Final Audit Report

Audited Bodies	
Puro.earth Project Proponent	GECA Environnement
Name of Contact for Puro.earth Project Proponent	Melissa Leung
Production Facility Operator	Oregon Biochar Solutions
Name of Contact for Production Facility Operator	Karl Strahl
Production Facility name	Oregon Biochar
Production Facility ID	753518
Production Facility Location	White City, Oregon – United States

Audit Description	
Type of Audit	Output Audit
Number of CORCs under Audit	7,022.50
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	0.00
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	6,090.24
Tonnes of dry biochar used under Audit	6,090.24
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	0.00
CORC conversion factor under Audit	1.153 tCO_2e per tonne dry biochar
Reporting Period Covered by Audit	1 November 2023 to 30 September 2024
Objective of Audit Engagement	Provide assurance opinion against requirements of Puro.earth General Rules (Version 3.1)
Date of Auditor Engagement	23 September 2025
Date of Audit Report Submission	17 November 2025

Audit Outcomes	
Number of eligible CORCs	6,925.49 (Stream A: 3,476.92, Stream B: 3,448.57)
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	0.00
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	6,077.71 (Stream A: 1,958.54, Stream B: 4,119.17)
Tonnes of eligible dry biochar used	6,077.71 (Stream A: 1,958.54, Stream B: 4,119.17)
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	0.00
CORC conversion factor (Stream A)	1.775261164 tCO_2e per tonne dry biochar
CORC conversion factor (Stream B)	0.837200213 tCO_2e per tonne dry biochar
CORC conversion factor (all streams)	1.139490038 tCO_2e per tonne dry biochar
Calculation Method	Biochar Methodology Edition 2022 v3

Auditing Body	
Auditor	EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd
Lead Auditor	Rodrigo Pardo
Additional Audit Personnel	Thais Monteiro Voll, Juanita Suarez Perez
Peer Reviewer	Katherine Simmons

This document details the nature and scope of the services provided by a member of EnergyLink Services in respect of the eligibility of the CO_2 Removal Supplier Production Facility under the requirements of Biochar Methodology v3.0 (Edition 2022) and the Puro.earth General Rules (Version 3.1).

This document is issued to Puro.earth detailing audit procedures conducted and the auditor's opinion in relation to the eligibility of the Production Facility. It should not be used for any other purpose.

Because of the inherent limitations in any internal control structure, it is possible that fraud, error, or non-compliance with laws and rules may occur and not be detected. Further, the audit was not designed to detect all weakness or errors in internal controls so far as they relate to the requirements set out above as the audit has not been performed continuously throughout the period and the procedures performed on the relevant internal controls were on a test basis. Any projection of the evaluation of control procedures to future periods is subject to the risk that the procedures may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with them may deteriorate.

The audit opinion expressed in this report has been formed on the above basis.

Copies of relevant documentation are available on the Puro.earth website: puro.earth

COMMERCIAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Version Control Record

Project Number – J0750				
Document File Name	Date Issued	Version	Lead Auditor	Peer Reviewer
20251117 Oregon Biochar Final Audit Report 2025 vF.0	17 November 2025	vF.0	Rodrigo Pardo Patron	Katherine Simmons

Contents

Abbreviation	Description
'H'	Hydrogen
'O'	Oxygen
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CORC	CO_2 Removal Certificate
C_{org}	Organic Carbon
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
OC	Overcalculation
UC	Undercalculation
Stream A	Roge or Powder biochar used for agricultural purposes
Stream B	Biochar screenings sent to landfill
The Puro Rules	The Puro Standard General Rules v3.1
The Biochar Methodology	Edition 2022 v3

PART A: Auditor's Report

To: Puro.earth

Dear Sir / Madam,

EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd (EnergyLink) were engaged to perform a reasonable assurance audit of Oregon Biochar Solutions' CO_2 removal calculation for the reporting period covered by the audit, from 1 November 2023 to 30 September 2024, against the eligibility requirements of 'the Puro Standard General Rules v3.1' (hereafter referred to as "the Puro Rules").

