in the tab titled 'Raw'. See columns BJ, BL and BN respectively.	VVB has assessed the user habit survey report/05/ and confirms that the Project Participant (PP) included the required survey questions, namely: (i) type of stove normally used (Cell BJ, Raw tab), (ii) stove power rating where electric or gas stove is used (Cell BL, Raw tab), and (iii) average cooking time on the stove before transferring the pot to the Wonderbag (Cell BN, Raw tab).

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
users, their exact capacities and their average time of use. Measurement surveys shall also be carried out for all other fuel types.		
FAR-06 With reference to finding #4 raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2, for the next periodic verification, PP shall monitor the value of operating hours through direct measurement. PP shall compare the value established through direct measurement during the next MP with the value	Verra has granted an allowance for FAR-06 (see file titled ‘VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025’ which is publicly available on the Verra website). This FAR was deferred on the condition that a direct monitoring pilot study be conducted in the current monitoring period. The direct monitoring pilot study was conducted, the results of which can be seen in the file ‘2025-09-11 Community Kitchen Cooking’. Verra specified various requirements when conducting the direct monitoring pilot study. Accordingly, the below section 3.2.1 of this monitoring report expands on the following Verra requirements, under a subheading titled ‘DEVIATIONS APPLIED FOR IN THIS MONITORING PERIOD’: • An outline of the data recording method and calibration practices for the selected monitoring method • Data obtained during the pilot survey	VVB has assessed the allowance granted by Verra (refer to file “VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025”)/11/, the PP conducted a direct monitoring pilot study, as described in Section 3.1 of the Monitoring Report (MR). The PP also carried out a controlled cooking demonstration using an electric heater and Wonderbag at the manufacturing facility/30/. Detailed analysis of this assessment is provided in Appendix 4 of the FVR.

Description of issued FAR	Compliance with FAR	VVB Assessment
established during the current MP. If the value established through direct measurement is found to be lower, PP shall retroactively apply the lower value to the emission reduction calculations of current MP and deduct the overissued VCUs for the current MP from the VCUs determined during the next MP.	Analysis of pilot survey data. In summary of the analysis of pilot survey data: The data results from the direct measurement pilot survey were compared to the values established through the latest User Habit Survey conducted for the fourth monitoring period. The values established through direct measurement were found to be higher than the values established in the latest user habit survey. Accordingly, no retroactive application to the emission reduction calculations is required, because it has been demonstrated that no over-issuance of VCUs has occurred with respect to the past or present assumptions used to calculate the emission reductions from the use of Wonderbags in households that use electric project stoves.	

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

The project activity falls under sectoral scope 03 and the Carbon Check is accredited for validation /verification of project activities under this scope.

Further in line with section 3.24.7 of the VCS Standard, version 4.7/B01/, the “producer(s) or retailer(s) of the impacted good or service are known but not involved in the project or do not have a website”, PP will inform the manufacturers of the project Wonderbag and the implementation partner that the Verified Carbon Units (VCUs) may be issued for the greenhouse gas emission reductions and removals under this grouped project. For these VCUs, the PP will be claiming carbon credits under VERRA. PP will further apprise that the ownership of these credits lies exclusively with Wonderbag UK Limited to avoid any potential risk of double claiming of Scope 3 emissions.

Verification team has been provided the copies of the emails /12-13/ this has been checked and verified by the verification team deemed appropriate and inline with the VCS standard requirements/B01/.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

It has been confirmed through the description in PD /04/ and through interviews that the project activity does not participate in any emission trading program or any other GHG program and has not sought or received any other form of environmental credit. The project has applied only under VCS for registration. The grouped project is not participating under any other GHG programs/26/.

3.1 Methodology Deviations

Two deviations from the requirements of AMS-II.C have been applied in this monitoring period.

VVB has assessed the continuation and application of the two deviations from the 3rd to the 4th monitoring period, namely

- (i) monitoring under constant load conditions and
- (ii) physical verification of power and operating hours,

both in relation to paragraph 20 of AMS-II.C. These deviations were previously addressed through FAR 02 and FAR 06 raised in the 3rd verification report issued on 19 July 2024.

VVB confirms that the Project Proponent has responded to these FARs in line with the Verra exemption letter dated 2 June 2025/12/, which granted additional time to demonstrate best efforts toward full compliance. VVB has reviewed the evidence provided on the evaluation of alternative monitoring approaches, the selection of direct measurement using runtime meters, and the justification for the feasibility and accuracy of this approach.

VVB has further assessed the design and implementation of the pilot direct monitoring campaign conducted at a community kitchen in Durban, KwaZulu-Natal/07/. The controlled setting, use of newly procured electric stoves and runtime meters, clearly defined participant selection criteria, and representative meal types provide a reasonable and credible basis for direct measurement of operating hours. The sample size and data collection over multiple days are considered adequate, and the calculated precision of 8.5% meets the applicable statistical requirements.

VVB has reviewed the comparison between operating hours derived from direct measurement and those obtained through the user habit survey for the 4th monitoring period. The analysis demonstrates that the values applied in the emission reduction calculations do not result in over-issuance of VCUs. Accordingly, no retroactive adjustment to past emission reductions is required, in line with the requirements of FAR 06.

VVB also confirms that the assumptions applied in the emission reduction calculations remain conservative. The continued use of a 1.5 kW stove plate rating, despite survey evidence indicating higher average power ratings, results in lower baseline emissions. In addition, the higher operating hours applied in the project scenario increase project emissions. The combined effect of these assumptions leads to a material reduction in net emission reductions and therefore ensures conservative quantification.

Based on the above assessment, VVB concludes that the deviations have been adequately justified and conservatively applied for the 4th monitoring period, and that the responses to FAR 02 and FAR 06 are acceptable in accordance with the applicable methodology and Verra guidance.

3.2 Project Description Deviations

There is no project description deviation identified during the current monitoring period.

3.3 New Project Activity Instances in Grouped Projects

3.4 Baseline Reassessment

Did the project undergo baseline reassessment during the monitoring period?

☐ Yes

☒ No

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1 Project Details

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion:				
Audit history	Audit type	Period	Program	Validation/verification body name	Number of years
	Validation and verification	1 st verification: 15-March-2019 – 31-March-2021	VCS	Carbon Check	2.0
	Verification	2 nd verification: 01-April-2021 – 30-April-2022	VCS	TÜV SÜD South Asia Private Limited	1.1
	Verification	3 rd verification: 01-May-2022 – 30-April-2023	VCS	Carbon Check	1.0
	Verification	4 th verification: 01-May-2023 – 31-July-2025	VCS	Carbon Check	2
Double counting and participation under other GHG programs	The monitoring system is implemented and fully functional to generate emission reductions without any double counting. The project is not receiving or seeking credit for GHG emission reductions or removals from the same project activity under any other GHG program. The verification team, through document review /04/ and on-site interviews, confirms that the emission reductions are unique and not claimed elsewhere, in conformance with the requirements of §3.23 of the VCS Standard Version 4.7 /B01/. The Project Proponent has provided all required information confirming that the project is not registered or seeking registration under any other GHG program, apart from its registration with Verra. The Project Proponent has also confirmed that the project has not been rejected by any other GHG program to date/26/.				

	It is noteworthy that the project activity is registered under the Verra Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) with registration number 2384. This registration reflects the project's exclusive association with the VCS Program and ensures that no double issuance or participation under other mechanisms has occurred. The Carbon Check confirms, based on the review of all evidence provided, that there is no risk of double counting or double issuance for the reported GHG emission reductions during the monitoring period 01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025.
No double claiming with emissions trading programs or binding emission limits	The assessment has been conducted in conformance with the requirements under §3.24.3 of the VCS Standard Version 4.7 /B01/ and confirms the absence of any potential double claiming of GHG emission reductions. VVB confirms that this project is not registered or seeking registration in the GCC, GS, or CDM project databases, according to VVB's investigation of: GS registry (https://registry.goldstandard.org/projects?q=&page=1); GCC project database (https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/pages/submitted_projects); and CDM project database (https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/projsearch.html)
No double claiming with other forms of environmental credit	The project activity has not sought, received, nor is it planning to receive credit from another GHG-related environmental credit system. The verification team, through a detailed review of project documentation and on-site interviews with the Project Proponent, confirms that no other forms of environmental credit, such as renewable energy certificates, biodiversity credits, or water benefit credits have been applied for or awarded in relation to the emission reductions generated by this project. This conclusion is made in conformance with §3.24.1 of the VCS Standard Version 4.7 /B01/, ensuring the integrity and uniqueness of the verified GHG emission reductions.
Supply chain (scope 3) emissions double claiming	The GHG emission reductions or removals are not associated with any supply chain emissions, as the project proponent or authorized representative is neither a buyer nor a seller of a product whose emissions footprint is affected by the project activity.

	Therefore, the verification team, by means of document review and on-site interviews, confirms that there is no risk of Scope 3 emission double claiming for this project activity, in conformance with §3.24.7 of VCS Standard Version 4.7 /B01/.
Sustainable development contributions	The project has implemented the activities that result in the Sustainable Development (SD) contributions described in Section 1.12 of the monitoring report. These activities have been assessed and verified through document review and stakeholder consultation, confirming alignment with the declared SD goals.
Additional information relevant to the project	No commercially sensitive information has been excluded from the public versions of the project documents beyond what is permitted under the VCS Program.

4.2 Safeguards and Stakeholder Engagement

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Stakeholder identification	The verification team through review of MR /01/, VCS PD /04/ and interviews with representatives of PP confirm that sufficient mechanism is in place to identify stakeholders and PP has identified relevant stakeholders as described in MR /01/.
Legal or customary tenure/access rights	The project maintains close engagement with local communities to address any concerns related to tenure or access rights. To date, no conflicts have been reported. The VVB deems this acceptable based on desk review and interviews conducted on-site visit.
Stakeholder diversity and changes over time	The project primarily engages indigenous and socio-economically disadvantaged communities. The composition and diversity of stakeholders have remained consistent since validation. The VVB finds this acceptable through document review and on-site stakeholder engagement.
Expected changes in well-being	The anticipated positive impacts on stakeholder well-being, including reduced drudgery and improved safety, are consistent with those

	reported during validation. No negative changes are expected. This conclusion is supported by evidence reviewed by the VVB.
Location of stakeholders	The geographic distribution of stakeholders remains unchanged. Beneficiaries continue to be located within South Africa. The VVB confirms this based on project records and interviews.
Location of resources	The project does not interfere with stakeholders' land or resource access, which remains consistent with previous assessments. The VVB accepts this based on desk review and stakeholder consultation.

4.2.2 Stakeholder Consultation and Ongoing Communication

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Ongoing consultation	On the basis of reviewing the registered VCD PD & validation report /04/, MR /01/, local stakeholder consultation supportive document /10/, ongoing communication report /10/, and interviews with the PP and stakeholders during the audit, it confirms that the project has a stepwise mechanism for ongoing communication. Wonderbag engages with stakeholders through electronic and social media. Wonderbag has recently launched a customer engagement app called MyWonderbag. The details of ongoing communication activity are mentioned in MR /01/. The verification team reviewed and verified those during onsite interview and crosschecked with registered VCS PD /04/ & MR /01/ and confirms the procedure and method for engagement.
Date(s) of stakeholder consultation	01-December-2024 (Latest stakeholder date)
Communication of monitored results	The monitored results have been properly documented in the monitoring report /01/ and were crosschecked by interviewing during onsite audit.
Consultation records	The verification team confirmed the method for documenting the outcomes of local stakeholders' ongoing consultation and account of all inputs received through reviewing of monitoring reports /01/, consultation records /10/ & onsite interview.

Stakeholder input	VVB confirms that no changes to the project design have been made owing to the positive reception of the project as confirmed during the on-site audit.
-------------------	---

4.2.3 Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Consent	The VVB reviewed stakeholder meeting records and the Wonderbag beneficiary agreement. During the stakeholder meetings, the benefits and safe use of the Wonderbag were explained and demonstrated. The process allowed stakeholders to raise concerns or questions in an open format. Consent was obtained voluntarily at the time of Wonderbag distribution, with beneficiaries signing a license agreement/18/ after receiving a detailed verbal explanation of the terms. The VVB concludes that the project has obtained free, prior, and informed consent in conformance with VCS Program FPIC requirements.
Outcome of FPIC discussion	Based on a review of pre-baseline survey data, stakeholder consultation minutes, and community feedback, all beneficiaries provided consent to participate in the project and accept the license agreement terms. No grievances, forced displacement, or encroachment on land were recorded. The VVB confirms that the process and outcomes of FPIC discussions are compliant and that project activities have been implemented with full and informed community participation.

4.2.4 Grievance Redress Procedure

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Grievance received and steps taken to resolve the grievance including the outcomes of the resolution	No grievances recorded in this monitoring period.

Grievance redress procedure

The VVB reviewed the grievance redress mechanism including community access via local representatives and a dedicated phone number. The process is found to be accessible, responsive, and in conformance with the VCS Program requirements. The verification team confirm the same concludes that the grievance procedure is appropriate

4.2.5 Public Comments

Comments received	Actions taken by the project proponent
No comments were received as part of the stakeholder consultation or outside of the public comment period.	No actions were taken as no public comments were received.
Date: 21- October- 2023 Engagement: CCFM Women's Conference Comment: Wonderbag' reduce cooking time and fuel cost but additional recipes would be nice	Wonderbag has added additional recipes to the MyWonderbag app and included them as printed inserts for future distributions. The recipes were additionally translated into Zulu and Afrikaans
Date: 14- May- 2023 Engagement: Durban North Coast Community Engagement Comment: Difficulty in completing app registration due to limited data coverage	Wonderbag has increased functionality to incorporate manual registration and USSD functionality which is then later uploaded to the MyWonderbag app.
Date: 06- January- 2024 Engagement: Red Cross Midlands Distribution Comment: The bags should be provided for free without the R50 co-payment	Wonderbag provided additional materials to community leaders explaining the carbon project and the policy requiring the typical minimal R50 payment.
Date: 13- June- 2024 Engagement: MyWonderbag App feedback portal Comments: Numerous users provided feedback that the Wonderbag resulted in energy savings and improved food quality.	Wonderbag responded to each response and selected several for testimonials to use in social media.
Date: 04- July- 2025 Engagement: Cape Flats Community Leaders	Wonderbag recorded the feedback and featured the feedback as a community case study.

