

# **TRADEWATER, LLC**

# **Validation and Verification Report**

ACR1117 Tradewater US – ODS - #9

Project: ACR1117 | Tradewater US - ODS - #9 Reporting Period: 2025/01/19 to 2025/02/04 Report for: Tradewater, LLC and ACR Program Report Date: April 10, 2025 Version: Final-Revised Dillon Project Number: 25-9749 (1000)

# **Table of Contents**

#### Acronyms, Abbreviations, Definitions

	Executive Summary						
1.0	Introduction						
	1.1	Objectives	2				
	1.2	Scope	2				
2.0	Valida	tion and Verification Activities	4				
	2.1	Conflict of Interest	4				
	2.2	Project Initiation	4				
	2.3	Validation and Verification Plan	4				
	2.4	Site Visit	4				
	2.5	Timing of Validation and Verification Services	5				
	2.6	Document Review	5				
	2.7	Evidence Gathering Procedures	6				
3.0	Valida	tion and Verification Findings	7				
	3.1	Validation and Verification Findings	7				
	3.2	Monitoring Requirements	7				
	3.3	Issues Log	8				
	3.4	Level of Assurance and Materiality	8				
	3.5	Independent Review	8				
4.0	Valida	tion and Verification Statements	9				
5.0	Projec	t Finalization	10				
6.0	Limita	tion of Liability	11				



#### **Tables**

Table 1.1: Project Summary	1
Table 1.2: Validation and Verification Scope	2
Table 2.1: Validation and Verification Schedule	5

#### **Tables (Following Report Text)**

Table A: Documents Listing

Table B: GHG Project Plan Validation and Verification Findings

Table C: Monitoring Plan Verification Findings

Table D: Measurement Instrument QA/QC

Table E: Point of Origin Details

Table F: Issues Log

#### Appendices

- A Validation and Verification Plan
- B Validation and Verification Opinion



# **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

The following acronyms and abbreviations have been used in this Report.

ACR	American Carbon Registry
ARB	Air Resources Board
CAR	Climate Action Reserve
<b>CO</b> <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2</sub> e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CSA	Canadian Standards Association
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GWP	Global warming potential
N <sub>2</sub> O	Nitrous oxide
ODS	Ozone depleting substance
OPR	Offset Project Registry
POR	Point of Origin
Standard	ACR Standard
SSRs	Sources, sinks, and reservoirs
<i>V/V</i>	Validation and Verification
VVB	Validation/Verification Body



# **Executive Summary**

Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon) has prepared this Validation and Verification (V/V) Report for the **Tradewater US - ODS - #9** Project, located in East Liverpool, Ohio, United States (Project or Site) under the ACR (formally American Carbon Registry) Program. The Project is registered with the ACR as **ACR1117**, under the ACR Standard (Standard), version 8.0 (July 2023).

The Project Proponent reported a total GHG reduction of **133,280** metric tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) in accordance with the methodology for the reporting period of **January 19 to February 4, 2025**. Following the Verification process, Dillon has determined with reasonable level of assurance that the reported GHG emissions and reductions presented in the Monitoring Report are free of an offset material misstatement and conformed to all requirements of the Standard and Methodology.

Based on the findings of this V/V Report, Dillon asserts Positive Validation and Verification Statements.



# 1.0 Introduction

Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon) has prepared this Validation and Verification (V/V) Report for the Project detailed in **Table 1.1** under the ACR (formally American Carbon Registry) Program. The Project is registered with the ACR under the *ACR Standard* (Standard), version 8.0 (July 2023). In particular, the scope involves the validation of the GHG Project Plan, and the verification of the Monitoring Report for the Project.

Table 1.1 below presents a summary of the project details.

#### **Table 1.1: Project Summary**

Project Information	Detail		
ACR Project ID#	ACR1117		
Project Title (Project)	Tradewater US - ODS - #9		
Destruction Facility Location (Site)	Heritage Thermal Services 1250 St. George St. East Liverpool, OH 43920 Referred to as the "Destruction Facility" hereinafter.		
ACR Account Holder	Tradewater, LLC		
Project Proponent / Responsible Party / Client	Tradewater, LLC, referred to as the Client hereinafter.		
Standard	ACR Standard, version 8.0 (July 2023) referred to as the "Standard" hereafter.		
Methodology	Methodology for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Removals from The Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High-GWP Foam, Version 2.0, February 2023, referred to as the "Methodology" hereinafter.		
Project Details	The Project involves the destruction of two ISO tanks full of R-11 (refrigerant ODS) in the United States.		
GHG Types	Emission offsets associated with the Project will result in reductions in CFC-11 (R-11).		
	Other ODS refrigerants eligible for emission reductions include; CFC-12, CFC-13, CFC-113, CFC-114, CFC-115, HCFC-22, and HCFC-123.		
Project Start Date	January 19, 2025		
Reporting Period	January 19, 2025 to February 4, 2025		
Crediting Period	January 19, 2025 to February 4, 2025		
GHG Emissions Reductions/ Removals claimed in Reporting Period	133,280 tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (CO $_2$ e)		
Monitoring Report Date	April 9, 2025		
GHG Project Plan Date	April 9, 2025		



# 1.1 Objectives

Dillon conducted and completed the validation and verification according to the Standard and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Standard *ISO* 14064-3:2019 – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas statements.

The objective of the validation was to provide Tradewater, LLC (the Project Proponent) and the ACR (the Regulator) with a systematic assessment of the GHG Project Plan and opinion on the likelihood that implementation of the GHG-related activities would result in GHG emission reductions, and an evaluation on whether the ex-ante information reported was consistent with the requirement of the Standard, applicable methodology, and other applicable criteria.

The objective of the verification was to provide the Project Proponent and the Regulator with a reasonable level of assurance, independent, third-party verification, and opinion on whether the Monitoring Report for the Reporting Period was consistent with the GHG Project Plan, whether the Monitoring Report and GHG assertion were free of material misstatements, as well as that the information reported was accurate and consistent with the requirements of the Standard, applicable methodology, and other applicable criteria (**Table 1.2**).

## 1.2 Scope

A detailed review of the V/V scope, qualitative and quantitative materiality considerations, V/V Team, and V/V procedures are provided in **Appendix A – Validation & Verification Plan**. The following is a summary of the V/V scope for the Project. Information that had changed, been added, or updated since the proposal and/or initial Validation and Verification Plan is flagged with an asterisk (\*).

Project Information	Detail				
Type of Engagement	Validation and Verification (V/V)				
Verification Level of Assurance	Reasonable				
Verification Materiality Threshold	±5% for GHG Emission Reductions, per Section 9.B of the Standard				
V/V Criteria	<ul> <li>ACR Standard: Requirements and Specifications for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting, Verification, and Registration of Project-Based GHG Emissions Reductions and Removals, Version 8.0, ACR, July 2023 (Standard);</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Methodology for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Removal from The Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High-GWP Foam, Version 2.0, ACR, February 2023 (Methodology) and subsequent versions or updates;</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>Errata and Clarifications – Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High- GWP Foam, Version 2.0, ACR, 2025-02-18 (E&amp;C)*</li> </ul>				
	<ul> <li>ACR Validation and Verification Standard Version 1.1, ACR, May 2018 (ACR V/V Standard), as amended;</li> </ul>				

#### Table 1.2: Validation and Verification Scope



Project Information	Detail					
	<ul> <li>ISO 14064-2:2019 Greenhouse gases – Part 2: Specification with guidance at the project level for quantification, monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emission reductions or removal enhancements, ISO, April 2019 (ISO 14064-2);</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>ISO 14064-3:2019 Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas statements, ISO, April 2019 (ISO 14064-3); and</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>ISO 14065:2020 General principles and requirements for bodies validating and verifying environmental information, ISO, December 2020 (ISO 14065).</li> </ul>					
GHG Types	Emission offsets associated with the Project will result in reductions in CFC-11 (R-11).					
	Other ODS refrigerants eligible for emission reductions include; CFC-12, CFC-13, CFC-113, CFC-114, CFC-115, HCFC-22, and HCFC-123.					
Period	Same as Reporting Period listed in Table 1.1 above					
Boundary	Same as the Destruction Facility Location (Site) listed in Table 1.1 above					
Baseline Scenario (Baseline emissions)	The baseline scenario detailed in the GHG Project Plan is the eventual leakage of ODS refrigerant, in which the emissions rate is 100%.					
Project emissions	Greenhouse gas (GHG) sources, sinks and reservoirs (SSRs) consist of the transportation of collected ODS from point of origin (POR) to a certified destruction facility, and destruction of the ODS which includes emissions from incomplete destruction of ODS, oxidation of carbon contained in destroyed ODS, and fossil fuel and electricity emissions in the destruction of ODS.					

# 2.0 Validation and Verification Activities

A detailed review of the V/V scope, materiality, criteria, V/V Team, project understanding, timeline, and V/V methodology are provided in **Appendix A – Validation & Verification Plan**.

# 2.1 Conflict of Interest

Dillon performed a self-evaluation conflict of interest (COI) check to determine the potential of an actual or perceived COI that Dillon may have with the Project or Project Proponent. The risk-based evaluation required by the Standard resulted in a low risk for COI between Dillon and the Project.

The evaluation of conflict of interest for offset project form was completed and submitted to the ACR and the Project Proponent. V/V services did not commence until the COI was approved by ACR as required by Section 6.A(3) of the Standard. The date(s) of COI submission(s) is/are specified in **Table 2.1** in **Section 2.5** below.

# 2.2 Project Initiation

Dillon held a kick-off conference call (planning meeting) between the Project Proponent to discuss project scope, project and baseline sources, sinks and reservoirs (SSRs), V/V timelines, and provide the Project Proponent with an initial information request. Site visit scheduling and logistics were also discussed during this meeting. The kick-off call date is specified in **Table 2.1** in **Section 2.5** below.

## 2.3 Validation and Verification Plan

Dillon developed a risk-based V/V Plan including strategic analysis, risk assessment, and Evidence-Gathering Planning and activities, based on a preliminary review of the data initially provided by the Project Proponent. Dillon submitted the V/V Plan to the Project Proponent prior to the site visit. The final V/V Plan is provided in **Appendix A – Validation & Verification Plan**. The submittal date of the initial V/V Plan is specified in **Table 2.1** in **Section 2.5** below.

## 2.4 Site Visit

On January 10, 2025, Dillon (V. Chan) previously completed an in-person site visit to the Destruction Facility for the same Project Proponent for another project that used the same Methodology (Tradewater US – ODS - #8, ACR1107). A positive Validation and Verification Opinion was issued for that project. Since that in-person site visit, there has been no change at the Destruction Facility with respect to processes, equipment, and/or ownership.



Dillon submitted an Industrial Projects Desk-Based Review Request, in accordance with ACR's November 26, 2024 policy. ACR approved the Desk-Based Review Request by email on **January 28, 2025**. As a result, no site visit was required, no in-person site visit was completed, and Dillon's completed a desk-based review that was completed within 24 months of the January 10, 2025 in-person site visit.

## 2.5 Timing of Validation and Verification Services

Offset V/V services were completed according to the schedule shown in Table 2.1.

#### Table 2.1: Validation and Verification Schedule

Dill	on Task	Timeline
0	Project award and contract signing	January 24, 2025
	Submissions of Project-Specific Conflict of Interest Attestation to ACR	January 27, 2025
1	Project kick-off call	February 5, 2025
2	V/V Plan preparation and submission to the Client	February 6, 2025
	Client review and approval of the V/V Plan	Within one week
3	Data and information exchange and recalculations	February to March 2025
4	Site visit	Not Required
5	First round of Issues log submission to the Client	February 12, 2025
	Client review and response to Issues log	February 14, 2025
6	Second round of Issues Log submission to the Client	February 19, 2025
	Client review and response to Issues log	February 21, 2025
7	Draft V/V Report and Opinion preparation	February 2025
8	Peer Review	February 24, 2025
9	Submittal of Draft V/V Report to the Client for review	February 26, 2025
	Client review of and response to Draft V/V Report (Closing Call)	February 28, 2025
10	Final V/V Report and Statement submission to the Client and Regulator	March 3, 2025
11	Revised V/V Report and Statement submission to the Client and Regulator	As required

### 2.6 **Document Review**

The Project Proponent made available to Dillon all documentation that would support a review of the calculations used to report project and baseline emissions for the reporting period. These records included but were not limited to the GHG Project Plan, Monitoring Plan, laboratory certificates of analysis, weigh scale tickets, POR and shipping documentation, scale and meter calibration records, and other operational records for destruction events. A complete list of all documents reviewed by Dillon is presented as **Table A – Documents Listing** following the report text.



