

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, Concepción
Production Facility ID	432524
Production Facility Location	Concepción, Bolivia

Audit Description	
Type of Audit	Output Audit
Number of CORCs under Audit	11,081.31
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	0.00
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	4,648.42
Tonnes of dry biochar used under Audit	4,648.42
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	0.00
CORC conversion factor under Audit	2.383887356 tCO ₂ e per tonne dry biochar
Reporting Period Covered by Audit	13 February 2026 to 13 March 2026
Objective of Audit Engagement	Provide assurance opinion against requirements of Puro.earth Rules v3.1
Date of Auditor Engagement	20 March 2026
Date of Audit Report Submission	31 March 2026

Audit Outcomes	
Number of eligible CORCs	11,082.64
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	0.00
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	4,648.42
Tonnes of eligible dry biochar used	4,648.42
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	0.00
CORC conversion factor	2.384173547 tCO ₂ e per tonne dry biochar
Calculation Method	Biochar Methodology v3.0 (Edition 2022)

Auditing Body	
Auditor	EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd
Lead Auditor	Rodrigo Pardo Patron
Additional Audit Personnel	Juanita Suarez Perez, Anouk Pilgrem Blasco, 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 of the biochar production output and CO₂ 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 v3.1.

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

© EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd 2026

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

Version Control Record

Project Number – J0731				
Document File Name	Date Issued	Version	Lead Auditor	Peer Reviewer
20260331 Exomad, Concepcion – February Output Final Audit Report vF.0	31 March 2026	vF.0	Rodrigo Pardo Patron	Brandon Melyadi

Contents

PART A: Auditor’s Report.....	5
Details of Audited Body.....	5
Responsibility of the Audited Body’s Management.....	5
Our independence and quality control.....	5
Our responsibility.....	6
Summary of procedures undertaken.....	6
Use of our reasonable assurance engagement report.....	6
Inherent limitations.....	6
Corrective Action Requests / Recommendations.....	7
Corrective Action Request 1: Biomass Records.....	7
Corrective Action Request 2: Infrastructure Emissions.....	7
Overall Conclusion.....	7
Output Verification (Positive Conclusion).....	7
Part B: Detailed Findings.....	8
Audit Findings and Conclusions.....	8
Eligibility Assessment.....	8
Confirmation of Production Facility Eligibility.....	12
Quantification of CO ₂ Removal.....	14
Verification of Proofs.....	15
Appendix A: Summary of Audit Details.....	17
Appendix B: Summary of CORC Calculation Parameters.....	18

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
ABT	Autoridad de Bosques y Tierras (Forest and Land Authority)
The Puro Rules	the Puro Standard General Rules v3.1
The Biochar Methodology	The Biochar Methodology v3.0 (Edition 2022)

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, Concepción Facility, CO₂ removal calculation for the reporting period covered by the audit, from 13 February 2026 to 13 March 2026, against the eligibility requirements of 'the Puro Standard General Rules v3.1' (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, Concepción
Production Facility ID	432524
Production Facility Location	Carretera Hardeman- Colonia Piraí, Concepción, Bolivia

Responsibility of the Audited Body's Management

The management of the audited body (Exomad SRL) is responsible for the application of the requirements of the Biochar Methodology v3.0 in quantifying CO₂ 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 v3.0. 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. Additionally, 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 v3.1 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 v3.1 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 v3.1. 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 this 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 v3.1. 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 two (2) corrective action requests, which were addressed during the course of the audit. The auditor has not issued any recommendations.

Corrective Action Request 1: Biomass Records

During the review of the biomass records, the auditor noted a discrepancy of 5,277.34 tonnes in the total biomass used during the audit period across records. Individual records of biomass amounted to a total of 9,540.1 tonnes, while summary records showed a total of 4,262.79 tonnes. This discrepancy was due to a formula error in the summary records. Upon request, Exomad reviewed and corrected the formula. The corrected value was 9,540.1 tonnes of biomass used during the reporting period.

This error did not impact the number of CORCs.