Comment: The Wonderbag reduces paraffin use and improves child safety.	
Date: 17- July- 2025 Engagement: WhatsApp Feedback Comment: Inner liners are difficult to replace due to the remote location of the households.	Wonderbag provided replacement liners and shipped them using a logistics partner.

4.2.6 Risks to Local Stakeholders and the Environment

4.2.6.1 Management Experience

The verification team assessed the management capacity of the Project Proponent and its implementation partners through a review of project documentation, organizational charts, training materials, and interviews conducted with senior management and field-level coordinators.

Roles and responsibilities for the monitoring, recording, and reporting of parameters related to GHG emission reductions were found to be clearly defined and consistently applied throughout the monitoring period. The Project Proponent has implemented an effective management structure that ensures oversight of field operations, quality control, and data integrity in line with the registered monitoring plan and VCS Program requirements.

Interviews with key personnel confirmed that staff involved in monitoring activities possess the required technical competencies and receive periodic training aligned with their responsibilities. Structured training programs/19/ have been developed and delivered, particularly for local coordinators and field staff, to strengthen capacity in areas such as data collection protocols, stove usage tracking, and stakeholder engagement.

The team demonstrated strong operational capabilities, especially in community mobilization, beneficiary coordination, and logistical execution. The Project Proponent retains overall managerial control and provides strategic direction, risk management, and performance oversight.

Based on the evidence reviewed and interviews conducted, the verification team concludes that the project's management system is robust, well-organized, and effectively supports the successful implementation and continuous monitoring of the project activity. The demonstrated managerial experience and operational structure are fully consistent with the requirements of the applied methodology and the VCS Program.

4.2.6.2 Risk Assessment

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Natural and human induced risks to stakeholders' wellbeing	Based on monitoring reports, stakeholder feedback, and field data, the project poses no such risks. The Wonderbag enhances household health by reducing indoor air pollution and burn injuries because the Wonderbag is a passive heat-retention device. Cooking is initiated on a conventional stove, after which the heated pot is sealed in the insulated bag and no additional energy source is required. The VVB concludes that no risk has been identified and project design is acceptable.
Risks to stakeholder participation	The VVB reviewed engagement strategies, field records, and conducted interviews. Ongoing community support, regular Wonderbag checks, and responsive technical assistance effectively manage this risk. The VVB finds mitigation measures appropriate.
Working conditions	Interviews and field documentation confirmed that the project does not alter traditional work practices. It enhances safety and indoor conditions. No risks identified.
Safety of women and girls	Stakeholder feedback and baseline data confirm the project improves safety for women and girls by reducing exposure to hazardous fuel collection and indoor smoke. The VVB finds no risk and acknowledges positive gender-related outcomes.
Safety of minority and marginalized groups, including children	The VVB verified that project activities reduce risks from baseline conditions, based on review of stakeholder meeting minutes and the monitoring report, the VVB concludes that the residual risk is low and mitigation measures are effective.
Pollutants (air, noise, discharges to water, generation and release of hazardous materials and chemical pesticides and fertilizers)	This is validated through performance evaluations and stakeholder interviews. The VVB concludes that no such risks exist under the project activity.

4.2.7 Respect for Human Rights and Equity

4.2.7.1 Labor and Work

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Discrimination	Staff training materials and grievance protocols were reviewed. Interviews with PP and employees confirmed awareness of anti-discrimination policies. No incidents were reported. The VVB concludes that the risk is minimal and effectively managed.
Sexual harassment	The VVB interviewed the PP and employee and found that PP is there is no grievance regarding sexual harassment and PP has Wonderbag's grievance policy to record such cases.
Gender equity in labor and work	The VVB reviewed project hiring records, HR policy/14/, and interviewed staff. The project emphasizes inclusive hiring practices, with a focus on improving female participation in the workforce, which is traditionally low in the region. Equal pay for equal work is practiced and verified through payroll records. The VVB finds that gender equity risks have been addressed and no concerns were identified during the monitoring period.
Forced labor	The VVB assessed recruitment and contract review/18/ and confirmed all labor is voluntary. Training emphasizes prohibition of forced labor. No violations were noted. Risk is appropriately mitigated.
Child labor	The VVB confirmed that the project enforces a strict minimum age requirement (18+), validated through identity verification and employment records and on-site interviews with representatives of PP ad employees. There have been no instances of underage employment during OSV. The VVB confirms no risk has been identified.
Human trafficking	Staff background checks and training materials were reviewed. Policies regarding human trafficking/14/ are clearly communicated to all project staff. No indicators or allegations of human trafficking have been identified during the monitoring period. The VVB concludes that this risk is adequately mitigated, and no risk has been observed.

4.2.7.2 Human Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
------------------	--

No risk identified	The VVB has reviewed the monitoring report and project documentation. The project distributes Wonderbag to households on a voluntary and non-discriminatory basis, with priority given to low-income communities. No human rights risks, grievances, land issues, or rights violations were identified. The project complies with applicable human rights laws and regulations in South Africa. The VVB finds the no risk during on site audit.
--------------------	---

4.2.7.3 Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
No risks identified	The VVB has reviewed the monitoring report/01/ and project implementation information. The project involves only household-level distribution and use of portable heat-retention cookers and does not include land acquisition, construction, or activities affecting Indigenous Peoples, local communities, or customary rights. No impacts on cultural heritage were identified during the monitoring period. Stakeholder engagement and grievance mechanisms remain in place. The VVB confirms the same during onsite audit.

4.2.7.4 Property Rights

Risks identified	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
No risks identified	The project activity involves distribution of Wonderbags, and it does not require acquisition of property. The VVB assessed land use, stakeholder interviews, and project documentation and interviews with end-users. No encroachment, relocation, or interference with legal or customary tenure or property rights was identified. The VVB confirms full respect of property rights throughout the project period. No risks were observed or reported.

4.2.7.5 Benefit Sharing

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
------	--

Summary of the benefit sharing plan	The project activity involves distribution of Wonderbag to households and therefore does not impact property rights, usage, or resources. Hence not applicable.
Benefit sharing during the monitoring period	N/A

4.2.8 Ecosystem Health

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems	The VVB reviewed project documents/04/, monitoring data, and stakeholder feedback. The Wonderbag reduces fuel (wood, LPG and electricity) use, thereby lowering deforestation, energy consumption and positively impacting biodiversity. No risks identified.
Soil degradation and soil erosion	Reduced firewood demand contributes to less forest degradation, preserving soil cover and preventing erosion. Field reports support this outcome. Not applicable. The use Wonderbag does not impact soil degradation or erosion.
Water consumption and stress	Based on monitoring report/01/ and project description/04/, Wonderbag works on the heat retention. So, not applicable.

4.2.8.1 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered species

Item	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
Species or habitat	Based on project location data, the VVB confirms the project is not located in or near habitats of rare, threatened, or endangered species. No risk identified. The Wonderbag are distributed into households directly where the dwelling is already established. This has been checked by the verification team during the onsite audit.
Areas needed for habitat connectivity	As per the reasons stated above, the project activity does not adversely impact areas needed for habitat connectivity during the monitoring period. No risk identified.

...	...
-----	-----

Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion	
Habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered species	N/A*
Areas for habitat connectivity	N/A*

*N/A - Not applicable

4.2.8.2 Introduction of Species

Not Applicable as this project involves distribution of fuel-efficient ICS to households. Therefore, it does not involve any planting or introduction of any new species.

Species introduced	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
N/A*	N/A*

*N/A - Not applicable

Existing invasive species	Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion
NA*	N/A *

*N/A - Not applicable

Evidence gathering activities, evidence checked, and assessment conclusion	
Invasive species	N/A

*N/A - Not applicable

4.2.8.3 Ecosystem conversion

Item	Evidence gathering activities and evidence checked
------	--

Ecosystem conversion

Not applicable as the project does not affect existing ecosystems

4.3 Accuracy of Reduction and Removal Calculations

The equations and choices provided in the two methodologies and all other methodological tools are correctly quoted in the MR/01/. The emission reductions of the project instances of the grouped project and project activity instance are calculated using the formulae mentioned in the applied methodologies; AMS-II.C (version 15) and AMS-II. G (version 11.1)/B02/. The verification team has reviewed the ex-post emission reduction spread sheet/03/ and checked all the formulae and found they are correct and are in accordance with the monitoring plan of the PD/04/ and the applied monitoring methodology.

According to applied methodology AMS-II.C (version 15)/B02-a/ the baseline, project and leakage emissions are calculated as below.

Baseline Emissions

The baseline emissions from electricity-based cooking systems are calculated as follows:

$$BE_y = E_{BL,y} \times EF_{CO2,ELEC,y} + Q_{ref,BL} \times GWP_{ref,BL} \quad (\text{Equation 1, AMS-II.C.})$$

This equation is modified as follows to distinguish between the use of electricity or fossil fuels in the baseline:

$$BE_{ELEC,y} = E_{BL,y} \times EF_{CO2,ELEC,y} + Q_{ref,BL} \times GWP_{ref,BL} \quad (\text{Equation 1, AMS-II.C., modified for electricity baseline})$$

Where:

$BE_{ELEC,y}$ = Baseline emissions from electricity consumption in year y (tCO₂e/y)

$E_{BL,y}$ = Energy consumption for the baseline in year y (kWh)

$EF_{CO2,ELEC,y}$ = Electricity emission factor. If electricity displaced is grid, the emission factor in year y shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions in VT0011, version 1.0. If electricity displaced is captive electricity, the emission factor in year y shall be calculated in accordance with the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emission from electricity consumption”

$E_{BL,y}$ is calculated as follows:

$$E_{BL,y} = \sum_i (n_i \times \rho_i \times o_{i,BL} / (1 - l_y)) \quad (\text{Equation 2 AMS-II.C.})$$

Where:

n_i = Number of pieces of equipment of the group i baseline equipment retrofitted or that would have been retrofitted

ρ_i = Electrical power demand (kW) of the group i baseline equipment.

In the case of a retrofit activity, electrical power demand is the weighted average of the rated power (kW) of group i baseline equipment. The baseline equipment for this grouped project consists of different electrical stoves. The power ratings of these electrical stoves can be fixed ex ante.

$O_{i,BL}$ = Average annual operating hours of the group of i baseline equipment.

The operating hours of the baseline equipment in year y can be determined using surveys by measurement of usage hours of baseline equipment. For a large population of baseline equipment: (a) Use a representative sample (sampling determined by a minimum 95% confidence interval and 10% maximum error margin); and (c) Ensure that sampling is statistically robust and relevant, i.e., the selection of the equipment to be analysed for operating hours has a random distribution and is representative of target population (size, location).

L_y = Average annual technical grid losses (transmission and distribution) during year y for the grid serving the locations where the devices are installed, expressed as a fraction. This value shall not include non-technical losses such as commercial losses (e.g., theft). The average annual technical grid losses shall be determined using recent, accurate and reliable data available for the host country. This value can be determined from recent data published either by a national utility or an official governmental body. The reliability of the data used (e.g., appropriateness, accuracy/uncertainty, especially exclusion of non-technical grid loss) shall be established and documented by the project participant. A default value of 0.1 shall be used for average annual technical grid losses, if no recent data are available or the data cannot be regarded accurate and reliable.

The number of Wonderbags in use (n_i) can be calculated as follows:

$$n_i = N_w \times (u_w - f_{rate,w}) \times u_{ELEC,w} \times t_w$$

Where:

N_w	= The number of Wonderbags of type w distributed
u_w	= Share of users actually cooking with a Wonderbag of type w (%)
$u_{ELEC,w}$	= Share of users cooking on an electric stove with a Wonderbag of type w (%)
$f_{rate,w}$	= Failure rate of the Wonderbags (%)
t_w	= Active time in the monitoring period for the full population of Wonderbags type w (%)

The baseline energy consumption can be calculated as follows:

$$E_{BL,FOSSIL,i,y} = FC_i \times NCV_{FOSSIL FUEL i}$$

Where:

FC_i	= Baseline consumption of fossil fuel i (unit of consumption/year)
$NCV_{FOSSIL FUEL i}$	= Net calorific value of fossil fuel i (TJ/unit of consumption)

Calculation for baseline Emission reductions for project activity instances as below;

$$BE_y = BE_{ELEC,y} + BE_{FOSSIL,y}$$

Hence BEy from AMS-II.C are calculated as 222,991 tCO₂e.

Project Emissions

The project emissions from fossil fuel consumption in cooking systems can be calculated as follows in accordance with AMS-II.C.:

$$PE_y = E_{PJ,y} \times EF_{CO2,y} + PE_{ref,y}$$

(Equation 7, AMS-II.C.)

Where:

PE_y	= Project emissions in year y (tCO ₂ e)
$E_{PJ,y}$	= Energy consumption for the project activity in year y (kWh)

- $EF_{CO2,y}$ = Electricity emission factor. If electricity displaced is grid, the emission factor in year y shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions in VT0011, version 1.0. If electricity displaced is captive electricity, the emission factor in year y shall be calculated in accordance with the “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emission from electricity consumption”
- $PE_{ref,y}$ = Project emissions from physical leakage of physical refrigerant from the project equipment in year y (tCO₂e/y)

The equation above is modified for fossil fuel consumption as follows:

$$PE_{FOSSIL,y} = E_{PJ,FOSSIL,i,y} \times EF_{CO2,i,y} \times n_i$$

(Equation 7, AMS-IL.C., modified for fossil fuel consumption)

Where:

- $E_{PJ,FOSSIL,i,y}$ = Project activity energy consumption of fossil fuel i in year y (TJ)
- $EF_{CO2,i,y}$ = Emission factor for fossil fuel i in year y (tCO₂/TJ)
- n_i = Number of pieces of equipment of the group i baseline equipment retrofitted or that would have been retrofitted

The number of Wonderbags in use (n_i) can be calculated as follows:

$$n_i = N_w \times u_w \times u_{FOSSIL,i,w} \times (1 - f_{rate,w}) * t_w$$

Where:

- N_w = The number of Wonderbags of type w distributed
- u_w = Share of users actually cooking with a Wonderbag of type w (%)
- $u_{FOSSIL,i,w}$ = Share of users cooking using fossil fuel i with a Wonderbag of type w(%)
- $f_{rate,w}$ = Failure rate of the Wonderbags (%)
- t_w = Active time in the monitoring period for the full population of Wonderbags type w (%)

The project activity energy consumption can be calculated as follows:

$$E_{PJ,FOSSIL,i,y} = FC_{PJ,i} \times NCV_{FOSSIL FUEL i}$$

Where:

$FC_{PJ,i}$ = Project activity consumption of fossil fuel i (unit of consumption/year)

$NCV_{FOSSIL\ FUEL\ i}$ = Net calorific value of fossil fuel i (TJ/unit of consumption)

Accordingly, PEy from application of AMS-II.C are calculated as 65,526 tCO_{2e}.