Details of Audited Bodies

Puro.earth Project Proponent	GECA Environnement
Production Facility Operator	Oregon Biochar Solutions
Production Facility name	Oregon Biochar Solutions
Production Facility ID	753518
Production Facility location	2350 Avenue G, White City – Oregon, United States

Responsibility of the Audited Bodies' Management

The management of the audited bodies (i.e. GECA Environnement and Oregon Biochar Solutions) are responsible for the application of the requirements of 'Biochar Methodology Edition 2022 v3' (hereafter referred to as "the Biochar Methodology") in quantifying CO_2 Removal Certificates (CORCs) from the production of biochar, which is reflected in the proof provided to EnergyLink Services.

The management of the audited bodies are responsible for preparation and presentation of the evidence in accordance with Section 5 the Biochar Methodology. This responsibility includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal controls relevant to the preparation and presentation of proofs that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Our independence and quality control

EnergyLink Services have complied with the relevant ethical requirements relating to assurance engagements, which include independence and other requirements founded on fundamental principles of integrity, objectivity, professional competence, due care, confidentiality, and professional behaviour. These include all the requirements defined in the *Fortum – Supplier Code of Conduct*[1]. EnergyLink Services and the verification team declare no conflict of interest with the audited bodies for this engagement.

Furthermore, EnergyLink Services maintains a comprehensive system of quality control including documented policies and procedures regarding compliance with ethical requirements, professional standards, and applicable legal and regulatory requirements, in accordance with *ISQC 1 Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Reports and Other Financial Information.*

[1] Fortum (2020), Fortum – Supplier Code of Conduct, available at: www.fortum.com/about-us/contact-us/suppliers/code-of-conduct

Our responsibility

EnergyLink's responsibility is to express an opinion on the audited bodies' quantification of CORCs and compliance with the *Puro Rules* based on the procedures we have performed and the evidence we have obtained.

We have conducted a reasonable assurance engagement in accordance with the *Puro Rules* and relevant international standards, as listed below:

- International Standards on Assurance Engagements ISAE 3000 Assurance Engagements other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information.
- ISQC 1 Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Reports and Other Financial Information, and Other Assurance Engagement.

A reasonable assurance engagement in accordance with relevant international standards involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about the Production Facility process controls and quantification of CORCs in accordance with the Puro Rules. The nature, timing and extent of procedures selected depend on the assurance practitioner's judgement, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, we considered internal controls relevant to the audited bodies' preparation of proofs. We believe that the assurance evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our assurance conclusion.

Summary of procedures undertaken

The procedures we conducted in our reasonable assurance engagement included:

- reviewing evidence provided by the audited bodies;
- assessing the audited bodies against eligibility criteria;
- conducting interviews and a virtual site visit to validate the evidence provided;
- analysing procedures that the audited bodies used to gather data;
- testing of calculations that the audited bodies performed; and
- identifying and testing assumptions supporting the calculations.

Use of our reasonable assurance engagement report

This audit report has been prepared for use by the audited bodies and Puro.earth for the sole purpose of reporting on the audited bodies' quantification of CORCs and compliance with the *Puro Rules*. Accordingly, EnergyLink Services expressly disclaim and do not accept any responsibility or liability to any party other than Puro.earth and the audited bodies for any consequences of reliance on this report for any purpose.

Inherent limitations

There are inherent limitations in performing assurance audits - for example, assurance engagements are based on selective testing of the information being examined - and because of this, it is possible that fraud, error, or non-compliance may occur and not be detected. An assurance engagement is not designed to detect all misstatements, as an assurance engagement is not performed continuously throughout the period that is the subject of the engagement, and the procedures performed are based on a test basis. The conclusion expressed in this report has been formed on the above basis.

Additionally, non-financial data may be subject to more inherent limitations than financial data, given both its nature and the methods used for determining, calculating, and sampling or estimating such data.

Corrective Action Requests / Recommendations

During the audit process, the auditor issued three (3) corrective action requests, which were addressed during the course of the audit. Further, the auditor issued one (1) recommendation to be implemented by the next audit and one (1) suggestion for improvement.

