Output Final Audit Report

Audited Body	
Puro.earth Project Proponent	Exomad SRL
Name of Contact for Puro.earth Project Proponent	Marcelo Pereira
Production Facility Operator	Exomad SRL
Name of Contact for Production Facility Operator	Marcelo Pereira
Production Facility name	Exomad Green, Riberalta
Production Facility ID	292788
Production Facility Location	Riberalta, Bolivia

Audit Description	
Type of Audit	Production Output Audit
Number of CORCs under Audit	10,835.61
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	242.27
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	4,072.34
Tonnes of dry biochar used under Audit	4,314.61
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	0.00
CORC conversion factor under Audit	2.511378798 tCO_2e per tonne dry biochar
Reporting Period Covered by Audit	20 February 2026 to 17 March 2026
Objective of Audit Engagement	Provide assurance opinion against requirements of Puro.earth Rules v4.0
Date of Auditor Engagement	25 March 2026
Date of Audit Report Submission	3 April 2026

Audit Outcomes	
Number of eligible CORCs	10,835.61
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	242.27
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	4,072.34
Tonnes of eligible dry biochar used	4,314.61
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	0.00
CORC conversion factor	2.511378798 tCO_2e per tonne dry biochar
Calculation Method	Biochar Methodology Edition 2022 v3

Auditing Body	
Auditor	EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd
Lead Auditor	Rodrigo Pardo Patron
Additional Audit Personnel	Anouk Pilgrem Blasco, Juanita Suarez Perez, Thais Monteiro Voll
Peer Reviewer	Brandon Melyadi

This document details the nature and scope of the services provided by a member of EnergyLink Services in respect to the biochar production output and CO_2 Removal Certificates (CORCs) claims from an approved Production Facility under the requirements of Biochar Methodology v3.0 (Edition 2022) and the Puro Standard General Rules v4.0 (Edition 2024).

This document is issued to Puro.earth detailing audit procedures conducted and the auditor's opinion in relation to the biochar production output and CO_2 Removal Certificates (CORCs). 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

Suite 2, Level 1, 66-74 Clarence St., Sydney, NSW 2000

Version Control Record

Project Number – J0780				
Document File Name	Date Issued	Version	Lead Auditor	Peer Reviewer
20260403 Riberalta Output Final Audit Report March 2026 vF.0	1 April 2026	vF.0	Rodrigo Pardo Patron	Brandon Melyadi

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
The Puro Rules	The Puro Standard General Rules v4.0 (2024)
The Biochar Methodology	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 Exomad Green, Riberalta Facility, CO_2 removal calculation for the reporting period covered by the audit, from 20 February 2026 to 17 March 2026 (referred to as: March 2026), against the eligibility requirements of 'the Puro Standard General Rules v4.0' (hereafter referred to as "the Puro Rules").

Details of Audited Body

Puro.earth Project Proponent	Exomad SRL
Production Facility Operator	Exomad SRL
Production Facility Name	Exomad Green, Riberalta
Production Facility ID	292788
Production Facility Location	Carretera Riberalta – Santa Rosa, SN; Zona: E., Riberalta, Bolivia

Responsibility of the Audited Body's Management

The management of the audited body (i.e. Exomad) is 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.

The management of the audited body is responsible for preparation and presentation of the evidence in accordance with Section 5 the Biochar Methodology v3. 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 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 and the verification team declare no conflict of interest with the audited body for this engagement.

Furthermore, EnergyLink 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 body's quantification of CORCs and compliance with the Puro Rules v4.0 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 v4.0 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 v4.0. 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 body's 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 body;
- testing of calculations that the audited body performed; and
- identifying and testing assumptions supporting the calculations.

No site visits either virtual or physical were performed as part of the Output Audit.

Use of our reasonable assurance engagement report

This audit report has been prepared for use by the audited body and Puro.earth for the sole purpose of reporting on the audited body's quantification of CORCs and compliance with the Puro Rules v4.0. Accordingly, EnergyLink expressly disclaim and do not accept any responsibility or liability to any party other than Puro.earth and the audited body 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 one (1) carry forward recommendation to be implemented by the next audit.