Leakage emissions

Leakage is considered only under AMS-II. G, i.e. not under AMS-II.C. Leakage has therefore been taken into account in the calculation of emission reductions from reducing consumption of non-renewable biomass.

Accordingly, paragraph 39 of AMS-II.G, the discount factor of 0.95 is applied directly in the calculation of emission reduction.

According to applied methodology AMS-II. G (version 11.1)/B02-b/ the emission reductions are calculated as:

The biomass emission reductions were calculated as follows:

$$ER_{y,i,j} = B_{y,savings,i,j} \times 0.95 \times N_{y,i,j} \times \mu_y \times f_{NRB,y} \times NCV_{biomass} \times EF_{projected_fossil_fuel}$$

Where:

$ER_{y,i,j}$ = Emission reductions by project device type i and batch j during year y in tCO_{2e}

$B_{y,savings,i,j}$ = Quantity of woody biomass that is saved in tonnes per cookstove device type i and batch j during year y

$N_{y,i,j}$ = Number of project devices of type i and batch j operating during year y

μ_y	= Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y when applying equations 7 and 8 (fraction). Use 1.0 in other cases.
$f_{NRB,y}$	= Fraction of woody biomass that can be established as non-renewable biomass
$NCV_{biomass}$	= Net calorific value of the non-renewable woody biomass that is substituted (IPCC default for wood fuel, 0.0156 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried').

$EF_{projected_fossil_fuel}$ = Emission factor for the fossil fuels projected to be used for substitution of non-renewable woody biomass by similar consumers.

The quantity of woody biomass that is saved due to the project activity is calculated as follows in accordance with option 2 of the AMS-II.G. methodology:

$$B_{y,savings,i,j} = B_{old,i,j} - B_{new,KPT,i,j}$$

Where:

$B_{old,i,j}$	Annual quantity of woody biomass that would have been used in the absence of the project activity to generate useful thermal energy equivalent to that provided by the project device type i and batch j
$B_{new,KPT,i,j}$	Annual quantity of woody biomass used in tonnes per project device of type i and batch j , measured as per the Kitchen Performance Test (KPT) protocol. The KPT shall be carried out in accordance with national standards (if available) or international standards or guidelines. (e.g., the KPT Protocol listed by Clean Cooking Alliance)

Leakage Emissions:

No leakage emissions have been identified for the project activity as the introduction of the Wonderbag does not replace the baseline stoves. So, the leakage emissions considered 0 tCO₂e.

Summary of net GHG emission reductions or removals:

Emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y$$

Where:

ER_y = Emission reductions in year y (tCO₂e/yr)

BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO₂/yr)

PE_y = Project emissions in year y (tCO₂e/yr)

The total emission reductions calculated for this monitoring period 01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025 are 442,565 tCO₂e.

Emission reductions have been calculated in accordance with the applied methodology AMS II C “Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies” (Version 15.0) and AMS-II.G. “Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass” (Version 11.1) /B02/, and VCS PD/04/. The PP has used monitored data and ex-ante fixed data including default values as mandated/permitted by the applied methodology. The values used for calculation of GHG emission reductions have been thoroughly checked by the verification team and are found appropriate.

Parameters Determined ex-ante:

The following parameters are determined ex-ante and mentioned in section 5.1 of the VCS PD/04/

Table 4 : Ex-ante parameters specific to AMS-II.C.

Parameter	Unit	Value	Assessment
EF _{CO2,ELEC,y}	tCO ₂ /MWh	0.9619	The value is sourced from VT0011, version 1.0.
EF _{CO2,i,y}	kgCO ₂ /TJ	Paraffin: 71,900 kgCO ₂ /TJ LPG: 63,100 kgCO ₂ /TJ Coal: 96,100 kgCO ₂ /TJ.	Default values from the 2006 IPCC Guidelines have been used in accordance with paragraph 32 of AMS-II.C.

$NCV_{FOSSIL\ FUEL\ i}$	TJ/Unit of measurement	Paraffin: 0.000038 TJ/litre LPG: 0.000046 TJ/kg Coal: 0.024300 TJ/tonne		South African specific values were obtained from the South African Technical Guidelines. These values provide a more accurate indication of the NCV of fuels used in South Africa.
FC_i	Unit consumption of	Fossil Fuel i	Baseline consumption	The baseline consumption is used in accordance with paragraph 32 of AMS-II.C. The values are based on surveys conducted in accordance with the CDM sampling guidance.
		Paraffin	224.6 litres/year/adult equivalent	
		LPG	39.1 kg/year/adult equivalent	
		Coal	1.3 tonnes/year/adult equivalent	
ρ_i	kW	1.5		The baseline consumption is used in accordance with AMS-II.C. The values are based upon the specifications of an electric stove.
$O_{i,BL}$	Hours/adult equivalent	60		The baseline cooking time is used in accordance with AMS-II.C. The values are based on surveys conducted in accordance with the CDM sampling guidance.

Table 05 : Ex-ante parameters specific to AMS II.G.

Parameter	Unit	Value	Assessment
$f_{NRB,y}$	Fraction	0.71	The data is sourced from official statistics.

MAI _{forest,l} , MAI _{other,l}	t/ha/yr				The source of the mean annual increment of woody biomass growth per hectare of forest areas is the subtropical dry forest value for Africa, as per the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories: Volume 4, Chapter 4_(Table 4.9).
			MAI _{forest,l}	MAI _{other,l}	
		Value	2.2	0	
F _{forest,l} , F _{other,l}	ha				The data is sourced from historical data sets in the Global Forest Watch datasets from Global Land Analysis & Discovery.
			F _{forest,l}	F _{other,l}	
		Value	3,923,142	0	
P _{forest} , P _{other}	ha				The data is sourced from historical data sets in the country profile for South Africa on the Protected Planet website.
			P _{forest}	P _{other}	
		Value	346,160	0	
EF _{projected_fossil_fuel}	tCO2e/TJ	73.2			The default value was selected in accordance with paragraph 25 of AMS-II.G.
μ _y	-	1			Adjustment to account for any continued use of pre-project devices during the year y. AMS-II.G requires the use of a default adjustment factor of 1.0 in project activities that apply any equations in the methodology other than equations 7 and 9.
NCV _{biomass}	TJ/Tonne	0.0156			The default value is sourced from applied methodology AMS-II.G. AMS-II.G allows for the use of a default wood fuel value of 0.0156 TJ/tonne, based on the gross weight of the wood that is 'air-dried'

B _{old,i,j}	Tonnes/year/adult equivalent	1.15	The baseline survey /15/ was conducted in accordance with the CDM sampling guidance and the internationally Recognized Kitchen Performance Test Protocol provided by the Clean Cooking Alliance.
----------------------	------------------------------	------	--

The ex-post ER calculation spread sheet/03/ submitted by the PP clearly and transparently mentions values of the data parameters used for calculation of emission reductions. The input values have been verified from the reliable and authentic sources including monitoring records (distribution records), Monitoring Report/01/, and applied methodology/B02/. The emission reductions calculated were compared with the emission reduction spread sheet /03/ and found to be correct. No significant reporting risks have been identified for the data reported.

The details of monitoring parameters used for calculation of emission reductions are provided below.

Parameters monitored ex-post

Table 06 : Parameters monitored as per AMS-II.C.

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Energy (specifically electricity) consumption for the baseline in year y ($E_{BL,y}$).
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	The values are reported ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA

Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA. QA/QC procedures stated in MR comply with VCS PD/04/.
Company performing the calibration(internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR has been compared with monitoring survey records /05/ and the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Energy (specifically electricity) consumption for the project activity in year y. ($E_{PJ,y}$)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	The values are reported in the ER calculation spreadsheet.

Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbag.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA. QA/QC procedures stated in MR comply with VCS PD /04/.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Number of pieces of equipment of the group i baseline equipment retrofitted or that would have been retrofitted. (ni)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Data sets are recorded on an ongoing basis and aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Data sets are recorded on an ongoing basis and aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	The value is reported in 'the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Company performing the calibration(internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA

Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey/05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Operating hours (i.e., cooking time using a Wonderbag) of group of i project devices (i.e., electrical stoves) in the time interval t in year y (o _i)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	19.89 hours
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	Value obtained from user habit survey /05/
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.

Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /03/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Average annual grid loss of the national South African grid including transmission and distribution. (I_y)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Annual.
Reporting frequency:	Annual.
Reported value:	0.123
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as this value is determined using the Eskom Annual Report, published in 2025. The losses for 2025 as well as previous years can be found on page 141

Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
----------------------------------	------------------------------------

Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Share of users cooking with a Wonderbag in year y (U_w)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	91.18 %
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.

In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA
--	----

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Share of users cooking with electric stoves with a Wonderbag in year y. ($u_{ELEC,w}$)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	NA
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbag.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA

Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Baseline energy consumption of fossil fuel i in year y. ($E_{BL,FOSSIL,i,y}$)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2023', 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2024' and 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2025' tabs in the in the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	The monitoring equipment used to measure fossil fuel consumption includes the use of hand-held scales, foot scales and measuring jugs. The

	monitoring equipment is typically used in residential or household applications and therefore do not have accuracy ranges or serial numbers associated with meters or equipment utilised in industrial applications.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have	NA

not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	
--	--

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Project activity energy consumption of fossil fuel i in year y . ($FC_{PJ,i}$)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	NA
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbag.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /03/.

How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Project activity energy consumption of fossil fuel i in year y . ($E_{PJ,FOSSIL,i,y}$)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2023', 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2024' and 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2025' tabs in the in the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	Where physical site visits were conducted, the monitoring equipment used to measure fossil fuel consumption included the use of hand-held scales, foot scales and measuring jugs. The monitoring equipment is typically used in residential or household applications and therefore do not have accuracy ranges or serial numbers associated with meters or equipment utilised in industrial applications.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not	NA

specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Share of users cooking with fossil fuel i in year y ($\mu_{FOSSIL,i,w}$)

Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2023', 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2024' and 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2025' tabs in the in the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.

In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA
--	----

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Failure rate of Wonderbag. ($f_{rate,w}$)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2023', 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2024' and 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2025' tabs in the in the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags. The failure rate is determined through the User Habit Survey, where respondents are asked whether "the "Wonderbag is still used for cooking?". All the survey respondents indicated "yes" to this question. Therefore, the failure rate was determined to be 0.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval:	NA

Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Active time in the monitoring period for the full population of Wonderbag type w. (t_w)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.

Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2023', 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2024' and 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2025' tabs in the in the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbags.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the	NA

registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	
--	--

Table 07: Parameters monitored as per AMS-II.G

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Number of project devices of type i (specifically biomass stoves) and batch j operating during year y. ($N_{y,i,j}$)
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2023', 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2024' and 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2025' tabs in the in the ER calculation spreadsheet.
Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbag.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbag.

Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	NA

Monitoring Parameter Requirement	Assessment/ Observation by the VVB
Data / Parameter: (as in monitoring plan of VCS PD):	Number of project devices of type i (specifically Annual quantity of woody biomass used in tonnes per project device of type i ($B_{new,KPT,i,j}$))
Measuring frequency/Time Interval:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reporting frequency:	Periodic sampling. Recording of data is aggregated on an annual basis.
Reported value:	Refer to the 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2023', 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2024' and 'Emission Reduction Calcs - 2025' tabs in the in the ER calculation spreadsheet.

Is measuring and reporting frequency in accordance with the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology? (Yes / No)	Yes
Details of monitoring equipment:	Where physical site visits were conducted, the monitoring equipment used to measure biomass consumption included the use of hand-held and/or foot scales. The monitoring equipment is typically used in residential or household applications and therefore do not have accuracy ranges or serial numbers associated with meters or equipment utilised in industrial applications.
Is accuracy of the monitoring equipment as stated in the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the accuracy of the monitoring equipment, does the monitoring equipment represent good monitoring practise?	NA
Calibration frequency /interval: Is it monitoring methodology /CDM EB guidance / local or national standards / manufacturers specification	NA
Is the calibration interval in line with the monitoring plan of the VCS PD? If the VCS PD does not specify the frequency of calibration, does the selected frequency represent good monitoring practise?	n/a as monitoring is undertaken on a sample basis of distributed, operational Wonderbag.
Company performing the calibration (internal or external calibration):	NA
Did calibration confirm proper functioning of monitoring equipment? (Yes / No):	NA
Is (are) calibration(s) valid for the whole reporting period?	NA
If applicable, has the reported data been cross-checked with other available data?	Yes, the reported data in MR/01/ has been compared with the ER sheet /02/.
How were the values in the monitoring report verified?	NA
Does the data management (from data generation to emission reduction calculation) ensure correct transfer of data and reporting of emission reductions and are necessary QA/QC processes in place?	Yes, the data management ensures correct transfer of data from monitoring survey /05/ and reporting of emission reductions and all necessary QA/QC processes are in place.
In case only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the	NA

registered monitoring plan, has the most conservative assumption theoretically possible been applied or has a request for deviation been approved?	
--	--

The verification team confirms that all parameters are used correctly in the calculations, all results are verifiable and transparent, all assumptions are described and based on verifiable evidence and calculations are done in accordance with the pre-defined formulae from registered VCS PD/04/. The total number of emission reductions for the monitoring period (01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025) are 442,565 tCO₂e.