# 2.7 Evidence Gathering Procedures

As part of the validation process, Dillon reviewed and assessed the GHG Project Plan, Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Contribution Report for conformance to the Standard, ACR V/V Standard, and associated ACR templates. Dillon assessed the GHG Project Plan against the Methodology to determine the likelihood that implementation of the GHG-related activities would results in GHG emission reductions. A detailed summary of the evidence-gathering activities completed as a part of Dillon's validation are provided in **Appendix A – Validation & Verification Plan**.

As part of the verification process, Dillon reviewed and assessed the Monitoring Report and associated project records for consistency with the GHG Project Plan, and whether the information reported was accurate and consistent with the requirements of the Standard, Methodology, and other V/V criteria. A detailed summary of the evidence-gathering activities completed as a part of Dillon's verification are provided in **Appendix A – Validation & Verification** 



# 3.0 Validation and Verification Findings

## 3.1 Validation and Verification Findings

As part of the validation process, Dillon reviewed and assessed the GHG Project Plan, Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Contribution Report for conformance to the Standard, ACR V/V Standard, and associated ACR templates. Dillon assessed the GHG Project Plan against the Methodology to determine the likelihood that implementation of the GHG-related activities would results in GHG emission reductions.

As part of the verification process, Dillon reviewed and assessed the Monitoring Report and associated project records for consistency with the GHG Project Plan. Dillon completed independent document reviews and recalculation of baseline GHG emissions, project emissions, GHG reductions to determine whether the information reported was accurate and consistent with the requirements of the Standard, Methodology, and other V/V criteria.

Dillon observed that Sections 1.C and 8.C of the ACR V/V Standard detail the scopes of validation and verification, both of which call for examination of the elements of the GHG Project Plan. For brevity, a detailed list of Dillon's validation and findings and conclusions related to the GHG Project Plan are presented as **Table B – GHG Project Plan Validation and Verification Findings** following the report text. A detailed list of Dillon's verification findings and conclusions related to the Monitoring Report and associated project activity records are presented as **Table C – Monitoring Plan Verification Findings** following the report text.

## 3.2 Monitoring Requirements

The Project Proponent is responsible for monitoring all project activities. The Destruction Facility is responsible for monitoring and continuously tracking the performance of the project and operating each component of the destruction system(s), including weigh scales and flow meters, in a manner consistent with the manufacturer's specifications and certification testing.

A table summarizing the project's measurement instruments and quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) activities is provided in **Table D – Measurement Equipment Calibrations**.

A table summarizing the POR determination and documentation information for each destruction event for the Project is provided in **Table E – Point of Origin Details**.



## 3.3 Issues Log

Dillon performed data checks of all information provided by the Project Proponent.

Throughout the V/V process, the Dillon team developed a list of V/V findings in an Issues Log, representing clarification, document requests, observations, non-conformities, material misstatements and/or corrective actions for a response from the Project Proponent. The Issues Logs were based on the results of Dillon's document review, and cross-checks against the V/V criteria, and independent recalculations of the GHG emission reduction assertion. The Project Proponent had an opportunity to respond to the issues identified in the issues log through verbal communication or email correspondence. Upon closure, Dillon proceeded to the peer review and V/V reporting tasks.

The final issues log detailing all issues and their resolutions is provided in Table F – Issues Log.

## 3.4 Level of Assurance and Materiality

The verification was conducted to a reasonable level of assurance. The calculation for determination of a Material Misstatement is as follows:

% Error

= <u>Project Emission Reduction or Removal Statement – VVB Emissions Reduction or Removal Calculation</u> VVB Emissions Reduction or Removal Calculation

·100%

 $Percent\ error = \ \frac{133,280 - 133,280}{133,280} \cdot 100\%$ 

Percent error = 0.0000%

The quantitative aggregated magnitude of discrepancies, omissions, and misreporting identified during the verification services is 0.0000%, which is less than the materiality threshold of 5%.

## 3.5 Independent Review

An independent review of the Validation and Verification Report and findings was performed by a Dillon ACR-accredited Lead Verifier that has not been involved in the V/V of the project. Robert Morgan performed the independent review on **February 24, 2025** to identify any errors in planning, data sampling, and judgments of the V/V Team.

Upon completion of the independent review, Dillon's Independent Reviewer concurred with the V/V findings presented by the V/V Team.



# **4.0** Validation and Verification Statements

The Project Proponent has claimed **133,280 tCO**<sub>2</sub>**e** of total GHG emission reductions from the destruction of eligible ODS refrigerants for the Project and Reporting Period detailed in **Table 1.1** above.

The Project Proponent was responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the GHG Project Plan and Monitoring Report GHG assertion in accordance with the criteria. Dillon was responsible for completing the validation and verification and expressing opinions of the GHG Project Plan and Monitoring Report GHG assertion in accordance with ISO 14064-3:2019 and criteria listed in **Table 1.2** above.

Based on the systematic validation procedures undertaken, Dillon independently validated that implementation of the project activities detailed in the GHG Project Plan were likely to result in GHG emission reductions, and the information reported was consistent with the requirements of the Standard, Methodology and criteria listed in **Table 1.2** above.

Based on the verification procedures undertaken, Dillon independently verified that the Project's Monitoring Report GHG assertion that covers emissions reductions for the Reporting Period detailed in **Table 1.1** above, was prepared in accordance with the GHG Project Plan, Standard and Methodology, is supported by appropriate underlying evidence, is fairly stated, and is free from material errors and omissions to a reasonable level of assurance.

The Opinion Form is provided in **Appendix B – Validation and Verification Opinion**.



# 5.0 **Project Finalization**

Dillon has confirmed the finalization of this Project V/V through a final review of documentation, issues log, V/V findings, and V/V statement with the Project Proponent through a web/teleconference discussion (closing call) held on the date specified in **Table 2.1** in **Section 2.5** above.



# 6.0 Limitation of Liability

This report and statement was prepared exclusively for the purposes, project, and site locations outlined in the report and statement. The report is based on information provided to, or obtained by Dillon Consulting Limited ("Dillon") as indicated in the report, and applies solely to site conditions existing at the time of the site investigation(s). Although a reasonable level of assurance investigation was conducted by Dillon, Dillon's investigation was by no means exhaustive. Rather, Dillon's report represents a reasonable review of available information within an agreed work scope, schedule, and budget. Further review and updating of the report may be required as conditions and the regulatory and planning frameworks, change over time.

This report was prepared by Dillon for the sole benefit of our Client. The material in it reflects Dillon's best judgment in light of the information available to it at the time of preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions made based on it, are the responsibilities of such third parties. Dillon accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.

The information and opinions rendered in this report are exclusively for use by the Client. Dillon will not distribute or publish this report without the Client's consent except as required by law or court order. The information and opinions expressed in this report are given in response to a limited assignment and should only be evaluated and implemented in connection with that assignment. Dillon accepts responsibility for the competent performance of its duties in executing the assignment and preparing this report in accordance with the normal standards of the profession, but disclaims any responsibility for consequential damages.

The work completed for this validation and verification was completed as part of the legally enforceable contract for GHG assurance services. The associated reports and statements provided to the Client as part of the assurance services provided, are intended for the use of the Client and the Regulator. The Client shall not use Dillon's Statement/Opinion, Reports, marks, logos, or labels in a manner that could mislead intended users or impair Dillon's reputation. Should the Client wish to use statements, opinions, reports, marks, logos, or labels provided throughout this process, they must seek to do so via a written statement. Any Dillon opinions or reports made public by the Client must be communicated in their entirety. Any Client or responsible party references to Dillon's findings, conclusions, reports and/or opinions must adhere to the requirements of ISO 14065:2020 Annex B.



# **Tables**





**Table A: Documents Listing** 

Table B: GHG Project Plan Validation and Verification Findings

Table C: Monitoring Plan Verification Findings Table D: Measurement Equipment Calibrations

**Table E: Point of Origin Details** 

Table F: Issues Log





# **Documents Listing**

No.	File Name	File Type	Category	Date Received
1	ACR GHGPP TWUSODS9 V1.1 02102025.docx	Microsoft Word	GHG Project Plan	02-10-2025
2	ACR_GHGPP_TWUSODS9_V1.1_02142025.docx	Microsoft Word	GHG Project Plan	02-14-2025
3	ACR_GHGPP_TWUSODS9_V1.2_02202025.docx	Microsoft Word	GHG Project Plan	02-20-2025
4	ACR-Env-Social-Impact-Assessment-Report_TWUSODS9.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Env Social Impact Assessment Report	02-10-2025
5	ACR-Env-Social-Impact-Assessment-Report_TWUSODS9_02142025.docx	Microsoft Word	Env Social Impact Assessment Report	02-14-2025
6	ACR-SDG-Cont-Report-Industrial-Project_TWUSODS9.pdf	Acrobat PDF	SDG Contribution Report	02-10-2025
7	D-85408 signed RPA & Rider.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
8	D-85629 signed RPA & rider.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
9	Bill of Lading - EURU191124-9 - T170609 (1).pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
10	Bill of Lading - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
11	Chain of Custody Signed - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
12	FedEx Sample Recipt Signature - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
13	FedEx Shipping Label - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
14	Lab Sample Label - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
15	Chain of Custody Signed - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
16	FedEx Sample Receipt Signature - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
17	FedEx Shipping Label - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
18	Lab Sample Label - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Chain of Custody Documentation	02-10-2025
19	P0134491.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
20	Title V Permit.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
21	Title V Renewal Draft Letter.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
22	GHG Exemption.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
23	2024 0119 OEPA CEI.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
24	HTS NOV List 3yr.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
25	NOTIFIED SUBMITTER OF RESOLUTION - ACCEPTED FOR ERROR # 125246.ms	Outlook Message	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
26	NPDES through 261031.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
27	2023 1113 USEPA RCRA Inspection Report.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
28	Acknowledgement 2022.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
29	RCRA Permit Renewal Final 011719.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
30	10-2024 Ebay.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Calibration Record	02-10-2025
31	10-2024 Front Gate.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Calibration Record	02-10-2025
32	12-2024 Ebay.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Calibration Record	02-10-2025
33	12-2024 Front Gate.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Calibration Record	02-10-2025
34	2-2025 Ebay.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Calibration Record	02-14-2025
35	2-2025 Front Gate.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Calibration Record	02-14-2025
36	RATA Report 103020.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
37	022820 state emergency from cberinger.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Compliance Documentation	02-10-2025
38	SSMP Rev 15.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Startup, shutdown and malfunction plan	02-10-2025
39	DRE Report Summary.pdf	Acrobat PDF	ODS Destruction Efficiency	02-10-2025
40	Heritage CPT Report 030221.pdf	Acrobat PDF	ODS Destruction Efficiency	02-10-2025
41	B. Pleskovich.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
42	C.COLE.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
43	D.Venturini.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
44	J. Higgins.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
45	J. Shenton.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
46	J.HANNAH.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
47	J.Horner.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
48	M.MCDANIEL.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
49	M.Smith.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
50	P.Wounaris.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
51	R.Gadd.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
52	R.MEEKS.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
53	S. Lorah.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
54	S.FOSTER.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
55	S.Shultz.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
56	s.ward.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Technician certification	02-10-2025
57	Attachment H-2, Rev 19 Clean.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Training document	02-10-2025
58	Certificate of Destruction - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Destruction	02-10-2025



# **Documents Listing**

No.	File Name	File Type	Category	Date Received
59	ODSBURN 01252025.xlsx	Microsoft Excel	Destruction	02-10-2025
60	Certificate of Destruction - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Destruction	02-10-2025
61	NRI Analysis Report - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
62	NRI Request for Refrigerant Analysis - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
63	ODS 100 Form - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
64	ODS Sample Certificate Signed - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
65	Offical Post Destruction weight ticket - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Weigh Ticket	02-10-2025
66	Offical Pre Destruction weight ticket - EURU191124-9 - T170609.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Weigh Ticket	02-10-2025
67	Certificate of Destruction - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Destruction	02-10-2025
68	ODSBURN 02042025.xlsx	Microsoft Excel	Destruction	02-10-2025
69	NRI Analysis Report - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
70	NRI Request for Refrigerant - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
71	ODS -100 Form - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
72	ODS Sampling Certificate Signed - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Sampling/Analysis	02-10-2025
73	Offical Post Destruction Weight Ticket - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Weigh Ticket	02-10-2025
74	Offical Pre Destruction Weight Ticket - EURU167282-2 - T170806.pdf	Acrobat PDF	Weigh Ticket	02-10-2025
75	Monitoring Report_US ODS 9_V1.0_02102025.docx	Microsoft Word	Monitoring Report	02-10-2025
76	Monitoring Report_US ODS 9_V1.0_02142025.docx	Microsoft Word	Monitoring Report	02-14-2025
77	Monitoring Report_US ODS 9_V1.1_02202025.docx	Microsoft Word	Monitoring Report	02-20-2025
78	Calculator_ACRUSODS9.xlsx	Microsoft Excel	Quantification	02-10-2025
79	Calculator_ACRUSODS9_02142025.xlsx	Microsoft Excel	Quantification	02-14-2025
80	ACR_GHGPP_TWUSODS9_VF2_04092025 - signed	Microsoft Word	GHG Project Plan	04-09-2025
81	ACR_MR_TWUSODS9_04092025 - signed	Microsoft Word	Monitoring Report	04-09-2025