Corrective Action Request 1: Distance to End Users

Oregon Biochar estimated the transportation distance of biochar to the end users based on historical data. The auditor identified discrepancies between the customer's ZIP codes and the States reported in the biochar sales data. Moreover, the auditor identified discrepancies between the customer address and the shipping address reported in some invoices. The auditor requested Oregon Biochar to review the biochar sales and transportation data.

As a result, the biochar transportation distance was corrected from 2,701.46 km to 2,891.75 km, an increase of 190.29 km (7%). Moreover, the total dry weight of the sold biochar was corrected from 1,971.07 tonnes of dry mass to 1,958.54 tonnes of dry mass, a decrease of 12.53 tonnes (0.6%).

These errors resulted in the over-calculation of 75 CORCs.

Corrective Action Request 2: Natural Gas Consumption

Oregon Biochar calculated the natural gas consumption for the reactor start based on natural gas invoices. The auditor identified a discrepancy between the total therms[2] used for the fuel consumption calculations and those listed in the invoices. Therefore, Oregon Biochar was requested to review the natural gas invoices and correct the total natural gas consumed. Upon review, the fuel consumed from natural gas was corrected from 95,250.61 kWh to 93,088.71 kWh, a decrease of 2.3%.

This error resulted in the over-calculation of 22 CORCs.

Corrective Action Request 3: CORC Report Summary

The auditor requested Oregon Biochar to provide two separate CORC Report Summaries for Stream A and Stream B to facilitate the calculation of the total number of eligible CORCs for each stream and their respective CORC factor. Oregon Biochar provided both summaries accordingly.

Recommendation 1: Record Keeping (Biochar Transportation Records)

Finding:

Because of the findings described in Corrective Action Request 1, the auditor has issued the following recommendation, to be assessed in the next audit.

Recommendation

EnergyLink recommends that Oregon Biochar augment its quality assurance and record keeping procedures to ensure that sales records contain accurate information related to the transportation distances of the biochar to the end users and the total tonnes of dry biochar used.

[2] Therms is a unit of heat, 1 therm is equivalent to 100,000 BTU or 29.3 kWh.

Suggestion for Improvement 1: Laboratory Results

Observation

At the time of audit, Oregon Biochar had laboratory tests done every three (3) months. Oregon Biochar provided four (4) lab results for the rogue biochar, including one (1) lab result for powder rogue biochar and three (3) lab results for the rogue biochar. Additionally, Oregon Biochar provided three (3) lab results for the biochar screenings for the reporting period.

Nevertheless, the auditor noted one of the lab tests was received by the laboratory on 4 November 2024, just outside of the reporting period. Oregon Biochar noted that whilst they took the sample during the reporting period, however, because the chain of custody documentation was incorrectly filled out, Oregon Biochar was unable to provide definitive proof of when the sample was collected. Although the auditor accepted the validity of the laboratory test result, this issue highlighted an area for improvement.

Suggestion for improvement

The auditor suggests Oregon Biochar strengthen its procedures for documenting chain of custody, ensuring that all sample collection dates are accurately recorded and traceable. This will help to avoid similar discrepancies in future audits and support the integrity of the reporting process.

Overall Conclusion

Positive Conclusion (Production Output Audit)

Production Output Verification Audit

The lead auditor is able to express a reasonable assurance opinion that, in all material respects, the quantification of **6,925.49 CO_2 Removal Certificates (CORCs)** by Oregon Biochar for the reporting period 1 November 2023 to 30 September 2024 is correct. The auditor identified that the eligible CORC quantity has been calculated in accordance with the Puro Standard General Rules v3.1 and all eligibility requirements have been met. A summary of the CORCs under audit is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Audited CORCs summary.

Biochar	CORCs Under Audit	Abs. Error (CORCs)	Net Error (CORCs)	Eligible CORCs	Abs. Error Rate (%)	Net Error Rate (%)
Stream A (Rogue)	3,573.72	97	97 OC	3,476.92	2.715%	-2.715%
Stream B (Screens)	3,448.78	0	0	3,448.57	0.000%	0.000%
Total	7,022.5	97	97 OC	6,925.49	1.381	-1.381

*OC = Overcalculation / UC = Undercalculation

The auditor notes the misstatements in the matter being audited are not pervasive enough to affect the matter being audited as a whole, and the quantitative error is not considered material as it is below the materiality threshold of 5%.