Corrective Action Request 2: Infrastructure Emissions

During the review of the LCA, the auditor noted that the emissions associated with the infrastructure had considered 31 days, instead of 29 days covered in the monitoring period. Upon request, Exomad reviewed and corrected the calculations, correctly reflecting the monitoring period. This caused the total $E_{production}$ to decrease by 1.34 tCO₂e, with the corrected value being 123.83 tCO₂e.

This error resulted undercalculation of 1.34 CORCs.

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 **11,082.64 CO₂ Removal Certificates (CORCs)** for the reporting period 13 February 2026 to 13 March 2026 by the audited body was correct. The auditor identified that the eligible CORC quantity has been calculated in accordance with the Puro Standard General Rules v3.1 and the Biochar Methodology v3.0, and that all applicable eligibility requirements have 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	11,081.31	1.34	1.34 UC	11,082.64	0.012%	0.012%

*OC = Overcalculation / UC = Undercalculation

The auditor noted 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
 31 March 2026

Part B: Detailed Findings

Audit Findings and Conclusions

Table 2 to Table 5 summarises 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 distributes the biochar to local farmers. Photographic 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
<p>Confirm that the biochar is produced from sustainable forest or waste biomass raw materials.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The auditor confirmed that the biochar produced in the Exomad Green, Concepción 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).</p> <p>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 Ambiente².</p> <p>All sawmills supplying waste 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 was cross-checked against the Certificación Aserraderos, (CERT-ABT-RIB-015-2025), 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Aserradero Fernandogz (ABT-RUEF-03692) – Aserradero y Barraca Carlos Eslawing (ABT-RUEF-01245) – Aserradero La Unidad (ABT-RUEF-05897) – Aserradero Industria Maderera Tunupa SRL (ABT-RUEF-01533) – Aserradero Industria Maderera JBM SRL (ABT-RUEF-00703) – Aserradero Vertical Pro Trade SRL (ABT-RUEF-03392) – Aserradero Latizal SRL (ABT-RUEF-04285) – SC (ABT-RUEF-02378) <p>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 (of approximately 90 days) for sawmills to complete their renewal process. Lastly, Exomad confirmed that the updated certificate would be provided once the renewal process was completed.</p>	<p>N/A.</p>

² Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente (accessed 24 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
<p>Confirm that the producer demonstrates net-negativity with results from a LCA that shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [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. 	<p>Finding</p>	<p>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, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A1 Biomass and A2 Transport of Biomass: emissions from the transport and handling of biomass were calculated using diesel records. No emissions from the storage of biomass were accounted for due to the high turnover of the biomass. However, as outlined in Corrective Action Request 1, during the review of biomass records, the auditor noted a discrepancy in total biomass processed during the audit period across Exomad's internal records. This error was due to an incorrect formula. Upon request, Exomad reviewed and corrected the formula, ensuring consistency across biomass consumption records. This error did not impact the number of CORCs. - A3 Production: the LCA included emissions due to biomass pre-processing, infrastructure, equipment construction and decommissioning, packaging, and waste management for used lubricants and greases. Additionally, emissions from the energy consumed were quantified based on electricity invoices, diesel records, and LPG consumption. As outlined in Corrective Action Request 2, during the review of the LCA, the auditor noted that the emissions associated to infrastructure had considered 31 days, instead of 29 days covered in the monitoring period. Upon request, Exomad reviewed and corrected the calculations. This error resulted in the undercalculation of 1.34 CORCs. - A4 Transport of Biochar: emissions from the transport of biochar to local farms were calculated based on diesel consumption records. - B1 Application and Use: emissions from the application of biochar were estimated based on the total biochar used and a conservative assumption on the diesel use per tonne of dry biochar. 	<p>Corrective Action Request 1</p> <p>Corrective Action Request 2</p>