### GHG Project Plan Validation and Verification Findings

Validation Findings				
Category	ACR V/V Standard Section	ACR Standard Section	Check	Detail
Project Boundary	2.A	2.B.1	Y	Dillon completed desk-based document reviews in accordance with the ACR Industrial Projects Desk-Based Review Policy. Dillon determined that the Project boundary and Destruction Facility information detailed in Sections A6 and B3 of the GHG Project Plan were in compliance with the requirements of Section 3.2(II) of the Methodology. Dillon verified that the Destruction Facility is located in the U.S.
Physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the project	1.C	6.B	Y	Dillon completed desk-based document reviews in accordance with the ACR Industrial Projects Desk-Based Review       Policy.         Dillon determined that the project technologies and activity detailed in Section A4 of the Final GHG Project Plan were in compliance with the eligible activities detailed in Section 2 of the Methodology.
GHG sources and sinks within the project boundary	2.B	2.B.1	Y	Dillon cross-checked the GHG Sources, Sinks and Reservoirs (SSRs) listed in Section B4, Table 4 of the GHG Project Plan against Section 4 of the Methodology. Dillon determined that the SSRs listed in the GHG Project Plan were consistent with the offset project boundary section of the Methodology; no relevant SSRs were excluded from the GHG Project Plan.
Temporal boundary (Start Date, Reporting Periods, Crediting Periods)	2.C, 6.A, 6.B,	6.B	Y	Dillon completed document reviews and cross-checked the GHG Project Plan against the Standard and Methodology. Dillon's document reviews included CEMS data, weigh tickets, and the Certificate of Destruction (COD). Dillon determined that the Start Date, Crediting Period and Reporting Period detailed in Section H of the GHG Project Plan were consistent with the definitions in the Standard, and the reporting period and crediting period requirements detailed in Sections 3.5 and 3.6 of the Methodology.
Description of and justification of the baseline scenario	3.A and 3.B	6.B	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon reviewed the GHG Project Plan, Methodology, Standard, ACR V/V Standard, and ACR Ozone Depleting Substances Primer (https://acrcarbon.org/resources/ozone-depleting-substances/), and the Project emission reduction calculations and information.</li> <li>Dillon noted that the Methodology does not explicitly define applicable baseline scenarios for destruction of ODS refrigerants. However, the baseline scenario detailed in Section B5 of the GHG Project Plan (i.e., the eventual leakage of the ODS refrigerant, in which the emission rate is 100%) was consistent with information from the ACR Primer.</li> </ul>
Methodologies, algorithms and calculations that will be used to generate estimates of emission reductions	Chapter 5	6.B	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon cross-checked the GHG Project Plan Monitored data and parameters (Section D), GHG Quantification details (Section E), and ODS GWPs and Emission rates (Table 5) against Section 5 and Appendix A Table 4 of the Methodology.</li> <li>Dillon determined that the: <ul> <li>ODS GWPs in Table 5 of the GHG Project Plan were consistent with the Vintage Year 2021+ values in Appendix A, Table 4 of the Methodology, and</li> <li>Emission Rates in Table 5 of the GHG Project Plan were consistent with Section 3.8 of the Methodology</li> <li>Default emission factor listed in Section E3 of the GHG Project Plan for transportation and destruction of refrigerant was consistent with Section 5.2(IV) of the Methodology.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Section D1 of the GHG Project Plan details use of CEMS data. Dillon considered the emission data bullet points listed in Section 5A of the ACR V/V Standard as part of the verification activities - see Table C.</li> <li>Dillon reviewed and determined that the activity data (CEMS data) used in the emission calculations (1) met the requirements of the approved methodology and were appropriate for the emission sources; (2) were correctly applied from the original documentation; and (3) was the most accurate data readily available.</li> </ul>
Process information, source identification/counts and operational details	1.C	6.B	Y	Dillon completed desk-based document reviews in accordance with the ACR Industrial Projects Desk-Based Review Policy. Dillon determined that the process information and operational details specified in Section A4 of the GHG Project Plan were real, additional, and permanent.



### GHG Project Plan Validation and Verification Findings

Validation Findings				
Category	ACR V/V Standard Section	ACR Standard Section	Check	Detail
Data management systems	1.C	6.B	Y	The Project Proponent is responsible for monitoring all project activities. The Destruction Facility is responsible for monitoring and continuously tracking the performance of the Project and operating each component of the destruction system(s), including weigh scales and flow meters, in a manner consistent with the manufacturer's specifications and certification testing. Dillon cross-checked the GHG Monitoring Plan in Section D of the GHG Project Plan against the Methodology. Dillon determined that the data management systems matched the monitoring parameters listed in Section 6.5, Table 3 of the Methodology that apply to ODS refrigerants.
QA/QC procedures	Chapter 11	6.B	Y	Dillon reviewed documents and cross-checked the GHG Monitoring Plan against the Methodology and Section 11.B of the ACR V/V Standard. Dillon determined that the QA/QC procedures listed for the monitoring parameters listed in Section in Section D of the GHG Project Plan was consistent with Project information and processes.
Processes for uncertainty assessments	11.A	2.B.3 and 2.B.6	Y	Dillon reviewed and cross-checked Section E5 of the GHG Project Plan against the Methodology, Section 2.B.3 of the Standard, and Chapter 11 of the ACR V/V Standard. Dillon observed that the GHG Project Plan was prepared based on actual, ex-post project data. Dillon confirmed that calculating uncertainty is therefore not applicable, as specified in Section E5 of the GHG Project Plan.
Project-specific conformance to ACR eligibility criteria	1.0	Chapter 3	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon reviewed and cross-checked Sections A5 and C2 of the GHG Project Plan against the Chapters 2 and 3 of the Methodology. Dillon also completed document reviews, interviewed Project Proponent and Destruction Facility personnel, and completed an in-person site visit.</li> <li>Dillon determined that the Project is eligible based on the following findings:</li> <li><u>Eligible Destruction Facilities</u></li> <li>Eligible DOS was destroyed at an eligible destruction facility as required by Section 2.1(l) of the Methodology. The Heritage Thermal Services destruction facility is an approved hazardous waste combustor (HWC) subject to RCRA with a RCRA permit, and has documentation that demonstrates destruction and removal efficiency (DRE) of at least 99.99%.</li> <li>The Destruction Facility is located in the US and meets all applicable monitoring and operational requirements under CAA and NESHAP standards, and all applicable federal, state and local laws that apply to ODS destruction activities during the Reporting Period, as required by Section 2.1(l) of the Methodology.</li> <li>The Destruction Facility has a valid Title V air permit, and any other air or water permits required by local, state or federal law for the Reporting Period and document compliance with all monitoring and operational requirements that apply to ODS destruction project activities, as required by Section 2.1(V) of the Methodology.</li> <li>The Destruction Facility manages any upsets or exceedances in accordance with an authorized Startup, Shutdown and Malfunction Plan (SSMP), as required by Section 2.1(V) of the Methodology.</li> <li>Any post-destruction hazardous waste is managed as required by RCRA.</li> <li>Dillon determined that the Project eligibility criterion and requirements listed in Sections A5 and C2 of the Final GHG Project Plan were consistent with Chapters 2 and 3 of the Methodology. See Table C - Verification Findings for additional Project Eligibility evaluation.</li> </ul>
Additionality: Regulatory Surplus Test and Performance Standard Evaluation	4.A and 4.D	Chapter 4	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon reviewed and cross-checked Section C of the GHG Project Plan against the Methodology, Chapter 4 of the Standard, and Chapter 4 of the ACR V/V Standard. Project additionality is assessed through a Regulatory Surplus Test and Performance Standard Evaluation, in accordance with Section 3.3 of the Methodology.</li> <li>Dillon independently reviewed USEPA ODS information (https://www.epa.gov/ozone-layer-protection/ozone-depleting-substances), and applicable regulations identified by the Project Proponent in the GHG Project Plan, i.e., Title VI of the Clean Air Act, and 40 CFR Part 82 Subpart F. Dillon confirmed that there are no existing laws, regulations, statutes, legal rulings, or any other legally binding mandates that require the destruction of ODS stocks, or that directly or indirectly affect the GHG emissions associated with the Project. Project emission reductions therefore pass the regulatory surplus test.</li> <li>Dillon reviewed and determined that the ODS Project activities meet the project definition and all other eligibility requirements in the Methodology, and Project activities exceed those likely to occur in a conservative business-as-usual scenario (e.g., baseline scenario); therefore, the performance standard evaluation is satisfied.</li> <li>Dillon determined that the Project emission reductions are additional and eligible for crediting under the Methodology.</li> </ul>



### GHG Project Plan Validation and Verification Findings

Validation Findings				
Category	ACR V/V Standard Section	ACR Standard Section	Check	Detail
Minimum Project Term	6.C	Chapter 3	N/A	Not Applicable to this project type.
Offset Title	6.D	Chapter 3	Y	Dillon reviewed and confirmed the Project Proponent's undisputed title to all offsets were documented in the Refrigerant Purchase Agreements (RPAs)
Impermanence and Risk Mitigation	6.E	Chapter 5	N/A	Not Applicable to this project type.
Leakage	6.F	Chapter 3	N/A	Not Applicable to this project type.
Environmental and Community Impacts	6.G	Chapter 8	Y	Dillon reviewed the project's Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Report and Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Contribution Report. Dillon determined that the Project Proponent evaluated community and environmental impacts, documented a mitigation plan for any foreseen negative community or environmental impacts, and disclosed any prior negative environmental or community impacts or claims of thereof.
Double Issuance, Double Selling, and Double Use of Offsets	6.H	Chapter 10	Y	Dillon determined that the project is not claiming emission reductions for the same project and reporting period on any other GHG registry or platform.
Projects Participating in Other Asset Programs	6.1	10.A.1	Y	Dillon determined that the project is not enrolled in other asset programs.
Conclusion				Based on Dillon's review, the Project Proponent's GHG Project Plan conforms to the requirements of the ACR Standard and the Methodology. Implementation of the GHG-related activities detailed in the GHG Project Plan are most likely to result in GHG emission reductions. Information in the GHG Project Plan was reported ex-post, there were no ex-ante information included.



Overview of Greenhouse Gas Re	eporting		
Category	ACR V/V Standard	Check	Detail
Temporal boundary (Start Date, Reporting Periods, Crediting Periods)	8.C	Y	Dillon completed document reviews and cross-checked the Monitoring Report against the GHG Project Plan, Standard and Methodology. Dillon's document reviews included CEMS data, weigh tickets, and the Certificate of Destruction (COD). Dillon independently verified that the Start Date, Crediting Period and Reporting Period detailed in Section II of the Monitoring Report were consistent with the dates listed in the GHG Project Plan; definitions in the Standard; and the reporting period and crediting period requirements detailed in Sections 3.5 and 3.6 of the Methodology.
Methods and calculations used to generate estimates of emissions and emission reductions	8.C	Y	Dillon completed document reviews, compared and cross-checked the Monitoring Report against the GHG Project Plan and Methodology. Dillon independently performed a complete recalculation of the baseline emissions that would have occurred over the reporting period and the project emissions for the reporting period, using the equations, default emission factors and ODS GWPs listed in the Methodology. Dillon raised Issue #6 (Table F) identifying a discrepancy between emission reduction values initially reported by the Project Proponent compared to the values recalculated by Dillon, which were the result of issues with values or equations/formulae. The issues were resolved in the Final quantification spreadsheet, GHG Project Plan and Monitoring Report files. Dillon did not identify any quantifiable discrepancy with the Project Proponent's final reported emission reduction value.
Process information, source identification/counts and operational details	1.C	Y	Dillon completed desk-based document reviews in accordance with the ACR Industrial Projects Desk-Based Review Policy. The Project Activity involves destruction of ODS refrigerant. Requirements in the Methodology related to sources of high GWP insulation foam, medical aerosol, fire suppressant, and solvents, and destruction at equipment de-manufacturing systems are not applicable. Dillon verified that the monitoring requirements detailed in Section 6.1, including Section 6.1(XI) of the Methodology was completed and maintained by the Project Proponent and/or Destruction Facility.
Data management systems	1.C	Y	The Project Proponent is responsible for monitoring all project activities. The Destruction Facility is responsible for monitoring and continuously tracking the performance of the Project and operating each component of the destruction system(s), including weigh scales and flow meters, in a manner consistent with the manufacturer's specifications and certification testing.
QA/QC procedures	Chapter 11	Y	Dillon reviewed documents and cross-checked the GHG Monitoring Plan against the Methodology and Section 11.B of the ACR V/V Standard. Dillon independently validated that the QA/QC procedures listed for the monitoring parameters listed in Section in Section D of the GHG Project Plan was consistent with Project information and processes.
Processes for uncertainty assessments	11.A	Y	Dillon reviewed and cross-checked Section E5 of the GHG Project Plan against the Methodology, Section 2.B.3 of the Standard, and Chapter 11 of the ACR V/V Standard. Dillon observed that the GHG Project Plan was prepared based on actual, ex-post project data. Dillon confirmed that calculating uncertainty is therefore not applicable, as specified in Section E5 of the GHG Project Plan.
Project-specific conformance to ACR eligibility criteria	1.C	Y	Dillon reviewed and cross-checked Sections A5 and C2 of the GHG Project Plan against the Chapters 2 and 3 of the Methodology. Dillon also completed document reviews, interviewed Project Proponent and Destruction Facility personnel, and completed an in-person site visit. Dillon independently validated that the Project eligibility criterion and requirements listed in Sections A5 and C2 of the GHG Project Plan were consistent with Chapters 2 and 3 of the Methodology. See Table C - Verification Findings for additional Project Eligibility evaluation.