Sincerely,

Rodrigo PARDO PATRON | Director of Engineering
EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd
Lead Auditor
17 November 2025

Part B: Detailed Findings

Audit Findings and Conclusions

Table 2 to Table 5 summarises the findings from the Production Output Audit. As part of the audit procedures, the auditor performed interviews with site representatives and a virtual site visit to the Production Facility. Where possible, the findings from these procedures were used to validate that the eligibility criteria under the methodology had been met, that the proofs and evidence provided by the audited bodies were accurate, and that the metering used to quantify the Output was appropriate and correctly calibrated (for details refer to Appendix B).

Eligibility Assessment

Table 2: Eligibility Assessment

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the biochar is used in applications other than energy.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the primary biochar (Stream A) was transported to be used for agricultural purposes. Additionally, the auditor confirmed the biochar screenings (Stream B) were sent to landfill.	N/A
Confirm that the biochar is produced from sustainable forest or waste biomass raw materials.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the biochar was produced mainly from waste biomass raw materials. Moreover, the auditor confirmed through the evidence provided by Oregon Biochar that the portion of feedstock used for biochar production that was sourced from forestry and wood processing (waste, landscape chips, and chip fines), was derived from sustainable raw materials.	N/A

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the producer demonstrates net-negativity with results from a LCA that shows: – [A1 Biomass and A2 Transport of biomass] carbon footprint of the biomass production and supply. – [A3 Production] emissions from the biochar production process. – [A4 Transport of biochar to site] carbon footprint of the biochar end use. – [B1 Application and use] cradle to grave.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the LCA provided by Oregon Biochar included all information relating to the biochar life cycle from biomass harvesting and transportation to the end-use of both streams. The auditor noted that: - Stream A, which was the rouge or primary biochar, was used for agricultural purposes; and - Stream B, which was the biochar screenings and were all sent to landfill, together with ash.	N/A
Confirm that the biochar production process meets requirements 1.1.4 to 1.1.6 of the Biochar Methodology, namely that: – It has considered the emissions related to the use of fossil fuels (coal, oil, natural gas). – there is no co-firing of fossil fuels and biomass in the same reaction chamber. – the pyrolysis gases are recovered or combusted. – the molar H/C_{org} ratio is less than 0.7.	Y	The auditor verified that while the gasification system operated as an auto-thermal process, generating the necessary thermal energy from the processed feedstock, it initially relied on natural gas to start the process and heat the reactor to the required temperature and pressure. The auditor confirmed that the emissions related to the use of fossil fuels for ignition, pre-heating, or heating of the pyrolysis reactor were considered and there is no co-firing of fossil fuels and biomass in the same reaction chamber. The pyrolysis gases are recovered and used for electricity generation. Primary biochar (stream A): The molar H/C_{org} ratio was 0.22. Biochar screenings (stream B): The molar H/C_{org} ratio was 0.26. Both H/C_{org} ratios are less than 0.7.	N/A
Confirm that measures are taken for safe handling and transport of biochar to prevent fire and dust hazards.	Y	The auditor confirmed via discussions with Oregon Biochar personnel that appropriate safety measures were taken to ensure the safe handling and transport of the biochar. The moving of the biochar is done automatically via conveyors and chain conveyors, and the quenching of the biochar is done via spraying.	N/A