Table 1:Emission reduction calculated using methodology AMS-II.C for this monitoring period

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCU (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-Dec-2023	63,090	18,586	0	44,504	N/A	44,504
01-Jan-2024 to 31-Dec-2024	94,160	27,746	0	66,414	N/A	66,414
01-Jan-2025 to 31-Jul-2025	54,838	16,164	0	38,674	N/A	38,674
Total	212,087	62,496	0	149,591	N/A	149,591

Table 2:Emission reduction calculated using methodology AMS-II.G for this monitoring period

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCU (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-December-2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	85,045	N/A	85,045

01-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	126,699	N/A	126,699
01-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	N/A	N/A	N/A	73,590	N/A	73,590
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	285,334	N/A	285,334

The total emission reduction calculation results for the emission reductions are provided in the following table:

Table 3:Emission reduction claimed during this monitoring period

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-December-2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	129,548	N/A	129,548
01-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	193,113	N/A	193,113
01-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	N/A	N/A	N/A	112,263	N/A	112,263
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	434,924	N/A	434,924

The final amount of issuance for the fourth monitoring period is therefore 403,302 tCO₂e (i.e. 434,924 tCO₂e - 31,622 tCO₂e).

4.4 Quality of Evidence to Determine Reductions and Removals

When verifying the report emission reduction, Carbon Check ensured that there was a clear audit trail that contained the evidence and records that validate the stated figures. All source documents that form the basis for assumptions and other information underlying the GHG data are shown above.

When assessing the audit trails, Carbon Check also examined:

- Whether sufficient evidence was available, both in terms of frequency and in covering the full monitoring period
- The source and nature of the evidence

3. If comparable information was available from sources other than that used in the monitoring report, Carbon Check cross-checked the monitoring report against the other sources to confirm that the stated figures were correct. The sources and the data referenced are shown in Appendix 1 below.

Carbon Check also assessed that the data collection system met the requirements of the monitoring plan as per the applied methodology. Proper data management inclusive of data acquisition and aggregation, data management system is being followed for the grouped project. The monitoring personnel are well trained and follow reproducible routines. Thus, they are competent to carry out the relevant tasks with sufficient accuracy.

4.5 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

The project activity was operational throughout the monitoring period. Hence there is no further requirement for the non-performance analysis rating during the monitoring period of the project activity.

5 VERIFICATION OPINION

5.1 Verification Summary

The Project Participant, Wonderbag UK Limited, has commissioned the VVB, Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. to perform verification of the VCS Project Activity "Recipe for Change Grouped Project". This report summarises the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of VCS criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring, and reporting.

The verification process was performed on the basis of all guidance and criteria as provided in VCS Standard version 4.7/B01/, VCS Program Guide version 4.5/B01/, VCS Validation and Verification Manual version 3.2/B01/ and Registration & Issuance Process version 4.6/B01/.

The selected baseline and monitoring methodologies AMS II C "Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies" (Version 15.0) and AMS-II.G. "Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass" (Version 11.1)/B02/ are applicable to the project and correctly applied.

The verification team confirm that the project has been implemented in accordance with the project description/04/.

Verification period: From 01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025 (both days inclusive).

Table 4:Emission reduction calculated using methodology AMS-II.C for this monitoring period

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCUs (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-Dec-2023	66,247	19,462	0	46,785	N/A	46,785
01-Jan-2024 to 31-Dec-2024	98,871	29,053	0	69,818	N/A	69,818
01-Jan-2025 to 31-Jul-2025	57,580	16,925	0	40,655	N/A	40,655
Total	222,698	65,440	0	157,258	N/A	157,258

Table 5:Emission reduction calculated using methodology AMS-II.G for this monitoring period

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCU (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-December-2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	85,045	N/A	85,045
01-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	126,699	N/A	126,699
01-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	N/A	N/A	N/A	73,590	N/A	73,590
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	285,334	N/A	285,334

The total emission reduction calculation results for the emission reductions are provided in the following table:

Table 6:Emission reduction claimed during this monitoring period

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCU (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-December-2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	129,548	129,548
01-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	193,113	193,113
01-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	N/A	N/A	N/A	112,263	112,263
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	434,924	434,924

The verification team is of the opinion that the project has been implemented in accordance with the registered project description/04/, the monitoring plan complies with the approved monitoring methodology. The monitoring was carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan, and that the monitored data and ER calculations/04/ were assessed and confirmed to be correct.

Therefore, Carbon Check hereby certifies, and requests the issuance of, the reported ERs during the monitoring period of 01-May-2023 to 31-July-2025 amounting to 434,924 tCO₂e for this monitoring period. After adjusting the over issued ERs 31,622 tCO₂e during MP 1, MP 2 and MP3, resulting total 403,302 tCO₂e emission reduction in current monitoring period . to the VCS Registry.

5.2 Verification Conclusion

The Project Participant, Wonderbag UK Limited, has commissioned the VVB, Carbon Check (India) Private Ltd. to perform verification of the VCS Project Activity “Recipe for Change Grouped Project”. This report summarises the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of VCS criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

Verification period: 1-May-2023 to 31-July-2025

Verified GHG emission reductions and carbon dioxide removals in the above verification period:

The total emission reductions per year follow. Note that the AMS.II.G. methodology does not separate the calculation between baseline and project emissions and hence only the calculation results for the emission reductions are provided in the following table.

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCU (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-December-2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	85,045	N/A	85,045
01-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	126,699	N/A	126,699
01-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	N/A	N/A	N/A	73,590	N/A	73,590
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	285,334	N/A	285,334

Vintage period	Baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Reduction VCU's (tCO ₂ e)	Removal VCU's (tCO ₂ e)	Total VCUs (tCO ₂ e)
01-May-2023 to 31-December-2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	129,548	N/A	129,548
01-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	N/A	N/A	N/A	193,113	N/A	193,113
01-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	N/A	N/A	N/A	112,263	N/A	112,263
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	434,924	N/A	434,924

VCU Issued vs Duplication

During the 4th monitoring period, duplication of Wonderbag is observed and now PP has adjusted the ERs overissued during MP 1, MP 2 and MP3. The recalculation of ERs/31/ of MP3 is done again based on the removal of duplication in project database, v3/06/. The new ER for MP 3 is 176,593 tCO₂e. The MP3 and MP4 share same database as there are no sales on Wonderbag after MP3. The brief of VCUs adjusted in this MP against issued VCUs /32/ as follows:

Period	Actual VCUs Issues	Over-issued VCUs	Remarks
MP 1	126,587 tCO ₂ e	16,217 tCO ₂ e	For MP1 and MP2, the PP has applied the most conservative value i.e. 0.55tCO ₂ e/WB/year
MP 2	180,076 tCO ₂ e	8,564 tCO ₂ e	For MP1 and MP2, the PP has applied the most conservative value i.e. 0.55tCO ₂ e/WB/year
MP 3	183,434 tCO ₂ e	6,841 tCO ₂ e	Re-calculation/31/
Total		31,622 tCO₂e	

After removal of 14,388 numbers of duplicate entries in project database, the ER volume for 4th monitoring period is 434,924 tCO₂e.

The final amount of issuance for the fourth monitoring period is therefore 403,302 tCO₂e (i.e. 434,924 tCO₂e - 31,622 tCO₂e). The over-issuance (31,622 tCO₂e) will be deducted from the

2025 vintage. The VCUs to be issued for this fourth monitoring period are therefore as follows by vintage.

Vintage	Actual VCUs
2023	129,548 tCO ₂ e
2024	193,113 tCO ₂ e
2025	80,641 tCO ₂ e
Total	403,302 tCO₂e

5.3 Ex-ante vs Ex-post ERR Comparaison

The achieved emission reductions (total of the emission reductions achieved under both methodologies) for the full monitoring period of 2025 years are compared with the total ex ante emission reduction estimates for the same period, in the table below.

The achieved emission reductions for the included projects activity instances (PAIs) are lower than the ex-ante emission reductions and hence no further justifications are required.

<i>Vintage period</i>	<i>Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals</i>	<i>Achieved reductions/removals</i>	<i>Percent difference</i>	<i>Explanation for the difference</i>	<i>VVB Assessment</i>
01-May-2023 to 31-December-2023	178,569	129,548	-27%	Monitored project scenario consumption is less than the estimated consumption in the ex ante calculations. The ex ante calculations also include coal and paraffin which are excluded in this monitoring period.	VVB has reviewed the ER ex-ante/02/ calculation and confirmed that paraffin and coal are excluded in this monitoring.
01-January-2024 to 31-December-2024	266,032	193,113	-27%	Monitored project scenario consumption is less than the estimated consumption in the ex ante calculations. The ex ante calculations also include coal and paraffin which are excluded in this monitoring period.	VVB has reviewed the ER ex-ante/02/ calculation and confirmed that paraffin and coal are excluded in this monitoring.

<i>Vintage period</i>	<i>Ex-ante estimated reductions/removals</i>	<i>Achieved reductions/removals</i>	<i>Percent difference</i>	<i>Explanation for the difference</i>	<i>VVB Assessment</i>
01-January-2025 to 31-July-2025	154,517	112,263	-27%	Monitored project scenario consumption is less than the estimated consumption in the ex ante calculations. The ex ante calculations also include coal and paraffin which are excluded in this monitoring period.	VVB has reviewed the ER ex-ante/02/ calculation and confirmed that paraffin and coal are excluded in this monitoring.
Total	599,119	434,924*	-27%	Monitored project scenario consumption is less than the estimated consumption in the ex ante calculations. The ex ante calculations also include coal and paraffin which are excluded in this monitoring period.	VVB has reviewed the ER ex-ante/02/ calculation and confirmed that paraffin and coal are excluded in this monitoring.

* The total GHG emission reductions achieved from the nineteen small-scale Project activity instances are 434,924 tCO₂e for this monitoring period. After adjusting the over issued ERs 31,622 tCO₂e during MP 1, MP 2 and MP3, resulting total 403,302 tCO₂e emission reduction.

APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS

BE	Baseline Emission
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CL	Clarification Request
CO₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO_{2e}	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
EB	CDM Executive Board
EF	Emission Factor
ER	Emission Reduction
FAR	Forward Action Request
FVR	Final verification Report
GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
NA	Not Applicable
OSV	On Site Visit
PD	Project Description
PP	Project Proponent
QC/QA	Quality control/Quality assurance
TR	Technical Review
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VCS	Verified Carbon Standard
VCU	Verified Carbon Unitss
VB	Validation Verification Body

APPENDIX 2: REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Sr no	Document
/01/	2026-04-15 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v8 2026-04-03 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v7 2026-03-26 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v6 2026-02-06 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v5 2025-12-24 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v4 2025-12-17 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v3 2025-12-02 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v2 2025-10-13 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v1
/02/	2025-12-02 RfC 4th MR ex ante calcs v2 2025-10-13 Wonderbag RfC 4th MR v1
/03/	2026-04-15 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v7 2026-04-03 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v6 2026-03-26 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v5 2026-02-10 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v4 2025-12-17 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v3 2025-12-02 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v2 2025-10-10 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v1
/04/	Registered VCS PD for the grouped project “Recipe for Change Grouped Project”. Version 3.0 dated 06-May-2021 and corresponding validation report 3.0 dated 06-May-2021.
/05/	2026-02-10 User Habit Survey 4 analysis v3 2025-11-14 User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2 2025-10-09 User Habit Survey 4 analysis v1
/06/	2026-03-06 Wonderbag Database v3 2025-11-24 Wonderbag Database v2
/07/	2025-09-11 Community Kitchen Cooking and Community Kitchen Test Photos
/08/	Entrepreneurs List 2023-2024 (1)
/09/	Foam 2023-2025 (1) – Quantity Details
/10/	Stakeholder Communication Outcomes Report
/11/	VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025
/12/	Verra_Foward Action Requests 02-Jun-2025
/13/	Verra_inclusion of new bags or instances 11-Nov-2025
/14/	Work environment and human rights policy
/15/	2021-03-02 Wonderbag Baseline Survey Results
/16/	Donations Details – Declaration for SDG 1, 12, and 15,
/17/	Grid emission factor with ESCOM Integrated report for the year 2023, 2024 and 2025
/18/	Subcontractors Agreements and Invoices
/19/	Training and activations
/20/	Electric stoves Ratings

/21/	fNRB Report and Calculation sheet
/22/	2025-12-12 Random sampling screenshot
/23/	Wonderbag 12 Year Thermal Performance Report - 2023-06-26 and specification
/24/	Declaration - Project not registered or under process of registration in any other Emissions trading Programs and Other Binding Limits.
/25/	Declaration - Project not registered or under process of getting and Other Forms of Environmental Credit.
/26/	Declaration - The project has not been registered and is not seeking registration under any other GHG program.
/27/	Declaration(s) - Projects not Rejected by Other GHG Programs Declaration from PP confirming that the project is not claiming any other environmental credits other than VCU.
/28/	Countersigned contract between Wonderbag UK Ltd. and Carbon Check .
/29/	Declaration supporting the statement: "Where appropriate, evidence has been included in Appendix 2. Due to POPIA rules, some evidence containing personal information cannot be included, as it cannot be shared publicly without consent."
/30/	Controlled cooking demonstration using an electric heater and Wonderbag at the manufacturing facility
/31/	2026-03-26 RfC MR3 ER calcs recalculation
/32/	VCUs issued (Verra Search Page)
/33/	Email from Verra for Wonderbag duplicates approaches

Ref	Document
/B01/	VCS Requirements a. VCS Standard (v4.7, dated 16-April-2024) b. VCS Program Guide (v4.4, dated 29-August-2023) c. VCS Validation and Verification Manual version (v3.2, dated 19-October-2016) d. Registration & Issuance Process (v4.5, dated 16-April-2024) e. VCS Program Definitions version (v4.5, dated 16-April-2024) f. VCS MR template version 4.4
/B02/	Applied baseline and monitoring methodology. a. AMS II C – "Demand-side energy efficiency activities for specific technologies" (Version 15.0) b. AMS-II.G. "Energy efficiency measures in thermal applications of non-renewable biomass" (Version 11.1).
/B03/	Methodological Tool • CDM Tool 30 "Calculation of the fraction of non-renewable biomass" Version 04.0.
/B04/	a. "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of

	activities" (version 09.0). b. Guidelines for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and Programme of Activities (version 04).
s	Website and links: 1. IPCC (http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp) 2. http://cdm.unfccc.int 3. http://www.v-c-s.org