Verification Checklist							
Category	Methodology	Check	Detail				
	Section						
	0.1						
KUKA permit status	2.1	Y	The Destruction Facility is an approved hazardous waste combustor with a RCRA Permit (EPA IS No. OHD980613541). ODS Destruction efficiency of at least 99.99% is documented in "Destruction Removal Efficiency Test, Final Report and Notification of Compliance for the Rotary Kiln Incinerator", TRC Environmental Corporation (September 2023), and "Comprehensive Performance Test Final Report and Notification of Compliance for the Rotary Kiln Incinerator", TRC Environmental Corporation (May 2020).				
Eligible Destruction Facility and Regulatory compliance	2.1 and 3.7	Y	The Destruction Facility has the following permits: RCRA; Clean Air Act (CAA); Clean Water Act (CWA); Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE); Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA); Ohio Pharmacy License; Department of				
			Agriculture Soil Agreement; and Discharge to Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW). The Destruction Facility has a Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction Plan (SSMP) pursuant to the HWC MACT Regulations, dated June 2020, Revision 15. Dillon verified that the Project met the compliance requirements stated in Section 2.1(II), (V) to (VII) of the Methodology.				
Eligible ODS	2.2	Y	Dillon verified that destroyed ODS refrigerants was from one or more of the eligible sources listed in Sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.5 of the Methodology; was not from government inventories or stockpiles; and documented in one or more Certificates of Destruction that was/were issued by the Destruction Facility and contained the information required by Section 2.2(VII) of the Methodology.				
608/609 certifications	2.2	Y	Dillon reviewed and determined that handling, recovery and disposal of ODS refrigerants were performed by USEPA Sections 608/609 certified technicians.				
Reporting period	3.5	Y	Dillon verified that project activities involve one reporting period under 12 months.				
Original underlying data and docum	entation / Monit	orina Re	aurements				
Point of origin (POR) documentation	6.1(III)	Ŷ	<ul> <li>Dillon confirmed POR documentation contents for all ODS documented the following:</li> <li>Facility name and physical address.</li> <li>POR zip code.</li> <li>Serial or ID number of containers for storage/transport.</li> </ul>				
Chain of custody (COC) documentation	6.1(IV)	Y	Dillon verified that the COC documentation contents included the following: • Name, address, contact of all entities buying/selling for destruction. • Mass of ODS, incl. ODS and contaminants, in each transaction.				
Sampling documentation	6.1(X)	Ŷ	<ul> <li>Dillon reviewed the Project Proponent Sampling files, and verified that the Composition and mass analysis sampling documentation for all destruction events contained the following information:</li> <li>Time and date of sample.</li> <li>Name of Project Proponent.</li> <li>Name of technician taking sample.</li> <li>Employer of technician taking sample.</li> <li>Size of each sample in pounds.</li> <li>Volume of container from which sample was extracted.</li> <li>Ambient air temperature at time of sampling.</li> <li>Chain of custody for each sample from point of sampling to AHRI lab.</li> </ul>				
CEMS data	6.1(XI)	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon reviewed the Project Proponent destruction files, i.e., CEMS data, completed interviews with project personnel and verified that the following destruction facility information was collected and maintained:</li> <li>ODS feed rate.</li> <li>Operating temperature and pressure of destruction unit.</li> <li>Effluent discharges - water and pH levels.</li> <li>Data on the emissions of carbon monoxide during destruction.</li> </ul>				



Category	Methodology	Check	Detail
Original underlying data and docun	nentation / Monit	oring Rea	l quirements
POR determination	6.2	Y	Dillon reviewed the Chain of Custody files, and verified that the Project Proponent collected and maintained data on the point of origin as part of the tracking chain of custody. The point of origin for the refrigerant ODS was the location of the ODS prior to acquisition by the Project Proponent, in accordance with Chapter 6.2(II)(A)(i) of the Methodology.
Scale calibrations	6.3(l)	Y	Dillon reviewed the Destruction Facility scale calibration certificates and RCRA permit. Dillon did not identify any defined scale calibration requirements in the RCRA permit. Dillon verified that scales were calibrated at least six months prior to the project start date to 5% or better accuracy.
Document Retention	6.4	Y	The Project Proponent details a data retention policy of 15 years in the Monitoring Report. The Project Proponent data retention policy exceeds the ACR document retention requirements, specified in the Errata & Clarifications document, version 2.0, published on February 18, 2025.
Sampling Procedures			
Mass determination	App C(I)(A)	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon completed document reviews and verified that the following mass determination requirements were completed:</li> <li>Single scale used for full and empty weights, i.e., pre- and post-destruction weights.</li> <li>Full weight measured &lt;48 hours prior to start of destruction per the Certificate of Destruction (COD).</li> <li>Empty weight measured &lt;48 hours after conclusion of destruction per the COD.</li> <li>Each container was weighed or sampled separately and treated as its own destruction event.</li> <li>No mixing or aggregation following weighing and sampling.</li> </ul>
Weighing Procedures	App C(I)(B)	Y	Dillon interviewed Destruction Facility personnel and completed an in-person site visit in January 2025 for a previous project (ACR1107 - Tradewater US - ODS - #8). During the site visit, Dillon viewed the ODS 100 procedure, which documents the Destruction Facility's requirement to disconnect the trailer from the tractor (i.e., transportation vehicle) and remove the tractor from the scale. Dillon verified that the Destruction Facility weighing procedures comply with Appendix C(I)(B)(i) of the Methodology.
Mass composition sampling requirements	App C(I)(C)	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon completed document reviews and verified that the following sampling requirements were completed:</li> <li>Sample must be taken when in possession of Destruction Facility.</li> <li>Clean, fully evacuated sample bottle meeting DOT requirements, capacity of 1 lb.</li> <li>Sample taken in liquid state.</li> <li>Minimum sample size of 1 lb.</li> <li>Individually labeled and tracked.</li> <li>COC documented by bills of lading or electronic tracking, incl. proof of delivery.</li> </ul>
Mass composition information	App C(I)(C)(v)	Y	<ul> <li>Dillon completed document reviews and verified that sample information included:</li> <li>Time and date of sample.</li> <li>Name of Project Proponent.</li> <li>Name of technician.</li> <li>Employer of technician.</li> <li>Size of sample in pounds</li> <li>Volume of container from which sample was extracted.</li> <li>Ambient air temperature at time of sampling.</li> </ul>
Mass composition analysis	App C(I)(D)	Υ	<ul> <li>Dillon completed document reviews and verified that sample analysis information included:</li> <li>identification of the ODS refrigerant.</li> <li>Purity % of ODS mixture by mass using gas chromatography.</li> <li>Moisture level in ppm. Moisture content must be &lt;75% of saturation point of ODS based on temperature recorded at time sample taken. (For non-mixed ODS, saturation point is of major ODS species; for mixed, lowest value of any species that makes up at least 10% of composition).</li> <li>Analysis of high boiling residue (HBR), must be under 10% by mass.</li> <li>Analysis of other ODS and % by mass.</li> </ul>
Mixed ODS procedure requirements	App C(I)(G)	N/A	<ul> <li>Where mixed, the following additional requirements apply:</li> <li>Sampling may be conducted at the destruction facility or prior to delivery to the destruction facility.</li> <li>Circulation and sampling activities must be conducted by a contracted third-party and trained individuals.</li> <li>Documentation for procedures of analysis.</li> <li>Prior to sampling, ODS mixture must be circulated in a container that (details below).</li> </ul> There was no ODS mixing for this Project.



Category	Section	Check	Detail
Sampling Procedures			•
Mixed ODS container requirements	App C(l)(G)(vi)	N/A	Circulation container requirements for mixed ODS are as follows: • No solid interior obstructions. • Fully evacuated prior to filling. • Sampling ports for liquid and gas phases. • Sampling ports located in middle third of container (not at ends). • Circulation through closed loop system from bottom to top for a single container or from the bottom of one tank to the top of another tank if two connected containers are used. There was no ODS mixing for this Project.
Mixed ODS circulation App C(I)(G)(vi) N/A and (vii)		N/A	<ul> <li>The following procedure for mixed ODS circulation applies:</li> <li>Liquid mixture circulated from liquid port to vapor port for a single container.</li> <li>Volume of mixture equal to 2 times the volume of container to be circulated.</li> <li>Calculations converting between mass and volume to use densities in Table 5 of the Methodology, must be in liquid state if converting.</li> <li>Circulation at a rate of at least 30 gal/min.</li> <li>Record start and end times.</li> <li>Confirmed that within 30 minutes of circulation, minimum of 2 samples were taken from bottom liquid port and analysed at AHRI lab.</li> <li>There was no ODS mixing for this Project.</li> </ul>
GHG reductions calculation	App C(I)(G)(viii)	Y	Confirmed that Project Proponent calculated GHG reductions using all sample results, choosing the most conservative
Emission Source Group - SSR4 - Proj	ject Emissions		
Scope Item Verified			Fossil fuel emissions from the vehicular transport of ODS from aggregation point to final destruction facility.
Verification Procedure			Review of total quantity of refrigerant sent for destruction and Methodology default emission factors.
Verification Findings			The Project Proponent calculated SSR4 fossil fuel emissions from vehicular transport of ODS from the aggregate point to the destruction facility in accordance with Equation 11 of the Methodology and associated default emission factors. Dillon reviewed the weigh scale records, batch make-up and mixing sheets (if applicable), Certificates of Destruction (COD), Certificates of Analysis (COA), destruction event records, and POR documentation and completed a full recalculation. Dillon found no material discrepancy with the reported emissions.
Conclusion			Based on Dillon's review of the methodology, Dillon has determined that the calculations are correct, accurate, and free
Emission Source Group - SSR5 - Base	eline and Project	Emissio	וטי טיו אבר וומנפוומו ווואאנמנפווופוווא. חא
Scope Item Verified			Emissions of ODS from recovered ODS stockpiles and EOL equipment (if not sent for destruction)
Verification Procedure			Review of masses of ODS destroyed and Methodology default emission factors
Verification Findings			The Project Proponent calculated SSR6 baseline emissions from refrigerant ODS in accordance with Equation 3 of the Methodology using default values from Table 4 and excluding the mass of HBR, moisture and ineligible ODS from the mass of refrigerant ODS sent for destruction (Qref,i). Dillon reviewed the weigh scale records, batch make-up and mixing sheets (if applicable), COD, COA, destruction event records including weigh tickets, and POR documentation and confirmed the masses of ODS destroyed. Dillon completed a full recalculation of the estimated CO2e emissions that would have occurred if the total quantity of recovered ODS would not have been sent for destruction and would have eventually leaked into the atmosphere. Dillon found no material discrepancy in the reported emissions.
Conclusion			Based on Dillon's review of the methodology, Dillon has determined that the calculations are correct, accurate, and free of offset material misstatements



Emission Source Group - SSR6 - Project Emis	SSIONS
Scope Item Verified	- Emissions of ODS from incomplete destruction at destruction facility;
	- Emissions from the oxidation of carbon contained in destroyed ODS;
	- Fossil fuel emissions from the destruction of ODS at destruction facility; and
	- Indirect emissions from the use of grid-delivered electricity.
Verification Procedure	Review of masses of ODS destroyed, supporting calculations, and cross-check applied emission factors against the default factors listed in the Methodology
Verification Findings	The Project Proponent calculated SSR6 project emissions in accordance with Equation 9 of the Methodology and associated default emission factors, with total mass of ODS sent for destruction including the mass of all eligible and ineligible ODS, moisture, and HBR.
	Dillon reviewed the weigh scale records, batch make-up and mixing sheets (if applicable), COD, COA, destruction event records including weigh tickets, and POR documentation. Dillon completed a full recalculation.
	Dillon found no material discrepancy with the reported emissions.
Conclusion	Based on Dillon's review of the methodology, Dillon has determined that the calculations are correct, accurate, and free of offset material misstatements.
Summary of Greenhouse Gas Reductions	
Scope Item Verified	GHG emission reductions from destruction of ODS.
Verification Procedure	Review of calculations for baseline and project emissions, weights and sample analysis for ODS collected and destroyed, and recalculated GHG emission reductions.
Verification Findings	Dillon reviewed the Project Proponent's calculations, and performed an independent recalculation of the emission reductions based on the weigh scale records and destruction documentation. Dillon checked and confirmed that the Project Proponent's quantification file maintained at least 5 significant figures, with and no rounding to left side of decimal The Project Proponent's calculations were determined to be free of offset material misstatements, with no quantifiable
Conclusion	difference.
	accurate, and free of offset material misstatements.