Carry Forward Recommendation 1: Disposal of Lubricants

Finding

At the time of the audit, Exomad continued to accumulate used lubricants on site. Exomad confirmed they continued to seek companies who can treat the used lubricants and greases, and assess options available, including transporting used lubricants to the city of Santa Cruz, where a licensed lubricant treatment and disposal company was available.

Exomad confirmed the emissions associated with the disposal of used lubricants will account for transportation-related emissions and treatment and disposal-related emissions, which will be accounted for during the periods in which shipping to the disposal facility takes place.

Furthermore, supporting evidence for the disposal of used lubricants will be provided once sufficient volumes have been accumulated and the disposal undertaken. As such, the auditor carried forward the recommendation to be assessed during the subsequent audit.

Recommendation

The auditor recommends that Exomad ensures used lubricants and greases, which are classified as hazardous or special waste, are properly treated rather than disposed of in landfill[2].

Overall Conclusion

Output Verification (Positive Conclusion)

The lead auditor is able to express a reasonable assurance opinion that, in all material respects, the quantification of **10,835.61 CO_2 Removal Certificates (CORCs)** for the reporting period 20 February 2026 to 17 March 2026 by the audited body was correct. The auditor identified that the eligible CORC quantity had been calculated in accordance with the Puro Standard General Rules Edition 2024 v4.0 and the Biochar Methodology Edition 2022 v3, and that all applicable eligibility requirements had been met.

Table 1: Audited CORCs summary

Biochar	CORCs Under Audit	Abs. Error (CORCs)	Net Error (CORCs)	Eligible CORCs	Abs. Error Rate (%)	Net Error Rate (%)
Total	10,835.61	0.00	0.00	10,835.61	0.00%	0.00%

*OC = Overcalculation / UC = Undercalculation

Sincerely,

Rodrigo PARDO PATRON | Director of Engineering
EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd
Lead Auditor
3 April 2026

[2] The auditor acknowledges the used oils and greases would need to be stored on site until sufficient volume is collected to justify its transportation and treatment / disposal. As such, the auditor expects receipts to be provided in due course.

Part B: Detailed Findings

Audit Findings and Conclusions

Table 2 to Table 6 summarise the findings from the Output Audit. 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 body were accurate, and that the metering used to quantify the Output was appropriate and correctly calibrated.

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 produced biochar was used as a soil amendment for agricultural purposes. The distribution of the biochar to end-users was carried out by Exomad, which distributed the biochar to local farmers. Photo evidence was supplied to substantiate this claim and all emissions from the distribution were accounted for.	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the biochar is produced from sustainable forest or waste biomass raw materials.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the biochar produced in the Exomad Green, Riberalta Production Facility was produced from waste material that came from sustainably sourced biomass. The feedstock was composed of forestry residues and sawdust, which are co-products of regional sawmills certified by the Autoridad de Fiscalización y Control Social de Bosques y Tierra (ABT). The auditor confirmed that all sawmills held a valid ABT certification at the time of the audit by verifying the certification numbers against the "Lista de Empresas Habilitadas" available online on the website for the Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente[3]. All sawmills supplying wood biomass to Exomad during the reporting period held valid ABT certifications from 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026. Each biomass delivered listed in the sheet of the records were cross-checked against the Certificación Aserraderos, (CERT-ABT-RIB-016-2025), identifying each sawmill from which Exomad obtained waste biomass from. During the current audit period, all supplying sawmills were confirmed to hold valid ABT certifications, and were: – Aserradero Famabu (ABT-RUEF-04289) – Aserradero Don Luis Y Pachamama S.R.L. Sucursal 1 (ABT-RUEF-00639) – Aserradero Don Luis Y Pachamama S.R.L. (ABT-RUEF-00639) – Aserradero Industria Maderera Martinez S.R.L. Indusmar S.R.L.(ABT-RUEF-0611) – Aserradero Leovel Srl (ABT-RUEF-00921) – Aserradero Maderera Joroma (ABT-RUEF-02154) Exomad confirmed it was aware about the expiration date of the ABT certification (31 March 2026), noting that all suppliers were required to renew their registration with the ABT as part of their compliance obligations. Additionally, Exomad communicated that the ABT allowed a grace period (approximately 90 days) for sawmills to complete their renewal process. Lastly, Exomad confirmed the updated certificate(s) will be provided once the renewal process was completed.	N/A.