APPENDIX 3: CERTIFICATE OF COMPETANCE

Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Pankaj Kumar

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS, A 6.4 AS/ ISO/IEC14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| ☐ Management Function | ☐ Administrative | ☒ Validator/Verifier | ☒ Team Leader |
| ☐ Acting Team Leader | ☒ Technical Expert | ☐ Technical Reviewer | ☐ Trainee Assessor |
| ☒ Assessor | ☒ Regional Expert | ☐ Gender Expert | ☐ Financial Expert |
| <input type="text" value="India"/> | | | |
| ☐ Plastic Waste Expert | ☐ Health Expert | ☐ CCB Expert | ☒ SDG Expert |
| ☒ Expert Social Aspect | ☒ Expert Environmental Aspect | ☐ Internal Auditor | ☐ Legal Expert |
| ☒ FOEN Approved Technical Expert | ☐ FOEN Approved Quality Officer | | |

in the following Technical Areas:

- ☐ PWRP 2 - Plastic Waste Collection & Recycling
- ☐ TA 1.1 - Thermal energy generation
- ☒ TA 1.2 - Renewable Energy generation
- ☐ TA 10.1 - Fugitive emissions from oil and gas
- ☒ TA 13.1 - Solid waste and Wastewater
- ☒ TA 13.2 - Manure
- ☐ TA 14.1 - Afforestation and reforestation (except REDD & REDD+)

- ☐ TA 14.1 - Afforestation and reforestation (only REDD & REDD+)
- ☐ TA 15.1 - Agriculture (With Model Validation)
- ☐ TA 15.1 - Agriculture (Without Model Validation)
- ☐ TA 16.1 Carbon Capture and Storage ☐ TA 2.1 - Energy Distribution
- ☒ TA 3.1 - Demand Side Energy Efficiency
- ☐ TA 4.1 - Cement and Lime Production
- ☐ TA 4.n - Waste Heat Recovery & Fuel Switch ☐ TA 5.1 - Chemical Industry
- ☐ TA 5.2 - Caprolactam, Nitric and Adipic Acid ☐ TA 7.1 - Transport
- ☐ TA 8.1 - Mining/Mineral Production
- ☐ TA 9.1 - Aluminium and magnesium production
- ☐ TA 9.2 - Iron, Steel and Ferro-alloy Production
- ☐ TA PWRP 1 - Plastic Waste Collection & Recycling

Issue Date 14-01-2026 Expiry Date 14-01-2027

Vikash Kumar Singh
 Director - Compliance

Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Aluwani Balebale

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS, A 6.4 AS/ ISO/IEC14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:
for the following functions and requirements:

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| ☐ Management Function | ☐ Administrative | ☐ Validator/Verifier | ☐ Team Leader |
| ☐ Acting Team Leader | ☐ Technical Expert | ☐ Technical Reviewer | ☐ Trainee Assessor |
| ☐ Assessor | ☒ Regional Expert | ☐ Gender Expert | ☐ Financial Expert |
| | South Africa | | |
| ☐ Plastic Waste Expert | ☐ Health Expert | ☐ CCB Expert | ☐ SDG Expert |
| ☐ Expert Social Aspect | ☐ Expert Environmental Aspect | ☐ Internal Auditor | ☐ Legal Expert |
| ☐ FOEN Approved Technical Expert | ☐ FOEN Approved Quality Officer | | |

in the following Technical Areas:

- ☐ PWRP 2 - Plastic Waste Collection & Recycling
- ☐ TA 1.1 - Thermal energy generation
- ☐ TA 1.2 - Renewable Energy generation
- ☐ TA 10.1 - Fugitive emissions from oil and gas
- ☐ TA 13.1 - Solid waste and Wastewater ☐ TA 13.2 - Manure
- ☐ TA 14.1 - Afforestation and reforestation (except REDD & REDD+)



- ☐ TA 14.1 - Afforestation and reforestation (only REDD & REDD+)
- ☐ TA 15.1 - Agriculture (With Model Validation)
- ☐ TA 15.1 - Agriculture (Without Model Validation)
- ☐ TA 16.1 Carbon Capture and Storage ☐ TA 2.1 - Energy Distribution
- ☐ TA 3.1 - Demand Side Energy Efficiency
- ☐ TA 4.1 - Cement and Lime Production
- ☐ TA 4.n - Waste Heat Recovery & Fuel Switch ☐ TA 5.1 - Chemical Industry
- ☐ TA 5.2 - Caprolactam, Nitric and Adipic Acid ☐ TA 7.1 - Transport
- ☐ TA 8.1 - Mining/Mineral Production
- ☐ TA 9.1 - Aluminium and magnesium production
- ☐ TA 9.2 - Iron, Steel and Ferro-alloy Production
- ☐ TA PWRP 1 - Plastic Waste Collection & Recycling

Issue Date 25-10-2025

Expiry Date

25-10-2026

Vikash Kumar Singh
Director - Compliance

Carbon Check (India) Private Limited

Certificate of Competency

Indumathi C

has been qualified as per CCIPL's internal qualification procedures in accordance with the requirements of CDM AS, A 6.4 AS/ ISO/IEC14065:2020, ISO/IEC 17029:2019 and other applicable GHG programs:

for the following functions and requirements:

- | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| ☐ Management Function | ☐ Administrative | ☒ Validator/Verifier | ☒ Team Leader |
| ☐ Acting Team Leader | ☒ Technical Expert | ☒ Technical Reviewer | ☐ Trainee Assessor |
| ☒ Assessor | ☒ Regional Expert | ☐ Gender Expert | ☒ Financial Expert |
| India, Sri Lanka | | | |
| ☒ Plastic Waste Expert | ☐ Health Expert | ☐ CCB Expert | ☒ SDG Expert |
| ☒ Expert Social Aspect | ☒ Expert Environmental Aspect | ☐ Internal Auditor | ☐ Legal Expert |
| ☒ FOEN Approved Technical Expert | ☐ FOEN Approved Quality Officer | | |

in the following Technical Areas:

- ☒ TA 1.1 - Thermal energy generation
- ☒ TA 1.2 - Renewable Energy generation
- ☐ TA 10.1 - Fugitive emissions from oil and gas
- ☒ TA 13.1 - Solid waste and Wastewater
- ☒ TA 13.2 - Manure
- ☐ TA 14.1 - Afforestation and reforestation (except REDD & REDD+)
- ☐ TA 14.1 - Afforestation and reforestation (only REDD & REDD+)



- ☐ TA 15.1 - Agriculture (With Model Validation)
- ☐ TA 15.1 - Agriculture (Without Model Validation)
- ☐ TA 16.1 Carbon Capture and Storage ☐ TA 2.1 - Energy Distribution
- ☒ TA 3.1 - Demand Side Energy Efficiency
- ☐ TA 4.1 - Cement and Lime Production
- ☐ TA 4.n - Waste Heat Recovery & Fuel Switch ☐ TA 5.1 - Chemical Industry
- ☐ TA 5.2 - Caprolactam, Nitric and Adipic Acid ☐ TA 7.1 - Transport
- ☐ TA 8.1 - Mining/Mineral Production
- ☐ TA 9.1 - Aluminium and magnesium production
- ☐ TA 9.2 - Iron, Steel and Ferro-alloy Production
- ☐ TA PWRP 1 - Plastic Waste Collection & Recycling

Issue Date 26-11-2025

Expiry Date

26-11-2026

Vikash Kumar Singh
Director - Compliance

APPENDIX 4: FINDING LOGS

Table 1: CLs from this Verification

CL ID	01	Section no.	KPI and section 1.1	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
1. In the key information table, PP has used older version of the VCS standard. PP shall clarify. 2. In section 1.1 of the MR, PP has mentioned 19 project activity instances which is not in line with section 3.1 of the MR and ER sheet. PP shall clarify. 3. In section 1.1. of the VCS MR, the scale of the project activities is not in line with clause 4.1.10 (4) of the VCS standard, v4.7. PP shall clarify. 4. In section 1.1 of the MR, PP mentioned that “There were 439,910 Wonderbags distributed into the field in this monitoring period” which is not in line with the database. PP shall clarify. 5. Section 1.1 of the Monitoring Report states that “Wonderbag is also responsible for the production of the bags, which is undertaken either in-house or subcontracted.” However, the Monitoring Plan does not clearly describe how the production of Wonderbags was carried out during the current monitoring period. PP shall clarify the production approach adopted for Wonderbags during this monitoring period (i.e., whether production was in-house or subcontracted) and provide supporting evidence (e.g., production records, contracts, invoices, or other verifiable documentation).				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. The key information and various sections in the MR have been revised to reflect the use in this monitoring period of the latest VCS Standard, version 4.7.
2. The inclusion of new project activity instances has been removed from the MR. All references in the MR and ER sheet refer to 19 PAIs already included in the grouped project.
3. Reference to small scale project activities has been removed from section 1.1.
4. Section 1.1 has been aligned with the database to reflect the 355,930 Wonderbags that were distributed in previous monitoring periods. No new Wonderbags have been included in this monitoring period. Text has been included to reflect this in Section 1.1.
5. In addition to production done in-house, Wonderbags were produced by contractors namely Lenience Holdings and Getnon. Please see supporting evidence provided of the agreement and invoices in the folder titled 'Subcontractors'

Documentation provided by PP

Monitoring Report v2

Subcontractor Invoices (See folder titled 'Subcontractors')

Getnon and Lenience Payments.xlsx

Getnon Manufacturing Agreement.pdf

Manufacturing Lenience.pdf

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

1. PP has updated the referenced VCS Standard version to the latest applicable version across the MR. **Hence, CL is closed**
2. Section 1.1 of the MR has been revised and is now consistent with Section 3.1 and ER sheet. **Hence, CL is closed.**
3. The scale of the project activities has been removed by PP from section 1.1. **Hence, CL is closed.**
4. VVB has assessed the updated MR and previous monitoring report , response and found that PP has used the same quantity of Wonderbag as in previous monitoring period. As per current monitoring period, no new Wonderbag were distributed in current monitoring period. **Hence CL is open.**
5. During on-site audit VVB has witness the production facility and PP takes the wonder bad from other facility, they have contracted the same. PP has contract copy and payment invoices. **Hence, CL is closed.s**

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

CL ID	02	Section no.	1.8	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
1. In Section 1.8, the project activities are reported to be spread across nine provinces within South Africa, with South Africa as the host country. However, the sales database includes one project activity located in Mozambique. The PP shall clarify. Additionally, the database includes entries with a 'Null' province, for which the PP shall also provide clarification. 2. In Section 1.8, the provinces listed for RfC 1 to 14, RfC 17, and RfC 18 are not consistent with the information provided in the database. The PP shall clarify.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
1. The Wonderbag listing Mozambique as the Province has been removed from the database. The entries with Null in the province field are related to older distributions. These distributions occurred before the development of the Team Wonderbag app which standardized distribution forms. As a result there are some differences in the data that was collected. In older distributions the address was captured as a single string as opposed to the app which uses a separate column for the Province. All distributions occurred within SA and have addresses. The NULL value is how the database software represents an entry that does not have data assigned to it. 2. The provinces list has been revised in Section 1.8 to ensure consistency with the database. Please refer to the PivotTable starting on row 44 of the FuelSplit tab in the database.				
Documentation provided by PP				
Wonderbag database v2				
Monitoring report v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025
1. PP has removed "Mozambique" as a province from the database. PP also explained that the blank (NULL) province entries are from older distributions done before standard data collection started. Hence, CL is closed. 2. PP has updated the province list in Section 1.8 to align with the database. Hence, CL is closed.				

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

CL ID	03	Section no.	section 1.12	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
In table 1 of the section 1.12, PP mentioned that SDG 1 (Reduced time (hours) spent on cooking, using a Wonderbag) value has not yet monitored. PP shall clarify for considering this SDG.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
The time savings resulting from the use of the Wonderbag are significant and an important SDG. As such it has been included as a parameter. However, the necessary baseline information is not available for each fuel relating to the time spent for cooking. A new baseline survey will be conducted in the future that will include this parameter. The electricity savings have been calculated and included in the monitoring report as this information has been collected. The calculation of the time savings is in the 'SDG Impacts' tab from row 45 in the '4 th MR ex post calcs v2' Excel file.				
Documentation provided by PP				
4 th MR ex post calcs v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025
VVB has assessed the updated MR and found that PP has now included the contribution of SDG 1 in table 1 of the MR. Hence CL is closed.				

CL ID	04	Section no.	2.1 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
As per Section 2.1 of the MR, it is mentioned that "Wonderbag and distribution partners then undertake interactive training and activation sessions with community members who receive the Wonderbags." However, it is not clear whether such training and activation sessions were conducted during the current monitoring period. PP shall clarify this and provide necessary evidence (e.g., training records, attendance sheets, photographs, or partner reports).				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

Activations and training were conducted in the period. Please refer to records in the folder titled 'Training and activations' for photos and attendance registers of training undertaken in the monitoring period. In addition, the quotes relating to training provided to Wonderbag staff have been included in this folder.	
Documentation provided by PP	
Images (Please see folder 'Training and activations') Quotation - QU00000004 Training Quote.pdf Quotation_-_QU00000005 Training Quote.pdf SOP_Activations_Events (002).pdf Training Register.pdf	
VVB assessment	Date: 08/12/2025
PP has confirmed that training and activation sessions were conducted during the monitoring period and has provided supporting evidence. Hence CL 04 is closed.	

CL ID	05	Section no.	3.1	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
1. In the section 3.1 of the VCS MR, PP has mentioned scale "small" which is not in line with point 4 of clause 4.1.10 VCS standard, version 4.7. PP shall clarify. 2. In section 3.1 of MR, it is mentioned that "In this monitoring period, emission reductions from bags distributed to households cooking with paraffin and coal have been excluded. These users form a small proportion (less than 1%) of the overall population". PP needs to demonstrate it and provide the supporting evidence.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. The methodologies applied are CDM small-scale methodologies and each Project Activity Instance complies with the thresholds set by these methodologies. The reference to small scale has been removed from Section 3.1 for clarity.
2. These Wonderbag users form 0.5% of the population. This has been updated in Section 3.1. This value can be seen by adding the proportions found in the Database. In the tab titled "FuelSplit", see the cells Y4 for the coal (0.14%) and Y8 for the paraffin (0.37%) proportions.