## Table D ACR1117 | Tradewater US - ODS - #9 Validation and Verification Report



# Measurement Instrument QA/QC

Meter Type	Make and Model	Serial Number	Location	Calibration Frequency	Calibration Date(s)	Calibration Notes	Conforms with Methodology?
Weigh Scale E-BAY	RLW 920i	1979800023	E. Liverpool - East Bay	Bi-Monthly	• 2024-12-14 • 2025-02-08	<ul> <li>Kanawha Scales and</li> <li>Systems</li> <li>Within 5% accuracy</li> </ul>	Yes
Weight Scale Main/Front Gate	WTX 1310	70206483	E. Liverpool - Main Gate	Bi-Monthly	• 2024-12-14 • 2025-02-08	<ul> <li>Kanawha Scales and</li> <li>Systems</li> <li>Within 5% accuracy</li> </ul>	Yes

## Table E ACR1117 | Tradewater US - ODS - #9 Validation and Verification Report

# Point of Origin Details

В	ill of Lading	(BOL)	Refrigerant	Original Refrigeration Equipment / Shipment Container Description	Transporter	Aggregator/ Reclaimer/		Point of Origin Address			Technician(s)	EPA Certification	Tradewater Transport ID
BOL #	Date	Weight (lb)	туре	& Serial Numbers		Recovery	Company / Name	Address	State	ZIP		Number	
DPTISOR03	10-Jan-25	46850 (Gross)	R-11	1 ISO Tank - EURU 191124-9	Boasso Global	Tradewater	Dupont Speciality	5401 Jefferson Davis Hwy	VA	23234	N/A	N/A	Bill of Lading - EURU191124-9 -
		31,505 (Net)		Container Index No. 2025DP0001			Products USA, LLC	Richmond					T170609.pdf
DPTISOR04	27-Jan-25	40,360 (Gross)	R-11	1 ISO Tank - EURU 167282-2	Boasso Global	Tradewater	Dupont Speciality	5401 Jefferson Davis Hwy	VA	23234	N/A	N/A	Bill of Lading - EURU167282-2 -
		32,590 (Net)		Container Index No. 2025DP0002			Products USA, LLC	Richmond					T170806.pdf



# Issues Log - V4.0

lssue No.	Туре	Date	Issue Detail	Project Proponent Response	Status	Applicable Section of Standard / Methodology	Potential Offset Material Misstatement (Y/N)	Potential Non- Conformance with Standard / Methodology (Y/N)
1	CL	12-Feb-25	Please provide updated files for Tradewater US ODS #9 that address applicable ACR comments from Tradewater US ODS #8 (ACR1107), i.e.: a) Fix/apply page numbers in GHG Project Plan (GHGPP) b) Run spell check c) Either add a note similar to Total Project Emissions after the Project Emissions from Transportation and Destruction Using the Default Emission Factors Equation & Chart in Section E.3 of the GHGPP to clarify that certain parameters equal zero, or remove those parameters from the chart. d) Change text in Section E.5 of the GHGPP to "N/A" e) Change references to Assessment in Section F.1 to Appendix A f) Ensure the final GHGPP Appendices Table is completed per the ACR template instructions g) Revise the text in Section 2.C of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for clarity h) Revise the Methodology Section reference for the Legal Requirement Test Parameter in Section V of the Monitoring Report for accuracy, currently listed as N/A.	a) Corrected b) Done c) Done d) Done e) Done f) Done g) Done h) Done February 20, 2025 response: a.) Revised. B. and c) Corrected h.) Done i.) Feb. 21, 2025: Calibration frequency updated to bi-monthly. J.) Updated	Closed a) Dillon reviewed the file 'ACR_GHGPP_TWUSODS9_V1.1_02142025" and observed that the page numbers are not consecutive. Please fix page numbers in the GHGPP. b & c) Please fix the spelling error in Section E.3 of the GHGPP. h) Please ensure the Methodology section references for the Legal Requirement Test parameter is consistent between the Monitoring Report and GHGPP. i) Please update the QA/QC procedure for scale calibrations to accurately reflect actual frequency for all applicable parameters in Section D of the GHGPP. Feb. 21, 2025: One entry was updated. Please also update the scale calibration frequency for the 'Mass of ODS mixture in each container', and 'Q <sub>refr,i</sub> ' parameters j) For clarity, the text in Section A5 of the GHGPP should specify that Eligibility requirements are detailed or included in Table 2 of the ACR Standard. Feb. 21, 2025: Dillon reviewed the latest GHGPP 'ACR- GHGPP_TWUSODS9_V1.2_02202025" and verified that the issues were addressed. Resolved.	Standard Chapter 6.B	N	Y
2	DR	12-Feb-25	Dillon received December 2024 calibration records, which were complete prior to the destruction event and therefore meet the requirements of Section 6.3 in the Methodology. Dillon requests the February 2025 calibration records for the Front Gate and Ebay, to verify that the scales were within acceptable accuracy range during the entirety of the destruction event.	Uploaded	Closed. Dillon received and reviewed calibration records from February 8, 2025. Resolved	Methodology Section 6.3	N	Ŷ
3	CL	12-Feb-25	Are there are entities holding title to the carbon credits, and/or relevant regulators that should be listed in Section A8 of the GHG Project Plan? If so, please include full contact information, roles and responsibilities, in accordance with the instructions in the ACR GHG Project Plan template.	No, only Tradewater has Title to the carbon credits.	Closed.	Standard Chapter 6.B	N	Υ



# Issues Log - V4.0

lssue No.	Туре	Date	Issue Detail	Project Proponent Response	Status	Applicable Section of Standard / Methodology	Potential Offset Material Misstatement (Y/N)	Potential Non- Conformance with Standard / Methodology (Y/N)
4	CL	12-Feb-25	In Section B7 of the GHG Project Plan, please describe how the project reduces GHG emissions beyond what would have taken place in the baseline scenario.	I made changes by copying and pasting language that was previously accepted by the ACR in this section from an identical project (TW US ODS 7) TW response 2/20/2025: Text revised. 2/21/2025: Text revised	Open The revised text in Section B7 does not address the information required by the ACR GHG Project Plan template. <i>Describe how the</i> <i>project reduces GHG emissions and/or enhances the removal of</i> <i>GHGs from the atmosphere beyond what would have taken place in</i> <i>the baseline scenario.</i> Please review sections 1 and 2 of the Methodology and ensure text in Section B7 of the GHGPP is accurate and complete. Feb. 21, 2025: please add detail that explains how/where the ODS is destroyed. Feb. 21, 2025, 1:30 PM: Dillon reviewed the latest GHGPP 'ACR- GHGPP_TWUSODS9_V1.2_02202025'' and verified that the issues were addressed. Resolved.	Standard Chapter 6.B	N	Υ
5	OB	12-Feb-25	<ul> <li>Section V item 2.B in the Monitoring Report details the project proponent's data retention policy of 15 years. Dillon did not see a time limit for document retention in Section 6.4 of the Methodology.</li> <li>Dillon sought clarification from ACR for this issue for a previous verification. Clarification from ACR was received by Dillon on January 15, 2025. ACR indicated there was no issue with the specified 15 year retention policy, and they will be updating the ODS Errata &amp; Clarifications to specify the record retention length.</li> <li>No action required.</li> </ul>	N/A	Closed See Issue 5a for follow-up.	Methodology Section 6.4	N	Υ
5a	CL	19-Feb-25	ACR issued Version 2.0 of the Errata and Clarifications (E&Cs) on 2025-02-18, effective immediately. Item 4 provides clarification regarding the Project Proponent document retention requirement. Dillon verified that the Project Proponent's data retention policy complies with the ACR clarification. Please update ACR E&Cs references in the TW US ODS 9 files to the current version, e.g., Section II, line 10 of the Monitoring Report.	TW Response 2/20/2025: Updates made.	Closed	Methodology Section 6.4	N	Υ



# Issues Log - V4.0

lssue No.	Туре	Date	Issue Detail	Project Proponent Response	Status	Applicable Section of Standard / Methodology	Potential Offset Material Misstatement (Y/N)	Potential Non- Conformance with Standard / Methodology (Y/N)
6	CL	12-Feb-25	The Monitoring Report and supporting calculation worksheet list values of 133,464 tCO2e for Baseline Emission, 215 tCO2e for Project Emissions, and Total Emission Reductions (ER) of 133,249 tCO2e. Tradewater's Total ER value differs from Dillon's recalculated value by 31 tCO2e (0.023%, under-reported). Dillon attributes the difference to cell references in Tradewater's "Calculator_ACRUSODS9" Excel file. a) In the 'GHG Calculation_ACRV" tab, both line items are labelled as Batch 1, Sample 1 b) In the 'GHG Calculation_ACRV" tab, equations in cells E25, D28, and E28 (Batch 2, Sample 1) incorrectly reference cells from the Input tab that correspond to Batch 1, Sample 1 values c) In the 'Input' tab, the Saturation Point of 33, listed in Cell M26 for Batch 1, Sample 1 is not consistent with the Laboratory Analysis Report. d) the equation in cell D15 of the 'Output' tab does not accurately capture the total mass of baseline emissions for Batch 2, Sample 1. d) Cells B18 to D19 in the Output tab are not dependent on any other cells, this is a source of potential errors. The difference does not result in a material misstatement, omission, or error. Tradewater can decide whether or not to address this issue.	a) Corrected b) Corrected c) Corrected d) No changes made. February 20, 2025 response: Emissions values in MR and GHGPP have been edited to be the same.	Closed Dillon reviewed the "Calculator_ACRUSODS9_02142025" Excel file and verified that Issue Log items a to c were addressed. However, the Baseline Emission, Project Emissions, and Emission Reduction values were not updated in the Monitoring Report and GHGPP. 1) Please update the emission values in the Monitoring Report for consistency with the latest Tradewater calculations, i.e., Section III, Item 1.B; Section VI, items 1 to 4. February 21, 2025: Dillon reviewed the updated MR and GHGPP and verified that the emission values were consistent with the Quantification Calculator Excel file. Resolved	Standard Section 9.B	Ν	Ν
7	DR	2025-02-19	Please provide EPA 608/609 Certification information for Raymond R. Rieling IV if this person was involved with handling, recovery, and/or disposal of the ODS refrigerant for this Project.	Ray Rieling was involved in securing the deal but did not handle, recover, or dispose of any refrigerant related to this project. As such, his 608/609 is not required.	Closed Resolved	Methodology Section 2.2(XI)	N	Ŷ
8	CL	2025-02-19	In the file "POO-COC Diagram TWUSODS9", the Point of Origin street address entries are not consistent with other project documentation. Please provide a corrected POO-COC file.	This has been updated.	Closed Dillon reviewed the updated file and verified the typo was corrected Resolved.			



# Issues Log - V4.0

lssue No.	Туре	Date	Issue Detail	Project Proponent Response	Status	Applicable Section of Standard / Methodology	Potential Offset Material Misstatement (Y/N)	Potential Non- Conformance with Standard / Methodology (Y/N)
9	OB	2025-02-19	Dillon observed differences between the Dupont address listed in the Origin Document - Refrigerant Purchase Agreement (RPA) & Rider files compared to the Project Transport Bill of Ladings; e.g., North Chesterfield vs. Richmond. Dillon independently verified that the address listed in the RPA & Rider files were consistent with location information on Dupont's website https://www.dupont.com/locations.html No action required	N/A	N/A	Methodology Section 6.1(III)	N	Υ
10	DR	2025-02-19	Where there any violations or compliance issues at the Heritage Thermal Services Destruction Facility during the Tradewater US - ODS - #9 reporting period of Jan. 19 to Feb. 4, 2025 that would impact the project eligibility or regulatory compliance?	There were no violations or compliance issues during this time.	Closed	Methodology Section 3.7	N	Y

Note:

DR Data request

CL Clarification request

OB Observation



# Appendix A

Validation and Verification Plan







April 10, 2025

Tradewater, LLC 1411 W. Carroll, Suite N Chicago, Illinois USA 60607

Attention: Andre Buiza Carbon Project Manager

Risk-Based Validation and Verification (V/V) Plan ACR Carbon Accounting Program – ANAB Accreditation under ISO 14065 Validation and Verification of Tradewater US ODS 9 (ACR1117)

# Introduction

Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon) is pleased to present Tradewater, LLC with this riskbased Validation and Verification (V/V) Plan under the ACR (formerly American Carbon Registry) Carbon Accounting Program.