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
<p>Confirm that the biochar production process meets requirements 1.1.4 to 1.1.6 of the Biochar Methodology v3.0, namely that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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	<p>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 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.</p>	N/A.
		<p>A portion of the pyrolysis gases were recovered and combusted for use in the rotary dryers, while the excess was combusted in an open-flaring system.</p>	
		<p>The auditor confirmed that the molar H/C_{org} ratio was 0.264, which is less than 0.7.</p>	
<p>Confirm that measures are taken for safe handling and transport of biochar to prevent fire and dust hazards.</p>	Y	<p>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 recently performed during the annual Output Audit, the auditor observed that employees were wearing masks and personal protecting equipment (PPE), and that safety signage was in place throughout the facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the auditor confirmed that at the exit of the reactor, the biochar was carried out by three lines of double layer screw conveyors, each encapsulated in a water-cooling system, where water runs between two metal cylinders. 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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 body had gone through a Production Facility audit in 2023 and achieved a positive outcome.	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 measured at the time of dispatch. These packing units were then grouped into 'deliveries', which included details such as the end-user location, responsible person, and application type. The auditor tested individual packing units to assess the veracity of the data and information provided by Exomad and confirmed that an appropriate system was in place to quantify biochar produced and delivered during the reporting period.	N/A.
	Observation	During the monitoring period, Exomad had not reported any biochar stock. Exomad clarified this was reflective of their operational approach during this period, in which they aimed to apply all produced biochar without holding any stock.	

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
<p>Confirm that metering infrastructure is in place to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the production output. – the energy use of the Production Facility. 	<p>Y</p>	<p>The auditor confirmed that adequate metering infrastructure was in place, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Production Output: Exomad used an industrial truck scale to measure biochar production and supply to third parties for agricultural applications, which was calibrated every two months supported by third-party calibration certificates. Additionally, two 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. – Diesel Usage: the auditor reviewed Exomad’s diesel consumption records and confirmed that the company used a centralised diesel tank equipped with a calibrated meter. Each diesel withdrawal was documented with the vehicle type, date, and the driver’s signature, following a defined procedure managed by a single responsible person. This system ensured accurate allocation of diesel usage across the biochar value chain, including biomass collection, biochar production, and field application. – Tar and Wood Vinegar: tar and wood vinegar was distributed free of charge to local stakeholders. 	<p>N/A.</p>

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
<p>Confirm the calculations used to quantify emissions from the process. These must account for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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). 	Finding	<p>The auditor reviewed the emissions calculation methodology and underlying data provided by Exomad. Evidence was obtained for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. Additionally, the auditor confirmed that the feedstock is waste biomass so no emissions from the harvesting of the raw materials were included. – Energy Use: energy consumption during the production process was quantified using the electricity bills and fuel consumption records including diesel and LPG. – Biomass and Biochar Transportation: the auditor noted that diesel usage was quantified and correctly used to account for the emissions from the transport of the biomass and biochar. Nevertheless, as outlined in Corrective Action Request 1, the auditor noted a discrepancy in total biomass processed during the audit period across internal records. The error was due to an incorrect formula. Upon request, Exomad reviewed and corrected the formula, ensuring consistency across biomass consumption records. This error did not impact the number of CORCs. 	Corrective Action Request 1
Confirm the CO ₂ Removal Supplier is able to calculate the CO ₂ Removal independently.	Y	The auditor reviewed the evidence provided by the audited body and confirmed that the CO ₂ Removal Supplier was able to calculate the CO ₂ removal independently.	N/A.

Quantification of CO₂ Removal

Table 4: Quantification of CO₂ 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 Exomad and except where noted in Corrective Action Request 1 and Corrective Action Request 2, the auditor confirmed that the formulas applied in the quantification of CO ₂ removal for biochar were in accordance with the Puro Rules v3.1.	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
Confirm that the inputs to the Calculation formula of CO ₂ removal are appropriate and consistent with the evidence provided.	Finding	As outlined in Corrective Action Request 2, during the review of the LCA, the auditor noted that the emissions associated to infrastructure had considered 31 days, instead of 29 days covered in the monitoring period. Upon request, Exomad reviewed and corrected the calculations. This error resulted undercalculation of 1.34 CORCs. The auditor reviewed the updated CORC Report Summary and the evidence provided by Exomad and confirmed the inputs to the calculation formula of CO ₂ removal had been correctly determined.	Corrective Action Request 2

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 v3.0 and is consistent with other evidence.	Y	The auditor reviewed and validated 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 ³ .	Y	The auditor confirmed all necessary evidence has been provided as per Section 5 of the Biochar Guidelines.	N/A.