[3] Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente (accessed 25 March 2026). Lista de Empresas Habilitadas, available at: https://abt.gob.bo/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=142

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 Exomad included all information on the emissions of the different stages of the biochar cradle to grave life cycle, based on the following: - **A1 Biomass and A2 Transport:** Emissions from biomass collection and transport were calculated using diesel consumption records. No emissions were considered for biomass storage due to the high turnover and low stock levels. - **A3 Production:** Emissions from the biochar production were assessed, including infrastructure, energy use (based on electricity bills, diesel records, and LPG consumption), equipment construction and decommissioning, waste management for lubricants, and stack emissions. Nonetheless it was noted that no bio-oil was reported for this monitoring period. Upon request, Exomad included the bio-oil in the LCA and provided internal records showing total bio-oil delivered (9,800 kg) and the delivery person. This did not affect the CORC calculations as Exomad approach was to allocate all production emissions to biochar. Furthermore, as the bio-oil was used by vessel builders and cattle breeders, therefore there were no emissions associated with the disposal of the bio-oil. It is noted that the emissions from the distribution of the bio-oil were considered via the liquid fuel consumption. - **A4 Transport:** Emissions from transporting biochar to local farms were calculated using diesel consumption records. - **B1 Application and Use:** Emissions from applying biochar were estimated based on the amount of biochar applied and a conservative diesel consumption on the diesel use per tonne of dry biochar.	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
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 pyrolysis system operated as an auto-thermal process, generating the necessary thermal energy from the processed feedstock, it initially relied on LPG to initiate and stabilise the syngas flame within the reactors. Additionally, firewood was used initially in the furnace before being replaced by syngas from the reactors. Based on the above, the auditor confirmed that the emissions related to the use of fossil fuels were considered and there was no co-firing of fossil fuels and biomass in the same reaction chamber. A portion of the pyrolysis gases was recovered and combusted for use in the rotary dryers, while the excess is combusted in an open-flaring system.	N/A.

<table>
<tr><th>Requirement</th><th>Requirement Met?</th><th>Verification Remarks</th><th>Corrective Action Request / Recommendations</th></tr>
<tr><td>(Cont.)
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.</td><td>Observation</td><td>For this reporting period, Exomad provided the laboratory results of two samples of biochar taken on 09 February 2026 with H/C_{org} ratios of 0.21486 (Sample A) and 0.22539 (Sample B), both below the threshold value of 0.7. Exomad selected the lower H/C_{org} ratio (Sample A) for use in the calculations.
The auditor compared the CORCs calculated using each individual sample as well as using the average of both samples. The auditor confirmed that the results from Sample A resulted in a higher permanence factor, and in a lower number of CORCs, as shown in Table 3. As such, the auditor confirmed that using Sample A was a conservative approach for the calculation of CORCs.
Table 3: H/C_{org} Sample Results
<table>
<tr><th rowspan="2">Metric / Indicator</th><th colspan="2">Sample</th><th rowspan="2">Average</th></tr>
<tr><th>A</th><th>B</th></tr>
<tr><td>Carbon (C_{org})</td><td>83.20%</td><td>84.60%</td><td>83.9%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hydrogen (H)</td><td>1.50%</td><td>1.60%</td><td>1.55%</td></tr>
<tr><td>H/C_{org} Molar Ratio</td><td>0.21486</td><td>0.22539</td><td>0.220125</td></tr>
<tr><td>E_{stored}</td><td>11,039.70</td><td>11,133.12</td><td>11,086.41</td></tr>
<tr><td>CORC</td><td>10,835.61</td><td>10,929.03</td><td>10,882.32</td></tr>
<tr><td>CORCs Difference</td><td>NA</td><td>93.42</td><td>46.71</td></tr>
<tr><td>CORCs Difference (%)</td><td>NA</td><td>-0.86%</td><td>-0.43%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanence Factor</td><td>83.93%</td><td>83.24%</td><td>83.58%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Permanence Factor Difference (%)</td><td>NA</td><td>0.82%</td><td>0.42%</td></tr>
</table>
Accordingly, the H/C_{org} ratio applied in the calculations was 0.215, which is less than 0.7.</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that measures are taken for safe handling and transport of biochar to prevent fire and dust hazards.	Y	Exomad implemented occupational health and safety procedures, including fire risk management protocols, with photographic evidence showing staff participation in fire and emergency training. Furthermore, during the virtual site visit, and supplementary video evidence showcasing the operation of new equipment, the auditor observed that employees were wearing personal protective equipment (PPE), and that safety signage was in place throughout the facility. Additionally, the auditor confirmed that at the exit of the reactor, the biochar was carried out by screw conveyors, each encapsulated in a water-cooling system. Subsequently, the output from the pyrolysis reactors were combined via screw conveyors into a rotating drum, where the biochar was sprayed with water to suppress dust. Based on this evidence, the auditor confirmed that measures are in place for the safe handling and transport of biochar to prevent fire and dust hazards.	N/A.

