



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 Riberalta
Production Facility ID	292788
Production Facility Location	Riberalta, Bolivia

Audit Description	
Type of Audit	Production Output Audit
Number of CORCs under Audit	8,686.72
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	460.00
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	3,453.63
Tonnes of dry biochar used under Audit	3,829.63
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	84.00
CORC conversion factor under Audit	2.268 tCO ₂ e per tonne dry biochar
Reporting Period Covered by Audit	02 September 2025 to 23 October 2025
Objective of Audit Engagement	Provide assurance opinion against requirements of Puro.earth Rules v4.0 (Edition 2024)
Date of Auditor Engagement	12 November 2025
Date of Audit Report Submission	26 November 2025

Audit Outcomes	
Number of eligible CORCs	8,701.62
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (start)	460.00
Tonnes of dry biochar produced under Audit	3,453.63
Tonnes of eligible dry biochar used	3,829.63
Tonnes of dry biochar in stock (end)	84.00
CORC conversion factor	2.272182952 tCO ₂ e 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	Brandon Melyadi

This document details the nature and scope of the services provided by a member of EnergyLink Services in respect of the eligibility of the CO₂ Removal Supplier 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 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 2025

Version Control Record

Project Number – J0394				
Document File Name	Date Issued	Version	Lead Auditor	Peer Reviewer
20251126 Exomad Riberalta Periodic Output Final Audit Report (October)	26 November 2025	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: E _{biomass} and E _{production}	7
Corrective Action Request 2: Airborne Emissions Through Flaring	7
Carry Forward Recommendation 1: Standardised CORCs Claim Procedure	7
Carry Forward Recommendation 2: Disposal of Lubricants	7
Carry Forward Recommendation 3: Frequent Laboratory Testing	7
Overall Conclusion	8
Production Output Audit	8
Part B: Detailed Findings	9
Audit Findings and Conclusions	9
Eligibility Assessment	9
Confirmation of Production Facility Eligibility	11
Quantification of CO ₂ Removal	14
Verification of Proofs	15
Appendix A: Summary of Audit Details	16
Appendix B: Response to Previous Audit Recommendations	17
Appendix C: Summary of Calculation Errors	19

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 (Edition 2024)
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 SRL’s (Exomad) CO₂ Removal Certificate (CORC) calculation for the reporting period covered by the audit, from 02 September 2025 to 23 October 2025 (referred to as: October 2025), against the eligibility requirements of ‘the Puro Standard General Rules v4.0 Edition 2023’ (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 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 Green, Riberalta) is responsible for the application of the requirements of ‘Biochar Methodology Edition 2022 v3’ (hereafter referred to as “the Biochar Methodology”) in quantifying 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. 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* 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 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 Periodic Output Audit. A site visit will be undertaken as part of the audit procedures during the annual 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*. 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 and three (3) carry forward recommendations.

Corrective Action Request 1: E_{biomass} and $E_{\text{production}}$

In the CORCs Summary, the auditor noted that the E_{biomass} and $E_{\text{production}}$ for the biochar production prior to 02 September 2025 had already been accounted for in the annual output audit report for the reporting period of 07 September 2024 to 01 September 2025. However, Exomad considered these GHG emissions in this reporting period as well. Upon request, Exomad amended the CORCs Summary to exclude 5.48 tCO₂e from biomass emissions and 12.41 tCO₂e from production emissions to account for this inconsistency.

This error resulted in the undercalculation of 14.83 CORCs.

Corrective Action Request 2: Airborne Emissions Through Flaring

In the LCA calculations, the auditor noted that an incorrect formula had been used to calculate the airborne emissions produced from flaring during the pyrolyzer operation. Upon request, Exomad amended the LCA and CORC Report Summary to account for the correct emissions from the pyrolyser operation.

This error resulted in the undercalculation of 0.07 CORCs.