Confirmation of Production Facility Eligibility

Table 3: Production Facility assessment

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm the Production Facility Eligibility under the general rules of Puro Standard.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the audited bodies had previously undergone a Production Facility Audit in 2021, resulting in a positive outcome. It was noted that the Facility's crediting period was from 1 October 2019 to 30 September 2024, aligning with the end of the Output reporting period relevant to this audit. Lastly, there were no outstanding findings from the prior Production Facility audit.	N/A
Confirm that the Production Facility demonstrate Environmental and Social Safeguards.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the CO_2 Removal Supplier provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Production Facility did no significant harm to the surrounding natural environmental and local communities. The auditor confirmed that the audited bodies had documented environmental and social safeguards, including compliance with local air pollutant regulations. Oregon Biochar implemented a suite of systems such as blow out panels in the burner, additional thermal cameras, and updated training protocol to ensure worker safety. Furthermore, the audited bodies have engaged with the community, universities and forest fire services.	N/A
Confirm that the quantity of biochar produced and sold is documented via appropriate processes.	Y	The auditor confirmed during the virtual site visit that an appropriate system was in place to quantify the biochar produced and sold during the reporting period for the primary biochar and the biochar screenings.	N/A
Confirm that metering infrastructure is in place to determine: - the production output. - the energy use of the Production Facility.	Y	The auditor confirmed during the virtual site visit and through additional evidence, that appropriate metering infrastructure was in place to quantify the produced biochar, and that equipment used (e.g. the optical scanner) was recently checked and calibrated. The auditor confirmed that Oregon Biochar used the electricity generated at the plant and exported to the grid. The electricity use at the facility was not metered separately, but was calculated, based on the difference between the calculated electricity generation and the electricity exported to the grid. Additionally, the auditor confirmed that a gas meter was present and records from the natural gas used were provided. Lastly, the diesel consumption was supported by invoices provided by the audited bodies.	N/A

Quantification of CO_2 Removal

Table 4: Quantification of CO_2 Removal - Calculation Methodology

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the quantification of CO_2 removal is calculated using the Calculation formula of CO_2 removal.	Y	The auditor examined the CORC calculator provided by the audited bodies and confirmed that the formulas applied in the quantification of CO_2 removal for biochar were in accordance with the Puro Rules.	N/A
Confirm that the inputs to the Calculation formula of CO_2 removal are appropriate and consistent with the evidence provided.	Finding	The auditor found inconsistencies in the distance travelled between the facility and the end biochar user. Moreover, the sales data of the biochar was reviewed and amended. This error was corrected during the course of the audit. This error resulted in the over calculation of 75 CORCs.	Corrective Action Request 1 Corrective Action Request 2 Recommendation 1
		The auditor found a discrepancy between the natural gas invoices and the total natural gas used for the fuel calculations. This error was corrected during the course of the audit. This error resulted in the over calculation of 22 CORCs.	

Verification of Proofs

Table 5: Verification of proofs and documentation

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the standing data for the Production Facility meets the requirements of the Biochar Methodology and is consistent with other evidence.	Y	The auditor reviewed and validated the standing data provided by the audited bodies and confirmed this was consistent with desktop testing and the virtual site visit.	N/A

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the necessary proof and evidence documents are maintained by the Production Facility as per Section 5 of the Biochar Methodology[3].	Y	The auditor confirmed all necessary evidence has been provided as per Section 5 of the Biochar Guidelines.	N/A
Confirm the biochar properties are based on laboratory analyses performed in laboratories accredited by national authorities and comply with international testing standards (e.g. ASTM, ISO, AS, D).	Y	The auditor confirmed that the laboratory tests presented by Oregon Biochar were obtained from Control Laboratories, certified under the International Biochar Initiative (IBI). Moreover, the methods used followed ASTM standards. At the time of audit, Oregon Biochar had laboratory tests done every three (3) months. Oregon Biochar provided four (4) lab results for the rogue biochar, including one (1) lab result for powder rogue biochar and three (3) lab results for the rogue biochar. Additionally, Oregon Biochar provided three (3) lab results for the biochar screenings for the reporting period. Nevertheless, the auditor noted one of the lab tests was conducted just outside of the reporting period. Oregon Biochar noted that whilst they took the sample during the reporting period, however, because the chain of custody documentation was incorrectly filled out, Oregon Biochar was unable to provide definitive proof of when the sample was collected. Although the auditor accepted the validity of the laboratory test result, this issue highlighted an area for improvement.	Suggestion for Improvement 1

[3] Information in Section 5 of the Biochar Methodology includes:
- Proof of sustainability of raw material for forest and/or waste biomass.
- LCA data for biomass and biochar production.
- Justification on the soil temperature used for the calculation of the biochar sequestration.
- Proof of product quality, production volume, sales and end use of biochar.
- Proof of no double counting/C positive marketing.