Confirmation of Production Facility Eligibility

Table 4: 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 body had gone through a Production Facility Audit in 2024 and achieved a positive outcome. Additionally, the auditor confirmed that there were no outstanding findings from the prior Production Facility audit.	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the Production Facility demonstrate Environmental, Social, and Stakeholder Safeguards.	Y	The auditor confirmed that the CO_2 Removal Supplier showed sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Production Facility did no significant harm to the surrounding natural environmental and local communities. Furthermore, Exomad undertook stakeholder consultation and provided the auditor with information of these activities and their results in their Stakeholder Engagement Report provided during the Facility and Output Audit dated 18 December 2024 (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd).	N/A.
Confirm that the quantity of biochar produced and sold is documented via appropriate processes.	Y	Exomad tracked the biochar deliveries using the 'Carbonfuture' platform. Each truckload was recorded as a 'packing unit', with gross weight and moisture content were measured at the time of dispatch. These packaing unites were then grouped into 'deliveries', which included details such as the end-user location, responsible person and application type. The auditor confirmed that an appropriate system was in place to quantify biochar produced and delivered during the reporting period.	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that metering infrastructure is in place to determine: – the production output. – the energy use of the Production Facility.	Y	The auditor confirmed that adequate metering infrastructure was in place, including - **Production Output:** Exomad used an industrial scale to measure biochar production and supply to third parties for field applications, calibrated every two months. The last calibration was performed on 09 March 2026, and the calibration certificate was provided. Additionally, moisture analysers were used to measure moisture content. These were internally calibrated and tested weekly, with records documenting the responsible person, their signature, and the calibration date. - **Electricity Consumption:** Emissions from electricity consumption were calculated using actual data from electricity bills. The electricity billing period matched with the monitoring period which ensured that the total electricity consumption was accounted for. - **Diesel Usage:** The auditor checked the diesel records and confirmed that Exomad used a centralised diesel tank. Every time diesel was used, Exomad recorded the vehicle type, date, and driver's signature. There was a procedure in please, and one person was responsible for keeping these records. This system allowed Exomad to allocate diesel usage specifically to the biochar value chain, including biomass collection, biochar production, and field application. - **LPG Usage:** Exomad provided invoices for the procurement of LPG cylinders that did not align with the internal consumption records. Exomad had previously expressed that the LPG stock acted as a buffer between LPG purchase and use, which prevented the alignment between LPG consumption in the LCA with the quantities found on the invoices. Nevertheless, the auditor was able to confirm all LPG used for the reporting period had been accounted for. - **Bio-oil**: bio-oil was distributed free of charge to local stakeholders. Based on the evidence provided, the auditor confirmed that metering infrastructure was in place to determine the energy use of the Production Facility.	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm the calculations used to quantify emissions from the process. These must account for: – Cultivating and harvesting of raw materials (forest vs other biomass). – The energy source used in the production process. – Transporting of raw materials to the Production Facility (based on distance transported and fuel used).	Y	The auditor reviewed the emissions calculation methodology and underlying data provided by Exomad. Evidence was obtained for: – **Cultivation and harvesting:** The auditor confirmed that the diesel used for the collection and loading of the raw materials was correctly accounted for in the LCA. – **Energy use:** Emissions associated with energy consumption during the production process were quantified using the electricity bills and diesel consumption records. Additionally, auditor found LPG consumption records not to be aligned with procurement invoices. Exomad had previously explained that LPG stock was maintained as a buffer between LPG cylinders purchased and LPG cylinders used. Nevertheless, the auditor was able to confirm all LPG used for the reporting period had been appropriately accounted for. – **Biomass and biochar transportation:** The auditor confirmed that diesel consumption was correctly quantified to account for the emissions from the transport of the biomass and biochar. The estimated diesel consumption at end-use application was accounted for and followed a conservative approach.	N/A.