**Table 1** in the Validation and Verification scope subsection below, specifies details of the project.

# Validation and Verification Client

Information	Client Information
ACR Project ID	ACR1117
Project Name	Tradewater US – ODS - #9
Responsible Party Name	Tradewater, LLC, referred to as the "Client" hereinafter.
Responsible Party Address	1500 W. Carroll, Suite 213 Chicago, Illinois USA 60607
Responsible Party Contact Information	Timothy H. Brown, CEO <u>tbrown@tradewater.us</u> 312-273-5122 Andre Buiza Carbon Project Manager <u>abuiza@tradewater.us</u>
Intended User(s)	Tradewater, LLC and ACR

425 Adelaide Street West Suite 300 Toronto, Ontario Canada M5V 3C1 Telephone 416.628.4658 Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 2 April 10, 2025

## Validation and Verification Scope

**Table 1** below provides a summary of the scope of Dillon's GHG services. Information that had changed, been added, or updated since the proposal is flagged with an asterisk (\*).

Scope Item	Project-Specific Detail
Type of Engagement	Validation and Verification, referred to as V/V hereinafter.
Project Start Date	January 19, 2025*
Crediting Period	January 19, 2025* to February 4, 2025
Verification Reporting Period	January 19, 2025* to February 4, 2025
Client	Tradewater, LLC, referred to as the "Client" hereinafter.
Methodology or Protocol	Methodology for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Removals from The Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High-GWP Foam Version 2.0, ACR, February 2023, referred to as "ACR Methodology" hereinafter.
Project Location (Destruction Facility or Site)	1250 St. George Street East Liverpool, Ohio United States (Heritage Thermal Services location), referred to as the "Destruction Facility" or "Site" hereinafter.
Geographic and Organizational Boundaries	The GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs (SSRs) included in the offset project boundary are presented in <b>Table A</b> , following the report text.
Project Details	The Project involves the destruction of two ISO tanks full of R-11 (refrigerant ODS) in the United States. Emission offsets associated with the Project result in reductions in CFC-11 (R-11). Other ODS refrigerants that are eligible for emission reductions include CFC-12, CFC-13, CFC-113, CFC-114, CFC-115_HCFC-22_ and HCFC-123*
GHG Programme	ACR (formerly American Carbon Registry)
Regulation or Standard	ACR Standard, referred to as the "Regulation" or "Standard" hereinafter.
Regulator	ACR (formerly American Carbon Registry), referred to as the "Regulator" hereafter.

#### **Table 1: Validation and Verification Details**

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 3 April 10, 2025

Scope Item	Project-Specific Detail					
GHG Report	ACR Project Monitoring Report, and GHG Project Plan, collectively referred to as the "Offset Project Report" hereinafter.					
Verification Level of Assurance	Reasonable					
	<ul> <li>As per Section 9.B of the ACR Standard, the applicable verification materiality threshold was:</li> <li>±5% for GHG Emission Reductions.</li> </ul>					
Materiality Thresholds	The quantitative materiality thresholds apply to total error, and/or any individual identified quantifiable error, omission, misclassification, or misstatement. Qualitative materiality applies to issues that affect the GHG statement, including, but not limited to, noncompliance with GHG programme requirements and regulations; issues with record keeping, data management and control.					
Validation and Verification Criteria	<ul> <li>ACR Standard: Requirements and Specifications for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting, Verification, and Registration of Project-Based GHG Emissions Reductions and Removals, Version 8.0, ACR, July 2023 (ACR Standard);</li> <li>Methodology for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Removal from The Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High-GWP Foam, Version 2.0, ACR, February 2023 (ACR Methodology) and subsequent versions or updates;</li> <li>Errata and Clarifications – Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High-GWP Foam, Version 2.0, ACR, 2025-02- 18 (E&amp;C)*</li> <li>ACR Validation and Verification Standard Version 1.1, ACR, May 2018 (ACR V/V Standard), as amended;</li> <li>ISO 14064-2:2019 Greenhouse gases – Part 2: Specification with guidance at the project level for quantification, monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emission reductions or removal enhancements, ISO, April 2019; and</li> <li>ISO 14064-3:2019 Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas statements, ISO, April 2019; and</li> <li>ISO 14065 General principles and requirements for bodies validating and verifying environmental information, ISO, December 2020.</li> <li>The criteria may have been updated throughout the V/V process as more information became available.</li> </ul>					

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 4 April 10, 2025

Scope Item	Project-Specific Detail
	This assignment involved provision of independent, third-party validation and verification to the Client and Regulator.
Validation and Verification Objectives	The validation objectives of this assignment included a systematic assessment of the GHG Project Plan and the likelihood that implementation of the GHG-related activities would result in GHG emission reductions, and evaluation on whether the ex-ante information reported was consistent with the requirements of the ACR Standard, applicable methodology, and other applicable Criteria.
	The verification objectives of this assignment were to provide the Client and Regulator with a reasonable level of assurance, and opinion on whether the Monitoring Report was consistent with the GHG Project Plan, the Monitoring Report and GHG assertion were free of material misstatements, as well as that the information reported was accurate and consistent with the requirements of the ACR Standard, applicable methodology, and other applicable criteria.
GHG Assertion	133,280 tCO <sub>2</sub> e

# Validation and Verification Team

For this assignment, Dillon has assembled an experienced V/V Team consisting of the following individuals:

#### Valerie Chan, P.Eng. (Lead Validator/Lead Verifier)

Valerie is an Associate at Dillon and a licensed Professional Engineer in Alberta and Ontario with over 18 years of experience as an environmental consultant specializing in greenhouse gas (GHG) validations and verifications, and contaminated site assessments.

Valerie is an expert in GHG validation and verification for inventory and emission offset programs globally, spanning the following sectors: renewable and nonrenewable energy, oil and gas, pulp, and paper, institutional/general, power generation, electric power transactions, manufacturing, chemical production, and waste, as well as international aviation. She is an accredited Lead Validator/Verifier, Technical Expert, and has been a Technical Reviewer in the following programs: Canadian provincial and federal regulatory programs, CARB Mandatory Reporting Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 5 April 10, 2025



#### Robert Morgan, P.Eng., M.A.Sc. (Peer Reviewer)

Robert is an Associate at Dillon and a licensed professional engineer in Ontario with over 12 years of experience as an environmental consultant in atmospheric services. Robert has extensive knowledge of air pollution control, emission inventories, air dispersion modelling, noise impact assessments, ambient monitoring, source testing, climate change impact assessments, and greenhouse gas reporting and verification.

Robert has acted as project manager, technical lead, and provided support on numerous air and noise permitting projects in Ontario including the preparation of Environmental Compliance Approval applications and Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) registrations and their supporting documents for a variety of industrial, manufacturing, commercial, institutional, and waste management clients. Robert has prepared numerous annual facility emissions reports for a variety of clients to satisfy the requirements of federal and provincial reporting programs such as the Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC) National Pollutant Release Inventory, ECCC's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)'s Toxics Reduction Program, and the MECP's *O.Reg. 390/18* Greenhouse Gas Emissions program.

Robert's experience in climate change work is primarily associated with GHG mitigation assessments supporting the permitting of atmospheric and climate change studies for Environmental Assessments (EA) projects. Robert has performed GHG mitigation work for other programs such as the Federal Climate Lens.

Robert is an accredited lead validator or verifier and technical expert in the Federal Output Based Pricing Standard Regulations, the Ontario Mandatory Reporting Program, and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Cap and Trade Compliance Offset Program. Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 6 April 10, 2025



Richard is a registered Geoscientist-in-Training in Saskatchewan, with a researchbased master's degree in Environment and Sustainability from the University of Saskatchewan. Richard has over six years of technical experience in quantifying and analyzing GHG emissions. Richard's masters research investigated the GHG emissions, drivers, and implications of aquatic natural assets in agricultural landscapes. During this research, he designed and developed novel automated sensors to measure and analyze aquatic GHG emissions at high temporal resolutions. The results were used to inform sustainable management strategies that allowed continued use of these resources while mitigating their atmospheric contributions.

Richard's professional experience has involved work in a variety of air quality, climate change, and GHG accounting projects, including verification of GHG emissions reporting and offset projects. Richard also has experience in developing community and corporate GHG inventories (Scope 1, 2, and 3), municipal and natural asset management, air emissions inventory reporting, environmental compliance audits, project management, and is well-versed in the GHG reporting programs and regulatory landscapes in Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, and Saskatchewan.

Richard holds certifications in Natural Asset Management through Royal Roads University, and Clean Fuel Regulations Verification through Environment and Climate Change Canada.

#### **Emily Paulhus, EIT (Verifier, and Validation Support)**

Emily is an Environmental Engineer-in Training (APEGS) in Dillon's Saskatoon office, completing her Bachelor of Science in Civil (Environmental Option) Engineering Co-operative Program at the University of Alberta in 2022. In her time at Dillon, Emily has gained experience in air dispersion modeling and reporting, environmental compliance auditing, and groundwater sampling programs. Emily has assisted on a number of greenhouse gas verifications under various programs and protocols in Canada and the United States. She has also worked on greenhouse gas reporting and inventory creation for Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, sustainability, and offset evaluation studies.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 7 April 10, 2025



Chris is an Environmental Practitioner at Dillon since 2023. He is a carbon auditing professional under the Association of Energy Engineers. His expertise is from over 6 years of experience in environmental and sustainability consultancy services in Hong Kong. His expertise includes Greenhouse gas accounting and verification in line with the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard for Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. His project responsibilities have included delivering Greenhouse gas verification and validation, project coordination, and project management.

# **Project Understanding**

Information regarding the Destruction Facility location, geographic and organizational boundaries, applicable GHG sources, sinks and reservoirs (SSRs), project reporting period, and project details are detailed in **Table 1** in the Validation and Verification Scope section above.

No clear description of baseline scenarios is included in the Methodology. Based on review of the ACR Ozone Depleting Substances Primer, Dillon understands that the ODS refrigerant destruction baseline scenario involves stockpiling of ODS that cannot be or is not recycled and eventually vents/leaks into the atmosphere.

Dillon understands that the project activities involved the destruction of ODS refrigerant at an eligible destruction facility, as required by Section 2.1 of the Methodology. Equipment involved in the ODS Destruction process at Heritage Thermal Services includes, but is not limited to:

- Kiln;
- Secondary Combustion Chamber (SCC); and
- Stack.

# Validation and Verification Procedures

Dillon conducted the V/V simultaneously and combined the Validation Report and Verification Report into a single report, as permitted by the ACR V/V Standard.

Dillon used a risk-based methodology consistent with the requirements of the Standard. The following subsections detail Dillon's procedures for the document and data reviews, the site visit, and the contents of the Evidence-Gathering Plan and Risk Assessment.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 8 April 10, 2025

Dillon's V/V included an examination of the following elements of the GHG Project Plan and Monitoring Report, as applicable, in accordance with the ACR Standard:

- Project boundary and procedures for establishing the project boundary (validation);
- Physical infrastructure, activities, technologies, and processes of the project;
- GHGs, sources, sinks and reservoirs (SSRs) within the project boundary;
- Temporal boundary;
- Description of and justification of the baseline scenario (validation);
- Baseline (verification);
- Methodologies, algorithms, and calculations used to generate estimates of emissions and emission reductions (validation);
- Methods and calculations used to generate estimates of emissions and emission reductions (verification);
- Original underlying data and documentation as relevant and required to evaluate the GHG assertion (verification);
- Process information, source identification, and operational details;
- Data management systems;
- Roles and responsibilities of project participants and associated staff (verification);
- QA/QC procedures;
- Process for uncertainty assessments;
- Positive contributions to applicable sustainable development goals;
- Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Requirements; and
- Project-specific conformance to ACR eligibility criteria.

## **Strategic Analysis**

Dillon has completed a Strategic Analysis to understand the activities and complexity of the Project and to determine the nature and extent of V/V activities. The Strategic Analysis enabled the V/V Team to identify types and likelihood of potential material misstatements and select evidence-gathering procedures, considering all aspects identified in ISO 14064-3. Each item was rated as "simple" or "complex" on applicability and understanding of the Project. A "complex" rating indicates additional review is required, and the risk assessment and Dillon's internal Evidence-Gathering Plan have been adjusted to cover these items as necessary. The results of Dillon's strategic analysis are detailed in **Table B** (attached).