Carry Forward Recommendation 1: Standardised CORCs Claim Procedure

Finding

Because of the findings described in Corrective Action Request 1, the auditor has carried forward the previous audit recommendation, to be assessed in the next audit. More information on the previous audit recommendations can be found in Appendix B.

Recommendation

The auditor recommends Exomad establish and implement a standardised CORCs claim procedure to ensure a consistent approach is applied to the CORCs claim between reporting periods.

Carry Forward Recommendation 2: Disposal of Lubricants

At the time of the audit, Exomad had not stocked up significant quantities of lubricants to merit their transportation to a treatment Facility. As such, Exomad continued to accumulate lubricants on site until the volume is sufficient for collection by an authorized disposal company. Consequently, the auditor has carried forward the recommendation to be assessed in the next audit. More information on the previous audit recommendations can be found in Appendix B.

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 landfill².

Carry Forward Recommendation 3: Frequent Laboratory Testing

Finding

Similar to the previous output audit, Exomad had an annual testing regime conducted by a third-party laboratory. During this audit, Exomad provided the same laboratory report as for the annual Output Audit, dated 02 September 2025. Given that the final report for the annual Output Audit was issued after the date

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.

of engagement for this audit, Exomad had not implemented the recommendation yet. Consequently, the auditor has carried forward the recommendation to be assessed in the next audit. More information on the previous audit recommendations can be found in Appendix B.

Recommendation

The auditor recommends Exomad determine and implement a third-party laboratory testing frequency based on changes in results to ensure the results accurately reflect ongoing production.

Overall Conclusion

Positive Conclusion (Output Audit)

Production Output Audit

The lead auditor is able to express a reasonable assurance opinion that, in all material respects, the quantification of **8,701.62 CO₂ Removal Certificates (CORCs)** for the reporting period 02 September 2025 to 23 October 2025 (October 2025) 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 v4.0 and all 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	8,686.72	14.90	14.90 UC	8,701.62	0.171%	0.171%

*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
26 November 2025

Part B: Detailed Findings

Audit Findings and Conclusions

Table 2 to Table 5 summarises the findings from the Periodic 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 (for details refer to Appendix C). A site visit to the Production Facility was not part of the audit scope as it is expected that a site visit (either physical or virtual) will be conducted by the auditor during the annual Output Audit. Furthermore, a virtual site visit was recently completed during the previous annual Output Audit.

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.	N/A.
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 Riberalta Production Facility was produced from waste material that comes from sustainably sourced biomass. The feedstock was composed of forestry residues and sawdust, which are co-products of regional sawmills certified by the <i>Autoridad de Fiscalización y Control Social de Bosques y Tierra</i> (ABT).	N/A.

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. 	Y	<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, based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 biochar production, including infrastructure impact, equipment construction and decommissioning, energy use (based on electricity bills, diesel records, and LPG consumption), lubricants consumption, waste management for lubricants, and stack emissions. – A4 Transport to Site: 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 emissions factors from a database source. 	N/A.
<p>Confirm that the biochar production process meets requirements 1.1.4 to 1.1.6 of the Biochar Methodology, 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 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.</p>	Carry Forward Recommendation 3
		<p>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.</p>	
		<p>The auditor confirmed that the molar H/C_{org} ratio was 0.33, which is less than 0.7.</p>	

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	<p>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. 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.</p> <p>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>	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 2024 and achieved a positive outcome.	N/A.
Confirm that the Production Facility demonstrate Environmental and Social Safeguards.	Y	<p>The auditor confirmed that the CO₂ Removal Supplier showed sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Production Facility did no significant harm to the surrounding natural environmental and local communities.</p> <p>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).</p>	N/A.