Documentation provided by PP

Wonderbag Database v2

Monitoring Report v2

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

1. PP has removed the small-scale reference from Section 3.1. **Hence CL is closed.**
2. VVB has assessed the updated Wonderbag database row Y4 and Y8 FuelSplit tab and updated the same in section 3.1 of the MR. **Hence CL is closed.**

CL ID	06	Section no.	3.2 and 4.3 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
1. As per Section 4.3 of the MR, it is not clear how the plate rating has been determined as 1.5 kW. The methodology or basis for deriving this value has not been explained in the report. PP shall provide clarification and submit necessary supporting evidence to substantiate the stated plate rating. 2. As per Section 3.2 of the MR, Details regarding the user habit survey are not clear. The frequency of the surveys, specific dates, and information on whether the surveys were conducted through physical visits or telephonic communication have not been specified. PP shall clarify these aspects and update the MR accordingly. 3. For parameter N_w it is not clear how the reported value is being calculated from the monitored database.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025

1. The 1.5kW was the stove plate rating fixed ex ante during project validation. This stove rating was based on the specifications of a Defy stove, as this is a major brand available in South Africa. Subsequent to Verra's FARs related to the third monitoring period and report, the user habit survey for the fourth monitoring period was modified to include a requirement for field researchers to identify and record the electric stove plate ratings of the sampled households, where possible and where the name plate ratings were visible. The user habit survey for the fourth monitoring period found only 11 stoves where the nameplate was visible. The average stove plate rating from these nameplates was 1.95kW (refer to cell B39 of the Analysis tab in the User Habit Survey Analysis spreadsheet) with a standard error of 0.4kW (refer to cell B40 of the Analysis tab in the User Habit Survey Analysis spreadsheet). The 1.5kW rating is therefore a conservative value in comparison to these results, even accounting for the standard error of the results. The lower bound of the results would be roughly 1.55kW. The statistics are available in rows 1-2 in the tab titled (Day 1, 2 & 3) in the Community Kitchen Cooking Excel spreadsheet.

2. Section 3.2 has been revised to reflect the deviation requests in the current monitoring period and in the previous monitoring periods. Revisions have also been made to clarify the details of the user habit survey used in the fourth monitoring period. For example, no telephonic interviews were conducted in the latest survey. The survey consisted of both a user habit (qualitative) and KPT (quantitative) component, where each household was visited three times. These details of the surveys conducted for the current fourth monitoring report are included in the Monitoring Plan in Section 4.3 and include the dates upon which the surveys were conducted.

In addition, section 3.2 has been revised to reflect further details of the direct monitoring pilot (measuring operational hours), as requested in Verra's letter of 2 June 2025. The Verra letter provides for additional time to comply fully with FAR 02 and FAR 06 arising from the third verification report, conditional on the fulfilment of certain actions relating to a pilot monitoring campaign.

3. The parameter Nw is obtained from the database by summing the number of bags in the applicable instance. Please refer to the tabs 'FuelSplit' and 'StartDatePAI' in the file 'Wonderbag Database'. The pivot table counts each row where there is a serial number with the corresponding Project Activity Instance.

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

Community Kitchen Cooking.xlsx	
Wonderbag Database v2.xlsx	
Monitoring Report v2	
2025-11-14 User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2.xlsx	
WVB assessment	Date: 08/12/2025
1. The PP has clarified that the 1.5 kW plate rating was established ex ante based on a Defy stove specification and has additionally provided results from 11 newly collected user surveys showing an average observed rating of 1.95 kW, confirming that the 1.5 kW value remains conservative. The explanation is satisfactory, Hence CL is closed. 2. PP has updated Section 3.2 with clear information on the frequency, dates, and approach of the user habit survey, confirming that surveys were conducted through physical household visits and not telephonically. Hence CL is closed. 3. PP has explained that parameter <i>Nw</i> is derived directly from the Wonderbag database. Hence CL is closed.	

CL ID	07	Section no.	4.3 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
In section 4.3 of the MR, 1. The baseline and user habit surveys for the newly added project instance lack essential details on sampling methodology, population size, and achieved confidence and precision levels, as required by CDM AMS-II.C and AMS-II.G (minimum 90% confidence, 10% precision). PP shall provide this information to demonstrate methodological compliance. 2. for the newly added project instance Kitchen Performance Tests (KPTs) and Control Cooking Test (CCT) were performed and lack essential details on sampling methodology, population size, and achieved confidence and precision levels, as required by CDM AMS-II.C and AMS-II.G (minimum 90% confidence, 10% precision). PP shall provide this information to demonstrate methodological compliance.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. The new Project activity instances have been removed following confirmation from Verra regarding their inclusion. The statistical information regarding the baseline survey is included in Section 4.3.
2. The new project activity instances have been removed following confirmation from Verra. The statistical information regarding the KPT and user habit survey for the rest of the instances is included in Section 4.3.

Documentation provided by PP

Monitoring Report v2

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

1. PP has now removed the newly added project activity instances from section 4.3 of the MR. **Hence, CL is closed.**
2. PP has now removed the newly added project activity instances from section 4.3 of the MR. **Hence, CL is closed.**

CL ID	08	Section no.	3.6	Date:	29/10/2025
Description of CL					
1. In section 3.6 of the MR, PP has used the ASB0040-2018 Standardized baseline: "Grid emission factor for Southern African Power Pool" for the parameter "Image" but the documents validity completed in 06 October 2021 (CDM: Standardized baselines). PP shall clarify. 2. "The value of parameter Emission factor for the fossil fuel displaced "Image" for paraffin and Coal are not in line with 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 2: energy, stationary combustion. PP shall clarify." 3. In section 3.6 of the MR, the value if parameter "Bold,l,j" is not in line with ER sheet. PP shall clarify.					
Project Proponent response					Date:
					02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. The grid emission factor was fixed ex ante as a parameter. At the time of validation, the Standardized baseline was still valid. The grid emission factor has been updated to align with the calculated ex ante value using VT0011 v1. This calculation has been provided in Appendix 3.
2. Please see page 16 of the file 'V2_2_Ch2_Stationary_Combustion'. Default values have been applied. Paraffin is the same fuel as Other Kerosene and is the term used in South Africa for this fuel. The coal emission factor is the value for Sub-Bituminous Coal from this document.
3. The value provided in the MR for parameter 'Bold,l,j' is found on row 35 on tab 'Emission Reduction Calcs – 2023' of the ex ante ER spreadsheet, which has units of tonnes/year/adult equivalent. The value for Bold in row 63 of this tab is the baseline consumption per year and has units tonnes/year. The value in row 35 has been provided in the MR to ensure consistency with units.

Documentation provided by PP

1. Grid emission factor:
 - Monitoring Report v2
 - 2025-03-12 South Africa GEF
 - Eskom-integrated-report-2024
 - Historic_Electr_Generation_to_31_March_2024
 - Power_Stations_Primary_Energy_to_31_March_2024
2. V2_2_Ch2_Stationary_Combustion
3. 2025-11-12 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v2

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. PP has updated the calculation using VT0011 v1 and provided supporting documents. Hence CL 08-01 is closed.
2. PP has demonstrated that the emission factors for paraffin and coal are aligned with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines; therefore, CL 08-02 is closed.
3. PP has explained the difference in units for parameter *Bold,l,j*. The value reported in the MR is consistent with the ER sheet. Hence CL 08-03 is closed

CL ID	09	Section no.	5.1	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
In section 5.1 of the MR, PP mentioned that “An example calculation is provided for the year 2023 for RfC PA1:” but PP has provided the value of 2024. PP shall clarify.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
This was a typo, the section 5.1 of the MR has been corrected to reflect the example calculation for 2024.				
Documentation provided by PP				
Monitoring Report v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025
VVB has assessed the updated MR and response and found that PP has now corrected the values. Hence CL is closed.				

CL ID	10	Section no.	4.3 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
As per the User Habit Survey 4 Analysis v1; dated 2025-10-09, the selected samples are from only 3 provinces, whereas the database includes a total of 09 provinces. The PP is requested to clarify the rationale for limiting the sample selection to only two-three regions out of the 09 mentioned in the database.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

The samples were selected based on the share of the overall population as well as logistical practicalities. The distribution within the KwaZulu Natal (KZN) and Gauteng provinces forms more than 50% of the population and was thus chosen for the provinces of assessment. These provinces are also logistically more practical for Wonderbag and the third-party researchers responsible for the surveys, as they are both based in KZN and Gauteng respectively. The Western Cape was already surveyed in the previous user habit survey and the results in the fourth verification are similar. In addition, the Western Cape was initially included in the random sampling however these households were excluded due to higher security concerns in those areas. Furthermore, the cooking habits of low-income communities in South Africa is fairly homogenous. Accordingly, the results from KZN and Gauteng would be fairly representative of the greater population in the country.

Documentation provided by PP

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

The VVB assessed the database and observed that more than 50% of the Wonderbag distributions were carried out in the KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) and Gauteng provinces. Accordingly, PP conducted sampling in these two regions, and the VVB verified this through the submitted random sampling **Hence, CL 10 is closed.**

CL ID	11	Section no.	MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
PP has used the older version of the VCS standard throughout the MR. PP shall clarify for not using updated version of the VCS standard 4.7. Further, PP shall use the appropriate clause from updated version.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
The MR has been revised to include the reference to VCS Standard 4.7.				
Documentation provided by PP				
Monitoring Report v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

PP has updated the referenced VCS Standard version to the latest applicable version across the MR. **Hence, CL 11 is closed**

CL ID	12	Section no.	ER Sheet	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CL				
1. As per the user Habit Survey result, the value of parameter “Average adult equivalent in households using electricity” is 3.85 and PP has used 3.87. PP shall clarify. 2. PP has provided the ESKOM integrated report 2024, page 113 as an evidence for parameter ly (Average technical losses). But, VVB won't find the value on said page. CME shall provide the reference. 3. PP shall clarify for using VMR0050 for capping the parameter Share of users actually cooking with Wonderbag of type w in ER sheet. 4. PP has mentioned in ER sheet that “User Habit Survey Results, cell N6 in the 'Analysis' tab in the 'User Habit Survey Results Analysis' spreadsheet.” Reference is not correct. PP shall check and provide right reference. 5. PP shall provide the source of parameter “Average cooking hours in baseline per year per adult equivalent” in ER sheet 6. PP shall provide the evidence for parameter “Paraffin - Baseline fuel consumption per week 7. In Emission Reduction Summary tab of 2025-10-10 RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v1 sheet, the start and end date is not in line with MR. PP shall clarify.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025



1. The average adult equivalent for electricity households has been revised in section 4.3 of MR to align with the user habit survey results.
2. The value for l_y has been revised in section 4.2 of the MR. Please see page 141 of the provided 2025 integrated report from Eskom. The losses are labelled as 'Total energy losses, %' in the Technical Statistics table.
3. The usage rate has been revised to the user habit survey results of 91.3%. The responses from the latest User Habit Survey were used to calculate this rate. Participants in the survey were asked to respond to the question "Do you use the Wonderbag to keep food warm?".

Users who responded with either of the following answers were assumed to not be using the Wonderbag as intended:

- "I do not use the Wonderbag to keep food warm. I cook and we eat as soon as it is ready" and
- "Yes, I cook entirely on the stove and use the Wonderbag ONLY for keeping food warm".

These users were removed from the results, providing an accurate reflection of the usage rate provided for parameter in u_w section 4.2.

4. The reference has been corrected to refer to the appropriate cell in the 'User Habit Survey 4 analysis' spreadsheet.
5. The average cooking hours in the baseline, taking into account the number of times the Wonderbag is used per week, is calculated in cell Q3 in the 'Analysis' tab of the 'User Habit Survey 4 analysis' spreadsheet.
6. The paraffin consumption in the baseline was established in the baseline survey conducted at validation. These results have been provided (Wonderbag Baseline Survey Results spreadsheet). However, in this fourth monitoring period, emission reductions from Wonderbags distributed in households using paraffin have been excluded due to logistic and budget constraints. Paraffin users are a small proportion of the overall population as discussed in Section 3.1 of the MR.
7. The cells were incorrectly labelled. The start and end dates have been correctly identified and are aligned with the Monitoring Report.

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2 2021-03-02 Wonderbag Baseline Survey Results Monitoring Report v2 Eskom-integrated-report-2025.pdf	
VVB assessment	Date: 08/12/2025
1. PP has updated the average adult equivalent value in the MR to reflect the User Habit Survey results. Hence, C is closed. 2. For the ER calculations for 2023, 2024, and 2025, the PP has used the parameter I_y derived from 2025 data. This approach may compromise the conservativeness of the emission reduction estimates. Hence, CL is closed. 3. VVB has assessed the Cell BQ of the 'Raw' tab in the User Habit Survey and noted that PP collected information on the usage of Wonderbag. The survey results showed that 1% (6 out of 601) of the samples do not use Wonderbag, 8% (47 out of 601) use them only to keep food warm, and 91.2% (548 out of 601) use them for cooking and keeping food warm. VVB observed the same during the on-site. Further, PP has updated the same in section 4.2 of the MR. Hence, CL is closed. 4. The incorrect reference in the ER sheet has been corrected. Hence, CL is closed. 5. PP has explained the source and calculation for baseline cooking hours. Hence, CL 12-05 is closed. 6. Evidence for baseline paraffin consumption has been provided. However, since paraffin users were excluded in this monitoring period, this parameter is not used in ex-post calculations. Hence, CL is closed. 7. The start and end dates in the ER sheet have been corrected to align with the MR. Hence, CL is closed.	