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 9 April 10, 2025



In support of the development of the Evidence-Gathering Plan, Dillon completed a Risk Assessment for the verification. The Risk Assessment evaluated the risk of material misstatement or nonconformity and determined the level of evidencegathering for the verification. As required by Section 6.1.2.2 of ISO 14064-3, the Risk Assessment evaluated the inherent, control and detection risk for:

- Occurrence;
- Completeness;
- Accuracy;
- Cut-off; and
- Classification.

The inherent, control and detection risk levels were used to determine the amount of information to request in the Evidence-Gathering Plan. The Risk Assessment also considered all items identified in Section 6.1.2.3 and 6.1.2.6 of ISO 14064-3, as applicable. Each item was evaluated and given a level of risk (i.e., low risk, medium risk, high risk).

Dillon also performed high-level analytical procedures to determine other areas of risk. This may have included evaluation of:

- Expected GHG emissions reductions against reported emissions;
- Project boundary;
- Data management including acquisition equipment, sampling and frequency, and processing and tracking; and
- Project GHG emissions reductions.

Based upon information available at the onset of the V/V process, Dillon has developed a Qualitative Narrative of the Uncertainty Risk Assessment, presented as **Tables C.1** and **C.2** (attached). Dillon notes that the Risk Assessment was dynamic in nature and may have changed as data and controls were reviewed throughout the V/V.

Final versions of both **Table B** and **Table C** are provided with the final V/V Report.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 10 April 10, 2025



Dillon designed evidence-gathering activities to collect sufficient and appropriate evidence upon which to determine whether the Offset Project Report conforms to the criteria, taking into account the principles of the standards or GHG programme that apply to the GHG statement. Dillon adjusted the quantity of evidence requested based on the risk that the Project would not result in the achievement of the stated GHG outcomes and/or risk of misstatement and the outcome of our strategic analysis.

The following sections discuss the possible approaches that may have been taken in developing an Evidence-Gathering Plan. The Evidence-Gathering Plan was not provided to the Client in accordance with ISO 14064-3 Section 6.1.6.

#### **Evidence-Gathering Activities: Validation**

#### Recognition, Eligibility, Applicability

To assess recognition, eligibility, and applicability, Dillon evaluated the Project to determine:

- Whether the GHG-related activity is acceptable to the Intended Users and meets the eligibility and applicability criteria specified in the methodology;
- The GHG-related activity is real, quantifiable, verifiable, permanent, and enforceable; and
- After confirmation of the calculations used in the GHG Statement, reassess whether the GHG-related activity will still be recognized.

#### Ownership

Dillon assessed whether the Responsible Party could demonstrate project ownership and the right to claim emission reductions or removal enhancement expressed in the GHG statement, in accordance with Section 6.D of the ACR V/V Standard.

#### **GHG Boundaries**

Dillon determined whether the geographic and project boundaries stated in the Project are appropriate for the GHG-related activity, and consistent with the Standard, applicable methodology and available evidence.

Dillon determined if the sources, sinks, reservoirs (SSRs) relevant to the GHG-related activity, baseline scenarios and project scenarios had been included.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 11 April 10, 2025



Dillon assessed the baseline scenario detailed in the project documents and assess whether the most appropriate, plausible, and complete hypothetical scenario was included.

Dillon reviewed the ACR Project Monitoring Report and GHG Project Plan and crosscheck with the ACR Methodology for consistency of baseline scenario details.

#### Project Activity Measurements and Method – Additionality and Regulatory Surplus

Dillon reviewed and assessed the Project, and cross-checked against the applicable methodology, for details or restrictions on eligible activities.

Dillon also evaluated the GHG Project Plan and provided information to determine:

- Whether the project activities exceed a conservative business-as-usual scenario and meet the additionality requirements specified in the methodology;
- Whether there are any laws, statutes, or other regulatory framework mandating the project activities; and
- Whether there are any deviations in methodology or project description.

#### **Quantification Methodologies and Measurements**

Dillon assessed and determined whether the selected quantification methodologies and associated data sources, measurements, measurement units, emission factors, and/or monitoring approaches (i.e., monitoring plan) were acceptable. Dillon reviewed the following elements to validate the selected quantification methods, in accordance with Chapter 5 of the ACR V/V Standard:

- The quantification method for each data parameter is clearly defined, and supporting documentation provided is adequate to support the level of assurance required;
- The methods are appropriate for accurately quantifying each data parameter based on the required level of assurance;
- The methods are applied consistently to develop estimates of emission reductions and removal enhancements;
- The ISO principle of conservativeness is applied (i.e., the choice of assumptions, calculation methods, parameters, data sources, and emission factors is more likely to lead to an underestimation than overestimation of net GHG emission reductions and removal enhancements); and
- For verification only: claimed GHG emission reductions are rounded down to the nearest whole number, per Section 2.B.4 of the ACR Standard.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 12 April 10, 2025



Dillon reviewed the Project to assess the required GHG data management systems and controls to determine whether they could be relied upon during project operations and verifications.

Dillon evaluated the GHG data management systems and controls outlined in the Project, checking for potential errors and omissions, including the following:

- Selection and management of GHG data and information;
- Processes for collecting, processing, aggregating, and reporting;
- Systems and processes to ensure accuracy; and
- Design and maintenance of the GHG data management systems, including systems and processes that support it.

Dillon examined the documentation for the GHG data management system that outlines the processes for data collection, entry, calculation, and management. This included:

- Competency of data managers or employees responsible for collecting data;
- Emissions source type;
- Units of measure;
- Periodicity of data monitoring/collection;
- Data granularity and degree of aggregation;
- File type/format;
- Method of transfer;
- Assumptions; and
- Calibration records.

Dillon evaluated the effectiveness of the data collection and processing methods, identify potential sources of data corruption or errors, and characterize weaknesses in the integration of the GHG data collection and management system.

#### Leakage

Dillon assessed the Project data sources, assumptions, and calculations to assess, account for, and mitigate the potential for leakage (i.e., increase of GHG emissions or decrease in sequestration outside the project boundaries, as a result of the project), based on the processes detailed in the methodology.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 13 April 10, 2025

Dillon determined whether a leakage assessment was required and whether the leakage assessment in the GHG Project Plan conformed to the requirements of the methodology.

#### **Evidence-Gathering Activities: Verification**

Dillon considered inherent risk, control risk and detection risk and designed the evidence-gathering activities to lower the detection/verification risk to an acceptable level.

Dillon completed the V/V process and evidence-gathering activities using the following fundamental practices:

- Assessment of Data Trails;
- Assessment of GHG information systems and controls;
- Assessment of GHG data and information;
- Assessment of GHG aggregation process;
- Application of selected verification activities and techniques (e.g., Analytical testing, control testing, estimate testing, sampling); and
- Assessment against verification criteria.

#### Data Trail

A data trail is a complete record by which GHG information can be traced to the GHG source. The Dillon Team may have included data trails in their Evidence-Gathering Plan and information request to understand the process of recording, collecting, and processing data for material emissions. In the Evidence-Gathering Plan, if the source was considered high risk and the strategic analysis identified concern(s), Dillon included a request from the client to provide the data trail process.

#### **Data Management Systems and Internal Controls**

Dillon assessed the information systems and controls for sources of potential errors, omissions, and misrepresentations, taking into consideration the following:

- Selection and management of the GHG data and information;
- Processes for collecting, processing, consolidating, and reporting GHG data information, including recording mass and concentration of ODS or HFC destroyed every two minutes, per Section 6.5 in the ACR Methodology;
- Systems and processes that ensure the validity and accuracy of the GHG data and information;
- Degree of automation;

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 14 April 10, 2025

- Use of database features;
- Length of operation;
- Linkage to other systems;
- Standardization within an organization;
- Transparency of calculations;
- Design and maintenance of the GHG information system;
- Systems, processes, and personnel that support the GHG information system, including activities for ensuring data quality;
- Instrument maintenance and calibrations; and
- Results of previous assessment, if available and appropriate.

#### **Data and Information Flow**

In parallel to the assessment of data management systems and internal controls, Dillon also examined and assessed the data and information flows that form the basis for the Client's GHG assertion with professional skepticism. This assessment was informed by the V/V Plan, and like the V/V Plan, the assessment of data and information flow was a dynamic and changing process. The V/V Team must review sufficient data and information sources to complete the V/V in accordance with the Standard. Accordingly, the V/V Plan contains the following requirements, as applicable to the assignment:

- Where possible, review full data sets. When full data sets are not feasible, the Lead Verifier must determine based on magnitude and accuracy, to what degree (or confidence interval) the data and information is reviewed;
- Review of collection frequency and retention period;
- Complete a rank-based Risk Assessment for each source, including the risks related to data and information sources, along with items such as metering, third party data, and self-calculation;
- Focus on data and information sources that may result in a material misstatement; and
- Quality assurance and quality control of the data sets.

Where information or data was either not supplied by the Client or was determined to be insufficient, the V/V Team requested additional data and/or information.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 15 April 10, 2025



Dillon designed evidence-gathering activities that relate to how the data was collected and consolidated, including comparing the V/V report against the underlying records and examining material adjustments made during the course of preparing the V/V statement.

#### **Application of Selected Verification Activities Techniques**

Dillon also applied other selected Evidence-Gathering Plan activities, which can include, but are not limited to:

- Analytical Testing;
- Control Testing;
- Estimate Testing; and
- Sampling.

These activities are further described below.

#### Analytical Testing:

Analytical testing includes year over year changes and comparisons against different methodologies, which is as part of the Evidence-Gathering Plan. Dillon considered the following questions when deciding if analytical testing would be necessary in the verification process:

- Will it reduce or mitigate the risk identified?
- What is the reliability of the data analyzed?
- What is the likelihood of analytical testing identifying a material misstatement?

#### **Control Testing:**

As part of the evidence-gathering activities, Dillon requested evidence of the Client's data management system and interview staff to understand control data. If deviations were detected through review of the data, Dillon assessed whether the deviations affect the ability to rely on those controls, and if additional data review of controls was necessary and whether other types of evidence-gathering activities needed to be applied.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 16 April 10, 2025



If Dillon identified that estimating procedures had been used to quantify GHG emissions or removals, Dillon requested the information to determine:

- The appropriateness of the methodology applied;
- The applicability of the assumptions;
- The controls to develop the estimate; and
- The quality of data used in the estimate.

In addition to the requested data, Dillon also reviewed if the estimate had been used appropriately in previous verifications and if there had been any deviation in the approach.

#### Sampling:

If the Risk Assessment identified a concern with GHG supporting data, Dillon included a sampling plan in the Evidence-Gathering Plan. The sampling plan considered the purpose of the evidence-gathering activities and the characteristics of the data from which the sample was drawn from. If the initial sampling identified issues or concerns with the data, Dillon adjusted the Evidence-Gathering Plan to adjust for this risk.

### **Information Request**

Concurrent with submission of the initial V/V Plan, Dillon submitted the following information and data request:

- The Project Monitoring Report and GHG Project Plan;
- Chain of Custody and Point of Origin (POR) documentation;
- ODS and high-GWP blowing agent composition and mass determinations (i.e., laboratory reports or other procedures per the ACR Methodology);
- Weigh scale documentation;
- Sample data;
- Quantification details, i.e., calculations/spreadsheets used to create the reports;
- Process flow diagrams;
- Permits, Notices of Violations (NOVs) for US facilities, notices, or letters of noncompliances for non-US facilities, and any relevant administrative or legal consent orders dating back at least 3 years prior to the project commencement date;
- Destruction facility monitoring and maintenance information (continuous emissions monitoring data, DRE documentation, calibration procedures, calibration checks and daily zero validations (if applicable), manufacturer guidance pertaining to facility or technology maintenance and permits; and

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 17 April 10, 2025

 Other materials/sources that were used to support the ACR Project Monitoring Report and GHG Project Plan.

Dillon has developed an information request that covers the Evidence-Gathering Plan and its documents in **Table D**.

#### **Site Visit**

On January 10, 2025, Dillon (V. Chan) previously completed an in-person site visit to the Destruction Facility for the same Project Proponent for another project that used the same Methodology (Tradewater US – ODS - #8, ACR1107). A positive Validation and Verification Opinion was issued for that project. Since that in-person site visit, there has been no change at the Destruction Facility with respect to processes, equipment, and/or ownership.

Dillon submitted an Industrial Projects Desk-Based Review Request, in accordance with ACR's November 26, 2024 policy. ACR approved the Desk-Based Review Request by email on **January 28, 2025**. As a result, no site visit was required, no in-person site visit was completed, and Dillon's completed a desk-based review that was completed within 24 months of the January 10, 2025 in-person site visit.

#### **Working Papers**

Throughout the V/V process, the V/V Team developed a set of working papers that outlines the information reviewed, recalculation of data sets (as applicable), and issues identified by Dillon and their subsequent resolution status. The working papers do not form part of the Final V/V Report, but the information contained within them contribute to the V/V Opinion issued by Dillon.