³ Information in Section 5 of the Biochar Methodology v3.0 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.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
<p>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).</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The auditor confirmed the laboratory tests presented by Exomad were obtained from Eurofins Umwelt, certified under DIN EN ISO/IEC 17025:2018.</p> <p>The Eurofins Analytical Report (AR-26-FR-009633-01) was provided for this audit. The sample was taken on 10 December 2025 and processed on 30 January 2026. Additionally, Exomad confirmed that a new biochar sample had been undertaken this month (March 2026) and that its laboratory results would be provided as soon as it became available.</p>	<p>N/A.</p>

Appendix A: Summary of Audit Details

Table 6 summarises key data from the monthly Puro.earth audits of the Exomad Concepcion facility, including production, usage, and stock levels of dry biochar, as well as moisture content, H/C_{org} ratio, and CORC conversion factor.

Table 6: 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 ⁴
			tonnes	tonnes	tonnes	tonnes	-	%	tCO ₂ e sequestered	tCO ₂ e/t dry biochar
01	25 Mar 2025	12 May 2025	238.09	3,526.15	3,228.11	536.13	0.276	17.65	8,122.39	2.516
02	13 May 2025	11 Jun 2025	536.13	2,301.14	2,516.69	320.58	0.276	17.59	6,304.70	2.505
03	12 Jun 2025	11 Jul 2025	320.58	3,287.27	3,344.25	263.60	0.331	16.49	7,818.06	2.338
04	12 Jul 2025	11 Aug 2025	263.60	3,041.34	3,278.72	26.21	0.339	16.55	7,581.64	2.312
05	12 Aug 2025	11 Sep 2025	26.21	4,382.79	4,023.00	386.00	0.339	16.52	9,309.06	2.314
06	12 Sep 2025	12 Oct 2025	386.00	4,138.26	4,134.86	389.40	0.227	16.51	10,502.71	2.540
07	13 Oct 2025	12 Nov 2025	389.40	4,710.66	4,869.25	230.80	0.227	16.88	12,379.30	2.542
08	13 Nov 2025	11 Dec 2025	230.80	5,393.33	4,903.63	720.50	0.227	16.00	12,467.65	2.542
09	12 Dec 2025	31 Dec 2025	720.50	2,119.55	2,596.85	243.1	0.227	16.00	6,575.72	2.532
10	1 Jan 2026	12 Jan 2026	243.19	1,980.47	1,468.74	754.92	0.227	15.98	3,713.58	2.528
11	13 Jan 2026	12 Feb 2026	754.92	4,136.44	4,891.36	0.00	0.264	15.98	11,670.85	2.386
12	13 Feb 2026	13 Mar 2026	0.00	4,648.42	4,648.42	0.00	0.264	16.30	11,082.64	2.384
Subtotal (year to date)	25 Mar 2025	13 Mar 2026	N/A	43,665.82	43,903.88	N/A	N/A	N/A	107,528.30	2.449

⁴ Rounded to three decimal places.

Appendix B: Summary of CORC Calculation Parameters

A summary of the inputs to the CORC calculation formula is provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Summary of CORC calculation parameters

CORC Calculation Inputs	
Reporting Period Covered by Audit	13 February 2026 to 13 March 2026
Number of eligible CORCs	11,082.64 tCO ₂ e
Net carbon stored (E _{stored})	11,330.58 tCO ₂ e
Baseline carbon removal (C _{baseline})	0.00 tCO ₂ e
Biomass project emissions (E _{biomass}) ⁵	48.81 tCO ₂ e
Production project emissions (E _{production}) ⁶	123.83 tCO ₂ e
Use project emissions (E _{use})	75.29 tCO ₂ e
Tonnes of eligible dry biochar used	4,648.42
CORC conversion factor	2.384173547 tCO ₂ e per tonne of dry biochar

⁵ The WB confirmed that there were no Land Use Change (dLUC) emissions.

⁶ Embodied emissions associated with manufacturing installation, maintenance and disposal of the reactor are included within E_{production} under Biochar Methodology v3.0 - Edition 2022.