CL ID	13	Section no.	MR	Date: 10/11/2025
Description of CL				

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

During the on-site audit 1. VVB observed that most households are receiving electricity free of charge. The PP shall clarify how the Wonderbag is being used in such households despite the availability of free electricity. 2. VVB observed that most households have only one Wonderbag, which is used only for main meal preparation, while other cooking activities continue to be performed on the baseline stove. The PP shall clarify how emission reductions have been calculated for such cases. 3. In few sampled households, the number of Wonder bags observed during the on-site audit did not match the quantities recorded in the project database. The PP shall clarify.	
Project Proponent response	Date: 02/12/2025

1. South Africa provides certain low-income households with Free Basic Electricity (FBE) through a government social welfare policy. This initiative aims to provide a basic amount of energy, typically 50 to 60 kWh per month, to qualifying families who cannot afford essential services. Only indigent households (who can prove that they cannot pay and who earn less than a certain amount per month) qualify for free basic services. Municipalities have criteria to qualify for indigent status. Municipalities determine who qualifies to receive the 50kWh per month of free basic electricity using the qualifying criteria outlined in their respective indigent policies.¹ Households that qualify need to ensure that they do not breach the FBE threshold, as they will be charged for electricity consumption above the threshold. Accordingly, the proper use of a Wonderbag to cook meals can assist such households stay below the FBE threshold, or to limit charges should they breach the threshold. This is because the use of Wonderbags reduces the time, and therefore kWh, that meals are cooked on stoves.

In addition, there are instances, particularly in low-income communities, where households have informal or even illegal electricity connections provided by a third-party. In such cases, households may be reluctant to confirm that they pay for electricity, as they are aware that the connections are illegal and the payments are not going to the municipality².

Notably, and as discussed with electricity users in the onsite household interviews, there are other impactful benefits in the use of Wonderbags in these households, in addition to electricity cost savings where applicable. For example, the time saving and safety elements associated with the Wonderbag usage can be hugely beneficial. The food can be safely left in the Wonderbag to finish cooking, i.e. no element needs to remain on while food cooks in the bag, while the cook does other tasks.

Furthermore, informal and illegal electricity connections are unlikely to be as stable as a formal connection to the grid. As a result, the use of stoves, which has a high current draw, may result in frequent power trips. The reduction of electricity use through the use of Wonderbag therefore reduces the risk of potential trips of the surrounding network.

2. The emission reduction calculations are based on the number of Wonderbags in the project activity instance not the number of households. The survey results are normalized to the number of Wonderbags to account for households with differing numbers of Wonderbags. The consumption for electricity, for example, is in minutes/day/Wonderbag rather than per household. This is multiplied by the number

of Wonderbag used by electricity users, thus only cooking done with the Wonderbag is accounted for in the emission reductions.

3. These households in such cases had heat purchased retention devices that are not manufactured by Wonderbag. These devices are not used for cooking by the households, as their thermal insulation is insufficient. The households indicated that they use these bags purely to keep food warm and use their Wonderbag for cooking. The emission reductions are only calculated for the use of the Wonderbag and do not consider any potential reductions through the use of devices sold by other entities.

Documentation provided by PP

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

1. PP has submitted a detailed explanation on the applicability of the Free Basic Electricity (FBE) policy and clarified why Wonderbag continues to be used in households that receive free or informal electricity supplies. The justification provided such as support in staying within the FBE limit, avoiding additional electricity costs, timesaving and safety advantages, and lowering the risk of electricity trips from high current use is considered reasonable. The same has been seen during on site audit. **Hence, CL is closed.**
2. PP has clarified that emission reductions are calculated based on Wonderbag distributed rather than per household. **Hence CL is closed.**
3. VVB has assessed the PP response and found that the number of extra Wonderbag was not in project list. During on site audit, VVB observed that households are also buying wonder bags from market. **Hence, CL is closed.**

¹ Source: <https://www.eskom.co.za/distribution/free-basic-electricity/#:~:text=Free%20basic%20municipal%20services%20are.in%20their%20respective%20indigent%20policies.>

² See page 76 of the PDF: <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://pari.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Hungry-for-Electricity-Digi-19092022.pdf>

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

Table 2. CARs from this Verification

CAR ID	01	Section no.	KPI	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				
1. In the KPI of the MR, PP shall delete the template instructions. 2. Page number from entire MR is missing 3. Contents of the monitoring report is not in line with VCS monitoring report template, version 4.4. 4. In the VCS MR, the emission reduction values are not represented in vintage form. PP shall re-present the value in vintage form throughout the VCS MR. 5. In section 1.2 of the VCS MR, the 2nd MP duration is written 1 year, and 4th is written 2 years but the duration is 1.1 years and 2.3 years respectively. PP shall mention exact duration with months. 6. In section 1.3 of the VCS MR, PP shall mention sectoral scope number.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
1. The template instructions have been deleted from the cover page. 2. The MR has been corrected to include page numbers. 3. The table of contents and headings have been corrected to align with the template. 4. The MR has been revised to represent all emission reduction values in vintage form. The table in question was included purely as a comparative indication for each project activity instance and has been removed. The template comparison table has been applied for the overall comparison of ex ante and ex post emission reductions. 5. Section 1.2 has been revised to include months. 6. The sectoral scope number has been included in section 1.3.				
Documentation provided by PP				
Monitoring Report v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. PP has removed the template instructions from the KPI section.
2. PP has added page numbers throughout the MR.
3. PP has updated the table of contents and headings to follow the VCS MR template.
4. PP has revised the MR to present emission reduction values in vintage form.
5. PP has corrected the monitoring period durations to include the exact number of months.
6. PP has added the sectoral scope number in Section 1.3.

Hence, CAR is closed.

CAR ID	02	Section no.	1.12 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				
1. In table 1 of section 1.12 of the MR, the SDG indicator is not in line with UN SDG indicator. PP shall use appropriate SDG indicators. Further, as per section 1.12 of the monitoring report v4.4 template, "Evidence of the project's SD contributions shall be provided as appendices to the MR. "Accordingly, PP needs to provide evidence of the SD contributions as appendices to the MR. 2. In table 1 of the section 1.12, PP mentioned that "By supplying Wonderbag and the use thereof, there was a reduction in the requirements for using cooking fuels and thus monetary spending as a result, of ZAR 890,059,993." PP shall provide evidence. 3. Section 1.12 does not meet VCS MR template requirements. It lacks a brief summary of SD activities conducted during the monitoring period, does not specify activity locations, and fails to explain how these activities led to the SDG contributions in Table 1. The PP shall revise to include these elements as required.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. Where appropriate the evidence has been included in the Appendix 2. Please note that due to the POPIA regulations, not all evidence can be placed in the appendix as it contains personal information. POPIA prohibits publishing personal information in the public domain without prior consent.
2. This is a calculated value based on the survey results and the average 2024 Eskom residential electricity tariff and the average 2024 LPG price. The calculation can be seen on the SDG Impacts tab of the Emission Reduction Calculations spreadsheet.
3. The summary has been refined in Section 1.12 to comply with the template requirements.

Documentation provided by PP

Monitoring Report v2

RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v2

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

1. VVB has assessed the updated MR and ER sheet and found that the PP has updated the SDG indicators in section 1.12 of the MR in line with the SD Vista submitted under ID 2384. For SDG 1, 12, and 15, the PP mentioned that they cannot provide evidence due to privacy reasons, but they have provided declaration. **Hence, CAR is closed.**
2. PP has provided the monetary savings value based on survey data and average 2024 Eskom residential electricity and LPG prices. The calculation is provided in 'SDG Impacts' tab of the ex-post ER Calculations spreadsheet. **Hence, CAR is closed.**
3. PP has revised Section 1.12 to include a summary of SD activities and align with template requirements. **Hence, CAR is closed.**

CAR ID	03	Section no.	1.12 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. Section 1.12 of the MR is not in compliance with the Monitoring Report Template v4.4. PP shall clarify this inconsistency and revise the section accordingly.
2. In Table 1 of the MR, the SDG target numbers and SDG target indicators have not been presented as per the prescribed template format. PP shall update the table to align with the requirements of the Monitoring Report Template v4.4.
3. PP shall provide all supporting evidence for the SDG impacts mentioned in the MR to substantiate the reported outcomes.

Project Proponent response	Date: 02/12/2025
1. Section 1.12 has been revised to fully comply with the template. 2. The SDG target numbers and indicators have been aligned as per the template. The indicators selected are not official SDG indicators, as such there are no specific target numbers to include. 3. Please refer to the tab 'SDG Impacts' in the 'ex post ER Calculations' spreadsheet for the calculation of all the impacts. The supporting evidence is as follows: a. Time savings: Calculation based on survey results. Refer to Ex post emission reductions spreadsheet b. Reduced monetary spend: Survey results, electricity price (Eskom Tariff-booklet), LPG price average of 2024 Coastal prices (https://fuelsindustry.org.za/consumer-information/fuel-prices-current-past/) The provided weblink is for an industry association which publishes the average retail price of fuels in South Africa including petrol, diesel and LPG. c. Community donations: Folder titled 'Donations' d. Entrepreneurs: File titled 'Entrepreneurs List 2023-2024 (1)' e. Foam recycled: File titled 'Foam 2023-2025 (1)' f. Emission reductions: Ex post emission reduction calculations spreadsheet g. Biomass savings: Calculation based on survey results. Refer to Ex post emission reductions spreadsheet	
Documentation provided by PP	

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

Monitoring Report v2
RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v2
Eskom Tariff-booklet
Entrepreneurs List 2023-2024 (1
Foam 2023-2025 (1)
Donations
VVB assessment
Date: 08/12/2025
1. PP has revised Section 1.12 of the MR, and the updated section now complies with the requirements of the Monitoring Report Template v4.4. Hence, CAR is closed. 2. PP has updated Table 1 to align with the prescribed template format. Hence, CAR is closed. 3. For SDG 1, 12, and 15, the PP mentioned that they cannot provide evidence due to privacy reasons but they have provided declaration. Hence, CAR is closed

CAR ID	04	Section no.	3.2 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				
In section 4.2 of MR, the value reported for the parameter ly is inconsistent with the ER sheet.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
The value for ly has been revised to be consistent between the calculations and the MR.				
Documentation provided by PP				
User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

For the ER calculations for 2023, 2024, and 2025, the PP has used the parameter I_y derived from 2025 data. This approach may compromise the conservativeness of the emission reduction estimates. **Hence, CAR is closed**

CAR ID	05	Section no.	MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				
There are a few areas that require formatting corrections to align with the VCS MR template, particularly the date format along with editorial consistency and spacing issues throughout the report. Further, page number is missing throughout the document.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
The dates in the MR have been revised and page numbers added to the document. Spacing has been corrected.				
Documentation provided by PP				
Monitoring Report v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025
PP has corrected the date formats, added page numbers, and resolved spacing and formatting inconsistencies in the MR. Hence CL is closed.				

CAR ID	06	Section no.	ER Sheet	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				
In ER sheet, tab Emission Reduction Summary the start and end date of monitoring period is reported inconsistently.				
PP shall rectify the same.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
The start and end dates have been correctly reported in the ex post ER sheet.				
Documentation provided by PP				

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

RfC 4th MR ex post calcs v2	
VVB assessment	Date: 08/12/2025
PP has corrected the start and end dates in the Emission Reduction Summary tab of the ER sheet. Hence CAR 06 is closed.	

CAR ID	07	Section no.	1.1 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				
As per Section 1.1 of MR 1. In the summary of implemented activities, only nineteen small-scale projects are mentioned, with no information provided on any newly added instances. 2. It is reported that 439,910 Wonderbags were distributed during this monitoring period; however, it is unclear whether this figure represents the cumulative total of Wonderbags distributed since the project start date or only those distributed within the current monitoring period.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
1. Following communication from Verra, only the nineteen existing instances have been accounted for in the fourth monitoring period. References to new project activity instance inclusions have been removed. 2. Section 1.1 has been revised to make the number of Wonderbags clearer. No new bags have now been included in this monitoring period. Thereafter the new total 355,930 Wonderbags were all distributed and included in previous monitoring periods and were fully active in this monitoring period.				
Documentation provided by PP				
Monitoring Report v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

1. PP has revised Section 1.1 to reflect only the nineteen existing project activity instances, as per guidance from Verra. **Hence Car is closed.**
2. PP has clarified that no new Wonderbags were distributed during this monitoring period and that the total of 355,930 bags reflects distributions from previous periods. **Hence, CAR is closed.**

CAR ID	08	Section no.	4.3 of MR	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of CAR				
Section 5.3 is not in compliance with most recent monitoring report template.				
Project Proponent response				Date: 02/12/2025
Section 5.3 has been revised.				
Documentation provided by PP				
Monitoring Report v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025
PP has revised Section 5.3 in line with the latest monitoring report template. Hence, CAR 08 is closed.				

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

Table 3. FARs from previous validation and/or previous Verification

FAR ID	01	Section no.		Date: 29/10/2025
Description of FAR				
With reference to finding #1(2) raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2; for all the future verifications, the verifying VVB shall ensure that PP has established the following through surveys: 1. Duration of cooking food on baseline stove before placing it in Wonderbag. 2. How the end-user determines that the food is ready to be transferred into the Wonderbag. 3. If the end-users cook entirely on the baseline stove and use Wonderbag just to keep the food warm throughout the day.				
Project Proponents response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

The User Habit Survey conducted for the current monitoring period included these questions. Please see columns BU (Verra #1 cooking time), BV (Verra item #2 determining if the food is ready) and BX (Verra item #3 use to cook or just to keep food warm) on the tabs 'Firewood', 'Gas' and 'Electricity' in the User Habit Survey 4 Analysis Excel, for the question and responses by fuel type.

The results from the survey questions #1 and #3 above are incorporated as follows into the ex post ER calculations:

- **Duration of cooking food on baseline stove before placing it in Wonderbag:** used to calculate project emissions associated with the project stove, where these project stoves are either electric or LPG.
- **If the end-users cook entirely on the baseline stove and use Wonderbag just to keep the food warm throughout the day:** users who reported that they only use the Wonderbag to keep food warm, i.e. do not use the bags as intended for actual cooking purposes, were recorded as 'non-users'. Accordingly, these inputs reduce the total usage rates.

Documentation provided by PP

User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

VVB has assessed the User Habit Survey conducted during the current monitoring period between 21 July 2025 and 09 September 2025. In the survey, PP has included all three questions mentioned in FAR#1(2). PP has interviewed 601 users mentioned in 4.3 of the updated MR.