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
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 confirmed that an appropriate system was in place to quantify biochar produced and delivered during the reporting period.	N/A.
Confirm that metering infrastructure is in place to determine: – the production output. – the energy use of the Production Facility.	Y	Production Output Exomad used an industrial scale to measure biochar production and supply to third parties for field applications. 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. Diesel usage The auditor checked the diesel records and confirmed that Exomad used a centralised diesel tank with a calibrated meter. Every time diesel was used, Exomad recorded the vehicle type, date, and driver's signature. There was a procedure in place, 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. Based on the above, the auditor confirmed that calibrated metering infrastructure was in place to determine the production output and the energy use of the Production Facility. Tar and wood vinegar Based on discussions with Exomad personnel and additional evidence provided, tar and wood vinegar were distributed free of charge to local stakeholders.	N/A.

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). 	Y	<p>The auditor reviewed the emission 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. - Energy use: Energy consumption during the production process was quantified using the electricity bills and diesel consumption records. - 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 the biochar. 	N/A.
	<u>Finding</u>	<p>In the CORC Report Summary, the auditor noted that the E_{biomass} and $E_{\text{production}}$ for the biochar production prior to 02 September 2025 had already been accounted for in the annual output audit report for the reporting period 07 September 2024 to 01 September 2025. However, Exomad considered these GHG emissions in this reporting period. As Exomad's approach was to consider the E_{biomass} and $E_{\text{production}}$ of all the biochar produced during the reporting period, the auditor requested Exomad to amend the CORC Report Summary to exclude 5.48 tCO₂e from biomass emissions and 12.41 tCO₂e from production emissions to ensure a consistent approach between reporting periods.</p> <p>This error resulted in the undercalculation of 14.83 CORCs.</p>	<p>Corrective Action Request 1</p> <p>Carry Forward Recommendation 1</p>
	<u>Finding</u>	<p>In the LCA calculations, the auditor noted that an incorrect formula had been used to calculate the airborne emissions produced from flaring during the pyrolyser operation. Upon request, Exomad amended the LCA and CORC Report Summary to account for the correct emissions from the pyrolyser operation.</p> <p>This error resulted in the undercalculation of 0.07 CORCs.</p>	Corrective Action Request 2

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 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.	N/A.
Confirm that the inputs to the Calculation formula of CO ₂ removal are appropriate and consistent with the evidence provided.	Y	<p>The auditor reviewed the evidence provided by the audited body and confirmed the inputs to the calculation formula of CO₂ removal had been correctly determined. Nevertheless, the auditor notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The reporting period covered by the audit was 02 September 2025 to 23 October 2025 (October 2025); - The electricity invoice for September covered from 19 August 2025 to 21 September and the invoice for October covered 21 September 2025 to 23 October 2025. As the reporting period overlapped two billing cycles, the electricity consumption for September was prorated by calculating the daily consumption average and considering only the 20 days that were within the reporting period. The electricity consumption for October was considered in full. All emissions from electricity consumption were appropriately considered by Exomad. - At the time of the audit, Exomad had not stocked up significant quantities of lubricants to merit its transportation to a specialised treatment Facility. As such, Exomad continued to accumulate lubricants on site until the volume is sufficient for collection by an authorized disposal company which led to the Carry Forward Recommendation 2. All emissions from the disposal of lubricants were appropriately considered as hazardous waste by Exomad. 	Carry Forward Recommendation 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 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.
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).	<u>Finding</u>	The auditor confirmed the laboratory tests presented by Exomad were obtained from Eurofins Umwelt, certified under DIN EN ISO/IEC 17025:2018. Similar to the previous output audit, Exomad had an annual testing regime conducted by a third-party laboratory. During this audit, Exomad provided the same laboratory report as for the annual Output Audit, dated 02 September 2025. Given that the final report for the annual Output Audit was issued after the date of engagement for this audit, Exomad had not implemented the quarterly laboratory testing yet.	Carry Forward Recommendation 3

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.