Quantification of CO_2 Removal

Table 5: 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 body and confirmed that the formulas applied in the quantification of CO_2 removal for biochar were in accordance with the Puro Rules v4.0.	N/A.
Confirm that the inputs to the Calculation formula of CO_2 removal are appropriate and consistent with the evidence provided.	Y	The auditor reviewed the evidence provided by the audited body and confirmed that the inputs to the calculation formula of CO_2 removal had been correctly determined.	N/A.

Verification of Proofs

Table 6: 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 verified the standing data provided by the audited body and confirmed this was consistent with desktop testing.	N/A.
Confirm that the necessary proof and evidence documents are maintained by the Production Facility as per Section 5 of the Biochar Methodology[4].	Y	The auditor confirmed all necessary evidence has been provided as per Section 5 of the Biochar Guidelines. This included the certification on the sustainability of the biomass provided by the Autoridad de Fiscalización y Control Social de Bosques y Tierra (ABT), supporting evidence for the LCA and CORC Report Summary inputs, and no double counting or positive marketing statements in the carbon attestations signed by the end-users.	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 the laboratory tests presented by Exomad were obtained from Eurofins Umwelt, certified under DIN EN ISO/IEC 17025:2018. The report included two samples taken on 09 February 2026 and processed until 09 March 2026. At the time of the audit, Exomad had a quarterly laboratory testing regime. Additonally, the laboratory report included PAH testing and the results for both biochar samples were 5.5 mg/kg and 6.0 mg/kg, both compliant with the WBC-Premium threshold (6.0 mg/kg).	N/A.

[4] 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.

Appendix A: Summary of Audit Details

Table 7 summarises key data from all monthly Puro.earth audits of the Exomad facility, including production, usage, and stock levels of dry biochar, as well as moisture content, H/C_{org} ratio, and the CORC conversion factor.

Table 7: Summary of Audit Details

Audit Number	Start date	End date	Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	Tonnes of dry biochar produced	Tonnes of dry biochar used	Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	H/C_{org}	Average Moisture Content	Eligible CORCs	CORC conversion factor[5]
			tonnes	tonnes	tonnes	tonnes	-	%	tCO_2e sequestered	tCO_2e/t dry biochar
01	02-Sep-25	23-Oct-25	460.00	3,453.63	3,829.63	84.00	0.323[6]	16.50[7]	8,701.62	2.272
02	24-Oct-25	22-Nov-25	84.00	4,125.16	4,209.16	0.00	0.323	16.50	9,408.08	2.235
03	23-Nov-25	18-Dec-25	0.00	4,160.36	3,454.18	706.18	0.309	16.51	7,743.96	2.242
04	19-Dec-25	31-Dec-25	706.18	1,705.21	2,173.22	238.18	0.309	16.48	4,899.31	2.254
05	01-Jan-26	19-Jan-26	238.18	2,270.45	2,258.05	250.58	0.309	16.55	5,068.47	2.245
06	20-Jan-26	19-Feb-26	250.58	4,512.55	4,520.86	242.27	0.309	16.49	10,219.76	2.261
07	20-Feb-26	17-Mar-26	242.27	4,072.34	4,314.61	0.00	0.215	16.54	10,835.61	2.511
Subtotal (year to date)	02-Sep-25	17-Mar-26	N/A	24,299.7	24,759.71	N/A	N/A	N/A	56,876.59	2.297

[5] Rounded to three decimal places.