1. In the User Habit Survey, in row BN of 'Raw tab', PP has mentioned the question "How many minutes does your pot spend on average on the stove cooking before going into the Wonderbag?" as per users response on an average 30 mins takes before going into the Wonderbag.
2. In row BO of 'Raw tab', PP has asked question like "How do you know when the food is ready to be transferred to the Wonderbag?" Following responses received from users

Total HHs	601	
Responses from HHs	Quantity	%ge
After a certain amount of time	113	19%
By the smell of the food	143	24%
I follow the instructions in the recipe book	5	1%
I just know from trying myself	49	8%
Other, please specify in the notes.	1	0%
Someone showed me / I watched someone else	4	1%
When I see that it is boiling	286	48%

3. In row BQ of 'Raw tab', PP has asked question like "Do you use the Wonderbag to keep food warm?" Following responses received from users

Total HHs	601
-----------	-----

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

Responses from HHs	Quantity	%ge
Yes, I cook entirely on the stove and use the Wonderbag ONLY for keeping food warm?	47	8%
Yes, I use it to finish cooking my food AND to keep the food warm?	548	91%
I do not use the Wonderbag to keep food warm. I cook and we eat as soon as it is ready.	6	1%

Hence, FAR 01 is closed.

FAR ID	02	Section no.		Date: 29/10/2025
Description of FAR				
During the next monitoring survey, PP shall demonstrate compliance with monitoring requirements with respect to 'operational hours' set out in §40 of the applied methodology AMS-II.C version 15.				
Project Proponents response				Date: 02/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

As per the allowance granted by Verra (see file titled ‘VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025’) this FAR was deferred on the condition that a direct monitoring pilot study was conducted. The direct monitoring pilot study was conducted, the results of which can be seen in the file ‘2025-09-11 Community Kitchen Cooking’.

Verra specified various requirements when conducting the direct monitoring pilot study. Accordingly, section 3.2.1 of the MR expands on the following Verra requirements, under a subheading titled ‘DEVIATIONS APPLIED FOR IN THIS MONITORING PERIOD’:

- An outline of the data recording method and calibration practices for the selected monitoring method
- Data obtained during the pilot survey
- Analysis of pilot survey data.

In summary of the analysis of pilot survey data:

As per the requirements of FAR 06 arising from the previous verification, the data results from the direct measurement pilot survey were compared to the values established through the latest User Habit Survey conducted for the fourth monitoring period. The value established through direct measurement were found to be higher than the values established in the latest user habit survey. Accordingly, no retroactive application to the emission reduction calculations is required, because it has been demonstrated that no over-issuance of VCUs has occurred with respect to the past or present assumptions used to calculate the emission reductions from the use of Wonderbags in households that use electric project stoves.

Documentation provided by PP

VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025’

2025-09-11 Community Kitchen Cooking

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025



VVB has assessed the PP response and found that as per the allowance granted by Verra (see file titled 'VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025'), PP has conducted direct monitoring pilot study, PP has explained in section 3.1 of the MR. PP has also conducted cooking demonstration with electric heater and wonderbag in their manufacture facility, result as follow:

COMMUNITY KITCHEN DEMO
STOVE ONLY
5 NOVEMBER 2025

User No	User Name	Bag SAC No 1	Bag SAC No 2	Food Type	Photo	No of People
1	ZAMILE	N/A	N/A	Chicken & Rice	Y	4

Meter Time Start	Photo	Meter Time Finish	Photo	Total Cooking Time	Meter kWh Start	Meter kWh Finish	Total kWh Used	Cost
0.00	Y	34:25	✓	34:25	0.00	0.757	0.757	2.41

34 min 25 sec • 34 min 25 0.757 kWh R2.41
5/11/2025

Hence, FAR 02 is closed.

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

FAR ID	03	Section no.		Date: 29/10/2025
Description of FAR				
With reference to finding #3(3) raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2, for the next monitoring survey, verifying VVB shall ensure that PP demonstrates compliance with § 18(a) of CDM Survey Sampling Standard, version 8, in case of survey results not meeting the minimum required precision level.				
Project Proponents response				Date: 02/12/2025
Compliance with this FAR has been demonstrated, as indicated in the tab titled Analysis, in the User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2 Excel. The minimum precision threshold of 10% has been meet for all three fuels surveyed.				
Documentation provided by PP				
User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2				
VVB assessment				Date: 08/12/2025

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

The VVB has reviewed the sampling analysis submitted by the Project Participant (PP), including the calculations of mean values, standard deviation, standard error, confidence factor, and resulting precision. Based on the dataset provided, the following observations are made:

1. Confidence Level Verification

The PP has applied a confidence factor of approximately 1.96, corresponding to a 95% confidence level. This is consistent with the requirements of the CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of v4, which requires the PP to apply statistically appropriate confidence factors when determining confidence intervals. Further, the use of the normal distribution value ($z \approx 1.96$) is appropriate given the large sample sizes, in line with CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of v4

2. Precision Requirement Verification

The VVB confirms that the derived precision values meet the minimum requirement stipulated in §12 of the CDM Survey & Sampling Standard v9, which requires relative precision to be within the defined threshold (commonly $\pm 10\%$).

The observed precision values are:

- Electricity : **7.73%**
- Gas : **8.49%**
- Wood : **4.12%**

All monitored parameters are therefore compliant with the minimum precision requirement.

3. Assessment of §18(a) CDM standard, v9

In line with the requirement of the §18(a) CDM standard, v9 PP has taken motet samples i.e. 601 samples to meet the precision requirement.

Based on the current monitoring results, the PP's sampling approach and precision demonstration are considered adequate, and no further action is required for this finding.

Hence, FAR 03 is closed.

FAR ID	04	Section no.		Date: 29/10/2025
Description of FAR				

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

With reference to finding #1(1) raised by VERRA during PRR round 2, for the next periodic verification, the verifying VVB shall ensure that the grouped project seeks project deviation either through revision of applied methodologies or through the use of a new methodology entirely before the next verification of the project. Before the deviation is finalised, the project cannot add any new project instance or new Wonder Bag sales to the database of the existing instances.	
Project Proponents response	Date: 02/12/2025
Verra has deferred this FAR for the 4th monitoring period as the revision to VM0050 is underway. No new project activity instances have been included in this monitoring report.	
Documentation provided by PP	
VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025	
VVB assessment	Date: 08/12/2025
VVB reviewed the updated MR and ER sheet and Verra email and found that Verra has deferred this FAR for the 4th monitoring period as the revision to VM0050 is underway. From MR and PP responses no new instance are added. Hence, FAR 04 is closed.	

FAR ID	05	Section no.		Date: 29/10/2025
Description of FAR				
With reference to finding #2(2) raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2, for the next periodic verification, the user habit survey shall be carried to determine different types of stoves used by wonderbag users, their exact capacities and their average time of use. Measurement surveys shall also be carried out for all other fuel types.				

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

Project Proponents response	Date: 02/12/2025
The stove type, time of use and capacity was added to the user habit survey. In addition, measurements were conducted for the other fuels. Please refer to tabs 'Firewood', 'Gas' and 'Electricity' in the User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2 Excel. The relevant columns in each tab are: Stove type: BQ Capacity: BS Cooking time: BU	
Documentation provided by PP	
User Habit Survey 4 analysis v2	
VVB assessment	Date: 08/12/2025
VVB has assessed the user habit survey report and found that PP has included the following question in their survey 1. What stove do you normally cook on ? (Refer Cell BJ in Row tab) 2. If an electric or gas stove is selected. Provide the stove power rating from the nameplate. (Refer Cell BL in Row tab) 3. How many minutes does your pot spend on average on the stove cooking before going into the Wonderbag? (Refer Cell BN in Row tab) Since, PP has included the required question. Hence FAR 05 is closed.	

 Carbon CHECK	Draft Desk Review Findings	Revised: September 2020
--	----------------------------	-------------------------

FAR ID	06	Section no.	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of FAR			
With reference to finding #4 raised by VERRA during the PRR round 2, for the next periodic verification, PP shall monitor the value of operating hours through direct measurement. PP shall compare the value established through direct measurement during the next MP with the value established during the current MP. If the value established through direct measurement is found to be lower, PP shall retroactively apply the lower value to the emission reduction calculations of current MP and deduct the overissued VCUs for the current MP from the VCUs determined during the next MP.			
Project Proponents response			Date: 02/12/2025
As per the allowance granted by Verra (see file titled 'VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025') this FAR was deferred on the condition that a direct monitoring pilot study was conducted. The pilot study was conducted, the results of which can be seen in the file '2025-09-11 Community Kitchen Cooking'. Section 3.2.1 of the MR expands on the Verra requirements related to the direct monitoring pilot study, under a subheading titled 'DEVIATIONS APPLIED FOR IN THIS MONITORING PERIOD'. In summary of the results: the results of the pilot study for cooking time with the Wonderbag was lower than the average value established through the User Habit Survey. As a result, the User Habit Survey value has been applied as it is more conservative and results in higher project emissions. No recalculation of previous emission reductions has therefore been done.			
Documentation provided by PP			
VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025 2025-09-11 Community Kitchen Cooking			

VVB assessment

Date: 08/12/2025

VVB has assessed the PP response and found that as per the allowance granted by Verra (see file titled 'VCS_Allowance_Granted_2384_2JUN2025'), PP has conducted direct monitoring pilot study, PP has explained in section 3.1 of the MR. PP has also conducted cooking demonstration with electric heater and wonderbag in their manufacture facility, result as follow:

COMMUNITY KITCHEN DEMO
STOVE ONLY
5 NOVEMBER 2025

User No	User Name	Bag SAC No 1	Bag SAC No 2	Food Type	Photo	No of People
1	ZAMILE	N/A	N/A	Chicken & Rice	Y	4

Meter Time Start	Photo	Meter Time Finish	Photo	Total Cooking Time	Meter kWh Start	Meter kWh Finish	Total kWh Used	Cost
0.00	Y	34m25s	✓	34m25	0.00	0.737	0.737	2.41

34mins 25secs • 34mins 25 0.737 kWh R2.41

 5/11/2025

Hence, FAR 06 is closed.

Table 4. FARs for Future VVB

FAR ID	01	Section no.	Date: 29/10/2025
Description of FAR			
The Next/future VVBs shall verify and confirm during subsequent verification activities, that the project database does not contain any duplicate entries. VVB shall ensure that adequate measures and controls are in place and effectively implemented by the PP to prevent duplication, and that evidence of such checks is appropriately documented.			

APPENDIX 5: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

Row number	SDG target	SDG indicator	Net impact on SDG indicator	Current project contributions	Contributions over project lifetime	VVB Assessment
1)	1.0	Reduced time (hours) spent on cooking, using a Wonderbag	Implemented activities to decrease	The use of Wonderbags for cooking reduces the amount of time used for both collecting cooking fuel, especially wood, and for cooking, compared to the baseline scenario. The baseline scenario is cooking without the use of a Wonderbag. This is a highly valued benefit for the household as fuel collectors, particularly when collecting wood, and cooks now add productive time to their working day. The value has only been monitored for electricity and this is the first monitoring period it has been quantified. A total of 75,213,612 hours were saved for electricity users in this monitoring period. This equates to 134 hours per household each year.	Since monitoring of this SD Impacts began in the current, fourth monitoring period, there has been a reduction in 75,213,612 hours of cooking specifically for users cooking with electricity.	VVB has assessed the updated monitoring survey and found the value in line.

Row number	SDG target	SDG indicator	Net impact on SDG indicator	Current project contributions	Contributions over project lifetime	VVB Assessment
2)	1.0	Reduced monetary (ZAR) spending on cooking fuels	Implemented activities to decrease	By supplying Wonderbags and the use thereof, there was a reduction in the requirements for using electricity and LPG cooking fuels and thus monetary spending as a result, of ZAR 725,800,121	Since monitoring of SD impacts began for VCS, by supplying Wonderbags and the use thereof, there was a reduction in the requirements for using electricity and LPG cooking fuels and thus monetary spending as a result, of ZAR 958,232,450	VVB has assessed the SDG 1 calculation and evidence provided by PP/16/. VVB confirm the calculation
3)	1.0	Reduction in poverty through provision of economic resources	Implemented activities to decrease	Donations made to communities in need totalled ZAR 418,406.	Since monitoring of SD impacts began for VCS, donations made to communities in need totalled ZAR 1,270,621.	VVB has assessed SDG 1 calculation and declaration provided by PP/16/. VVB confirm the calculation

Row number	SDG target	SDG indicator	Net impact on SDG indicator	Current project contributions	Contributions over project lifetime	VVB Assessment
4)	8.0	Number of entrepreneurs, champions/ data monitors that are created within the Wonderbag eco-system	Implemented activities to increase	156 entrepreneurs were employed during the monitoring period.	683 entrepreneurs have been created since monitoring of this impact started on the project.	VVB has assessed declaration provided by PP/14/. VVB confirm the entrepreneurs have been created since monitoring of this impact started on the project
5)	12.0	Tonnes of recycled foam used in the manufacturing of Wonderbags	Implemented activities to increase	During the monitoring period, 82 tonnes of recycled foam was used for manufacturing Wonderbags.	Since monitoring of SD impacts began for VCS started, 191 tonnes of recycled foam have been used in the manufacturing of Wonderbags.	VVB has assessed the quantity details of Foam /09/ to confirm the PP stated weight.
6)	13.0	Tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions avoided or removed	Implemented activities to increase	During the monitoring period, the total emission reductions for the project were calculated as 434,924 tCO _{2e} . After adjusting the over issued ERs 31,622 tCO _{2e} during MP 1, MP 2 and MP3, resulting total 403,302 tCO _{2e} emission reductions	Since monitoring of SD impacts began for VCS, 893,487 tCO _{2e} in emission reductions have been calculated.	VVB has assessed the ER calculation sheet/2/ to confirm the value.



Row number	SDG target	SDG indicator	Net impact on SDG indicator	Current project contributions	Contributions over project lifetime	VVB Assessment
7)	15	Tonnes of avoided biomass combustion	Implemented activities to increase	The use of Wonderbags in communities has led to approximately 370,906 tonnes of avoided biomass use that would otherwise have been combusted.	Since monitoring of SD impacts began for VCS, the use of Wonderbags in communities has led to approximately 455,641 tonnes of avoided biomass use that would otherwise have been combusted.	VVB has assessed the updated monitoring survey and found the value in line.