Peer Reviewer Conclusion

Name of the peer reviewer	Katherine Simmons
Peer reviewer's credentials	• Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) in Polymer Engineering (minoring in Chemical Engineering). • Category 1 Registered Greenhouse and Energy Auditor with the Clean Energy Regulator (Australia). • Climate Active Registered Consultant. • Integrated Management Systems Lead Auditor ISO 19011, ISO 9001:2015, ISO 14001:2015, ISO 45001:2018.
Peer reviewer contact details	Email: katherine.simmons@kreaconsulting.com.au Phone: +61 431 612 950
Outcome of the evaluation undertaken by the peer reviewer	I have reviewed the engagement letter, audit report and supporting work papers / source data and am satisfied that the audit has been performed in accordance with the eligibility requirements of General Rules of Puro Standard General Rules Version 3.1.

Appendix A: Table of Site Visit Findings

Table 6: Site visit summary table

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Check that the raw material is of eligible type and sustainably sourced.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the biochar was produced predominantly from waste biomass raw materials. Moreover, the auditor confirmed through the evidence provided by Oregon Biochar Solutions that the portion of feedstock used for biochar production that was sourced from forestry and wood processing (waste, landscape chips, and chip fines), was derived from sustainable raw materials.	N/A.
Check that the LCA provided is consistent with observations on site.	Y	The auditor confirmed LCA provided was an accurate representation of the Production Facility and used appropriate assumptions where necessary.	N/A.
Confirm that the LCA considered the emissions related to the use of fossil fuels (coal, oil, natural gas) for ignition, pre-heating, or heating of the pyrolysis reactor. Additionally, there is no co-firing of fossil fuels and biomass in the same reaction chamber.	Y	The auditor verified that while the gasification system operated as an auto-thermal process, generating the necessary thermal energy from the processed feedstock, it initially relied on natural gas to start the process and heat the reactor to the required temperature and pressure. The auditor confirmed that the emissions related to the use of fossil fuels for ignition, preheating, or heating of the pyrolysis reactor were considered and there is no co-firing of fossil fuels and biomass in the same reaction chamber.	N/A
Evidence of safe handling and transport is provided and adequate for the production facility.	Y	The auditor confirmed via discussions with Oregon Biochar personnel that appropriate safety measures were taken to ensure the safe handling and transport of the biochar.	N/A
Check that the Production Facility's documentation system is accurate and reliable for recording the quantity of biochar produced and sold.	Y	The auditor confirmed during the virtual site visit that an appropriate system was in place to quantify the biochar produced and sold during the reporting period. The auditor confirmed that the sales records used for the CORCs calculation accurately reflect the information presented in the evidentiary invoices.	N/A

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Check that appropriate metering infrastructure is in place and calibrated correctly to quantify the Production Facility output and the energy use of the Production Facility.	Y	The auditor confirmed appropriate metering infrastructure was in place, in particular, the belt scanner calibration verification was provided. This enabled Oregon Biochar to correctly quantify the Production Facility biochar screening stream output. The auditor also confirmed the Production Facility had appropriate metering infrastructure to quantify the energy use on site.	N/A
Check that appropriate processes are in place to quantify the inputs to the Calculation formula of CO_2 removal for the purpose of Preparing the Output Report and calculating CORCs.	Y	The auditor reviewed the evidence provided by the audited bodies and confirmed that the inputs to the Calculation formula of CO_2 removal had been correctly determined.	N/A

Appendix B: Summary of Calculation Errors

A summary of the calculation errors and the associated impacts on CORC calculation is provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Summary of Calculation Errors

Source of Error	CORC calculation	Corrected CORC calculation	Abs. Error (CORCs)	Net Error (CORCs)	Abs. Error Rate (%)	Net Error Rate (%)
Error in distance of sales calculations	7,022.50	6,947.65	75	75 OC	1.1%	-1.1%
Natural gas – discrepancy between reported data and invoices	6,947.65	6,925.49	22	22 OC	0.3%	-0.3%
Total	**7,022.50**	**6,925.49**	**97**	**97 OC**	**1.4%**	**-1.4%**

*OC = Overcalculation/UC = Undercalculation