[6] The H/C_{org} stated in the October audit report dated 26 November 2025 (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) was 0.325 which was calculated with molar mass values for Carbon and Hydrogen rounded to the nearest integer. Moving forward, 3 decimal places for the molar mass values will be used to ensure accurate values are reported. Amendments were made to the values in Table 7 to ensure consistency.

[7] The Average Moisture Content stated in the October audit report dated 26 November 2025 (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) was 6.30 which was retrieved from the laboratory analysis test. Moving forward, the average moisture content calculated from each batch as reported in the CORC report summary will be used to ensure the most representative value from the output period is reported. Amendments were made to the values in Table 6 to ensure consistency.

Appendix B: Response to Previous Audit Recommendations

The Production Facility's audit dated 24 March 2026 (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) contained two carry forward recommendations. The recommendations and the auditor's responses are provided in Table 8.

Table 8: Previous Audit Recommendation

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Recommendations
Carry Forward Recommendation (1): The auditor recommends that Exomad augment its quality assurance and peer review procedures to ensure that all equations used in pro-rata calculations are accurate and aligned with their intended purpose. Specifically, the auditor advises that the equations used to apportion emissions across specific reporting periods be reviewed to confirm they correctly reflect the number of days within each reporting period. Additionally, the auditor recommends that Exomad provide evidence of electricity consumption that includes electricity metre readings and the corresponding dates. This will help prevent errors in estimating emissions associated with the biochar life cycle.	Y	For this monitoring period, no pro-rata approach was used. Instead, electricity consumption was taken from the "Aviso de Cobranza" for March 2026 covered the consumption between 20 February 2026 and 17 March 2026, which matched the monitoring period. Additionally, the auditor confirmed that the correct electricity consumption was used for the calculations.	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Recommendations
Carry Forward Recommendation (2): The auditor recommends that Exomad ensures used lubricants and greases, which are classified as hazardous or special waste, are properly treated rather than disposed of in landfill.	N	At the time of the audit, Exomad continued to accumulate used lubricants on site. Exomad confirmed they continued to seek companies who can treat the used lubricants and greases, and assess options available, including transporting used lubricants to the city of Santa Cruz, where a licensed lubricant treatment and disposal company was available. Exomad confirmed the emissions associated with the disposal of used lubricants will account for transportation-related emissions and treatment and disposal-related emissions, which will be accounted for during the periods in which shipping to the disposal facility takes place. Furthermore, supporting evidence for the disposal of used lubricants will be provided once sufficient volumes have been accumulated and the disposal undertaken. As such, the auditor carried forward the recommendation to be assessed during the subsequent audit.	Carry Forward Recommendation 1

Appendix C: Summary of CORC Calculation Parameters

A summary of the inputs to the CORC calculation formula is provided in Table 9.

Table 9: Summary of CORC calculation parameters

CORC Calculation Inputs	
Reporting Period Covered by Audit	20 February 2026 to 17 March 2026
Number of eligible CORCs	10,835.61
Net carbon stored (E_{stored})	11,.039.70 tCO_2e
Baseline carbon removal ($C_{baseline}$)	0.00 tCO_2e
Biomass project emissions ($E_{biomass}$)[8]	46.66 tCO_2e
Production project emissions ($E_{production}$)[9]	93.26 tCO_2e
Use project emissions (E_{use})	64.50 tCO_2e
Tonnes of eligible dry biochar used	4,314.61
CORC conversion factor	2.511378798 tCO_2e per tonne of dry biochar

[8] The VVB confirmed that there were no direct Land Use Change (dLUC) emissions.
[9] Embodied emissions associated with manufacturing installation, maintenance and disposal of the reactor are included within $E_{production}$ under Biochar Methodology - Edition 2022 v3.0.