Appendix A: Summary of Audit Details

Table 6 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 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
			tonnes	tonnes	tonnes	tonnes	-	%	tCO ₂ e sequestered	tCO ₂ e/t dry biochar
01	02 Sep 2025	23 Oct 2025	460.00	3,453.63	3,829.63	84.00	0.325	6.30%	8,701.62	2.272182952
Subtotal (year to date)	02 Sep 2025	23 Oct 2025	N/A	3,453.63	3,829.63	N/A	N/A	N/A	8,701.62	N/A

Appendix B: Response to Previous Audit Recommendations

The Production Facility’s audit dated 18 November 2025 (EnergyLink Services Pty Ltd) contained three (3) recommendations and one (1) carry forward recommendation. The recommendations and the auditor’s responses are provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Previous Audit Recommendation

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
<p>Recommendation (1):</p> <p>The auditor recommends Exomad establish and implement a standardised CORCs claim procedure to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ensure a consistent approach is applied to the CORCs claim across reporting periods. As per the reporting period from 07 September 2024 to 01 September 2025, all GHG emissions are based on actual energy consumption during the reporting period rather than on the quantity of biochar applied to the soil; and- All E_{production} emissions are based on the number of days of operation in the reporting period, such as depreciation of the factory construction and equipment, rather than on an annual basis.	<p><u>Partially</u></p>	<p>The auditor confirmed that the E_{production} emissions were correctly calculated based on the number of days of operation in the reporting period, rather than on an annual basis.</p> <p>However, the E_{biomass} and E_{production} emissions from the period prior to 02 September 2025, which had been accounted for in the previous reporting period, had been double counted in this reporting period. This led to the Corrective Action Request 1 and the Carry Forward Recommendation 1, to be further evaluating in the subsequent audit.</p>	<p>Carry Forward Recommendation 1</p>

Requirement	Requirement Met?	Verification Remarks	Corrective Action Request / Recommendations
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.	<u>Partially</u>	The auditor confirmed that Exomad appropriately classified lubricants and greases as hazardous or special waste in the LCA calculations. The auditor also verified that Exomad stores used lubricants and greases until a sufficient volume is accumulated to justify transportation to a licensed disposal company. Accordingly, the auditor has carried this recommendation forward for assessment in the subsequent audit.	Carry Forward Recommendation 2
Recommendation (3): The auditor recommends Exomad determine and implement a third-party laboratory testing frequency based on changes in results to ensure the results accurately reflect ongoing production.	<u>N</u>	The auditor noted that Exomad provided the same laboratory report as for the annual Output Audit, dated 02 September 2025. Given that the final report for the annual Output Audit was issued after the date of engagement for this audit, Exomad has not implemented the recommendation issued yet. Therefore, the auditor has carried forward this recommendation to be further evaluated in the next audit.	Carry Forward Recommendation 3
Carry Forward Recommendation (1) The auditor recommends that Exomad augment its LCA calculation and record keeping procedures to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All data, assumptions, and formulae used for the calculation of emissions associated with the biochar life cycle are traceable, transparent, well-documented, complete, and consistent with the supporting evidence, and – All relevant emissions sources are properly traceable, transparent, well-documented and consistent in the LCA emissions boundary. 	Y	The auditor reviewed the LCA calculations and supporting evidence and confirmed that the emission sources were traceable, transparent, well-documented, and consistent with the defined LCA emissions boundary. The auditor also verified that all relevant emissions were correctly allocated within the LCA calculations.	N/A

Appendix C: Summary of Calculation Errors

A summary of the calculation errors and the associated impacts on CORC calculation is provided in Table 8.

Table 8: Summary of Calculation Errors

Source of Error	CORC calculation	Abs. Error (CORCs)	Net Error (CORCs)	Corrected CORC calculation	Abs. Error Rate (%)	Net Error Rate (%)
Error in E _{biomass} and E _{production} allocation	8,686.72	14.83	14.83 UC	8,701.55	0.171%	0.171%
Error in emissions from pyrolyser operation from airborne emissions through flaring	8,701.55	0.07	0.07 UC	8,701.62	0.001%	0.001%
Total	8,686.72	14.90	14.90 UC	8,701.62	0.172%	0.172%

*OC = Overcalculation/UC = Undercalculation