#### **Issues Log**

Throughout the process, the V/V Team developed a list of findings in an Issues Log, representing clarifications, non-conformities, material misstatements and corrective actions for the Client's response. The Issues Log was based on the results of Dillon's review of the Offset Project Report against the Standard and applied methodology, independent recalculations of the Client's GHG assertion, as well our assessment of data management, controls, and data flow.

The Issues Log proceeded through several versions, representing ongoing discussions on the data and management systems. For budgeting purposes, we have assumed two issues log rounds was required. Upon closure, the V/V proceeded to the peer review and reporting stages.

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 18 April 10, 2025



If the Client did not respond to the issues in a timely manner or sufficient evidence was not provided, Dillon communicated to the Client that it would result in a disclaimer, modified or adverse statement, or a withdrawal from the V/V.

### **Peer Review**

As a final step, Dillon conducted an internal Peer Review. The Peer Review included a review of the Offset Project Report, working papers developed by the Dillon Team, and the Draft V/V Report and Opinions that was prepared by the team. Dillon notes that the V/V Report and Statement was not finalized until approval was received from the Peer Reviewer.

### **Validation and Verification Report**

At the conclusion of the verification process, Dillon prepared a Draft V/V Report that was subject to internal peer review, as well as review by the Client. The V/V Report was prepared to include the information detailed in ISO 14064-3 Section 6.3.3 and the Standard and was prepared by the Lead Validator/Lead Verifier.

The V/V Report includes:

- Appropriate title;
- Addressee;
- Date of the Report;
- Validation and Verification Scope and Criteria;
- Validation and Verification Opinions completed in accordance with the Standard and ISO 14064-3;
- The name and contact information for the Lead Verifier;
- The name and contact information for the Peer Reviewer; and
- Any other information required by the Standard.

## **Validation and Verification Opinion**

The V/V Opinion was prepared in accordance with ISO 14064-3 Section 9.3 and the Standard and was signed by the Peer Review and Lead Verifier. The opinion includes:

- Identification of the GHG-related activity and GHG statement, including the date and period covered by the GHG statement;
- Identification of the responsible party and a statement that the GHG statement is the responsibility of the responsible party;
- Identification of the criteria used to compile and assess the GHG statement;

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 19 April 10, 2025

• A declaration that the verification of the GHG statement was conducted in accordance with ISO 14064-3;

- Validation conclusion regarding conformance of the GHG Project Plan to the Standard and applicable methodology;
- Verifier's conclusion including level of assurance;
- Date of the Opinion; and
- Any other information required by the Standard.

# Validation and Verification Schedule

**Table 2** presents the scope of work tasks and V/V schedule.

#### Table 2: Schedule

Dill	on Task	Timeline
0	Project award and contract signing	January 24, 2025
	Submissions of Project-Specific Conflict of Interest Attestation to ACR	January 27, 2025
1	Project kick-off call	February 5, 2025
2	V/V Plan preparation and submission to the Client	February 6, 2025
	Client review and approval of the V/V Plan	Within one week
3	Data and information exchange and recalculations	February to March 2025
4	Site visit	Not Required
5	First round of Issues log submission to the Client	February 12, 2025
	Client review and response to Issues log	February 14, 2025
6	Second round of Issues Log submission to the Client	February 19, 2025
	Client review and response to Issues log	February 21, 2025
7	Draft V/V Report and Opinion preparation	February 2025
8	Peer Review	February 24, 2025
9	Submittal of Draft V/V Report to the Client for review	February 26, 2025
	Client review of and response to Draft V/V Report	February 28, 2025
10	Final V/V Report and Statement submission to the Client and Regulator	March 3, 2025
11	Revised V/V Report and Statement submission to the Client and Regulator	As required

Tradewater, LLC – V/V Plan Page 20 April 10, 2025



This V/V Plan, associated reports and statements provided to the Client as part of the V/V services provided, are intended for the use of the Client and the Regulator as the regulator only. The Client shall not use Dillon's Statement/Opinion, Reports, marks, logos, or labels in a manner that could mislead intended users or impair Dillon's reputation. Should the Client wish to use statements, opinions, reports, marks, logos, or labels provided throughout this process, they must seek to do so via a written statement. Any Dillon opinions or reports made public by the Client must be communicated in their entirety. Any the Client or Responsible Party references to Dillon's findings, conclusions, reports and/or opinions must adhere to the requirements of ISO 14065:2020 Annex B.

# Closure

Dillon's V/V team notes that this document was iterative in nature and was updated through the V/V based on the information provided.

Please do not hesitate to contact Valerie Chan at 226-750-4062 or vchan@dillon.ca, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

#### **DILLON CONSULTING LIMITED**

1/ in Chan

Valerie Chan, P.Eng. Lead Validator/Verifier

Attachments:Table A: Greenhouse Gas Sources, Sinks and Reservoirs applicable to project<br/>Table B: Qualitative Narrative – Strategic Analysis<br/>Table C.1 and C.2: Qualitative Narrative – Uncertainty Risk Assessment<br/>Table D: Information Request

Our file: 25-9749

Version	Changes	Date
1.0	Initial version	February 6, 2025
2.0	Updated version	February 26, 2025
3.0	Final version	March 3, 2025
4.0	Updated for ACR Comments	April 10, 2025

# Attachment A

**Tables** 



# GHG Sources, Sinks, and Reservoirs Applicable to Refrigerant Projects

SSR	Source Description	Gas	Included (I) or Excluded (E)
1		CO <sub>2</sub>	E
ODS Collection	Fossil fuel emissions from the collection and transport of ODS sources	$CH_4$	E
		N <sub>2</sub> O	E
2	Emissions of ODS from the recovery and collection of ODS at end-of-life or servicing	ODS	E
ODS Recovery and	Fossil fuel emissions from the recovery and collection of ODS at end-of-life	CO <sub>2</sub>	E
Collection	or servicing	$CH_4$	E
		$N_2O$	E
	Emissions of ODS from equipment use, leaks, and servicing	ODS	E
3	Eassil fuel emissions from the operation of refrigeration and $\Lambda/C$ equipment	CO <sub>2</sub>	E
ODS Use	and fire suppressant systems	$CH_4$	E
		N <sub>2</sub> O	E
4		CO <sub>2</sub>	I
Transport to	point to final destruction facility	$CH_4$	E
Destruction Facility		N <sub>2</sub> O	E
5	Emissions of ODS from recovered ODS stockpiles and EOL equipment (If not sent for destruction)	ODS	I
Recovered ODS		CO <sub>2</sub>	E
Stockpile	Indirect emissions from grid-delivered electricity	$CH_4$	E
		N <sub>2</sub> O	E
	Emissions of ODS from incomplete destruction at destruction facility	ODS	I
	Emissions from the oxidation of carbon contained in destroyed ODS	CO <sub>2</sub>	I
,		CO <sub>2</sub>	I
6 Destruction	Fossil fuel emissions from the destruction of ODS at destruction facility	$CH_4$	E
Destruction		N <sub>2</sub> O	E
		CO <sub>2</sub>	I
	Indirect emissions from the use of grid-delivered electricity	CH <sub>4</sub>	E
		$N_2O$	E



#### Qualitative Narrative - Strategic Analysis

Item No.	Areas to Consider	Analysis	Comments
1	Relevant sector information.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
2	The nature of operations of the facility(ies) or project or product.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
3	The requirements of the criteria, including applicable regulatory and/or GHG programme requirements.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
4	The Regulators threshold, including the quantitative components.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
5	The Regulators materiality threshold, including the qualitative components.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
6	The likely accuracy and completeness of the GHG statement.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
7	The scope of the GHG statement and related boundaries.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
8	The time boundary for data.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
9	Emissions SSRs and their contribution to the overall GHG statement.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
10	Changes in GHG emissions, removals and reservoir quantities from the prior reporting period.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	Not Applicable
11	Appropriateness of quantification and reporting methods, and any changes.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
12	Sources of GHG information.	Complex - Requires Attention.	Dillon reviewed all information, and recalculated emission reductions, checking for use of the appropriate emission factors from the ACR Methodology.
13	Data management information system and controls.	Complex - Requires Attention.	Dillon reviewed all provided files and information to determine consistency with ACR Methodology requirements for document retention and monitoring parameter frequency.
14	Management oversight of the responsible party's reporting data and supporting processes.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
15	The availability of evidence for the responsible party's GHG information and statement.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
16	The results of previous verifications.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
17	The results of sensitivity or uncertainty analysis.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
18	Allocation approach.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
19	The type of GHGs.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
20	The applied monitoring methodology.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	
21	Other relevant information (describe).	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review.	



#### Qualitative Narrative - Strategic Analysis

Item No.	Areas to Consider	Analysis	Comments
1	The Project Plan.	Complex - Requires Attention	Dillon cross-checked the GHG Project Plan against the requirements specified in the Standard and Methodology to determine whether there was any issues with compliance or consistency.
2	The Results of the Validation Plan.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review	Not Applicable.
3	The Requirements of the Monitoring Report.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review	Dillon checked the Monitoring Report against the ACR template requirements.
4	The applied Monitoring Methodology.	Straightforward - Simple does not require a high level review	Dillon cross-checked the Monitoring Report, calculation spreadsheets, and associated files to determine if the applied monitoring methodology met the ACR Methodology requirements.
5	The Monitoring Report.	Complex - Requires Attention	Dillon cross-checked the Monitoring Report against the requirements specified in the Standard and Methodology, and the supporting documents and data to determine whether there were any issues with compliance or consistency.

Table C.1 ACR1117 | Tradewater US - ODS - #9 Validation and Verification Plan

# DILLON

#### Qualitative Narrative - Uncertainty Risk Assessment

Number	RISK Factor	Risk Гуре	RISK LEVEI	RISK ACTION
General				
		Inherent	Low	Based on the low inherent and control risks, the allowable detection risk is
	and Controls	Control	Low	high. Dillon reviewed all data, and cross-checked project files for
	and controls.	Detection	Medium	consistency to mitigate the detection risk to medium.
	Management policies and practices in developing Monitoring Report.	Inherent	Low	Client has controls for data review and integrity. Dillon reviewed policies
		Control	Low	practices and associated application to mitigate the detection risk to low
		Detection	Low	
	Use of Information & Communication Technology (ICT).	Inherent	Medium	ICT may be used for virtual meetings, remote access of documents &
		Control	Low	records, and/or audio-video evidence of site conditions. Additional ICT
		Detection	Low	risks and mitigating actions are detailed in Table C.2 Risk Assessment.

	SSR	Percentage of Emissions	Risk of Occurrence	Risk of Completeness	Risk of Accuracy	Risk of Cut-off	Risk of Classification	Risk Type	Risk Level	Risk Action			
4 Transport to the Destruction	Fossil fuel emissions from the vehicular transport of ODS from aggregation point	ossil fuel emissions from							Inherent	Low	Inherent and control risks are low based on the use of		
		100% Project Emissions (with SSR 6)	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Control	Medium	default values published in the Methodology. Dillon reviewed all data and cross-checked with the Regulation and Methodology to mitigate the detection risk to low.			
Facility	to final destruction facility.							Detection	Low				
5	Emissions of ODS from					Low		Inherent	Low	Inherent risk was set to low based on the use of default values in the calculation methodology. All ODS is sent for destruction, therefore, Dillon set the control risk to			
Recovered ODS	recovered ODS stockpiles and EOL equipment (If not	100% Baseline Emissions	Low	Low	Low		Low	Control	Low				
Stockpile	sent for destruction).							Detection	Low	recalculations to mitigate detection risk to low.			
								Inherent	Low	Calculated using default factors and the equation published in the Methodology, resulting in a low inherent risk. Control risk was relead to medium based.			
	Emissions of ODS from incomplete destruction at destruction facility.	hissions of ODS from complete destruction at struction facility. hissions from the idation of carbon ntained in destroyed DS. 100% Project Emissions (with SSR 4)	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium Low	Low	Control	Medium	on observed data entry and calculation errors in the Project Proponent's initial spreadsheet. The allowable		
								Detection	Low	to low by reviewing all associated data and recalculating emissions.			
6 Destruction	Emissions from the oxidation of carbon contained in destroyed ODS.		Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low Low	Inherent	Low	Calculated using default factors and the equation published in the Methodology, resulting in a low inherent rick. Control rick was relead to medium based			
								Control	Medium	on observed data entry and calculation errors in the Project Proponent's initial spreadsheet. The allowable			
								Detection	Low	detection risk is high. Dillon mitigated the detection risk to low by reviewing all associated data and recalculating emissions.			
											Inherent	Low	Inherent risk was set to low based on the use of default values in the calculation methodology. Data is based on
	Fossil fuel emissions from the destruction of ODS at		Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Control	Medium	client acquired information; therefore, Dillon set the control risk to medium. Dillon completed a detailed			
	destruction facility.							Detection	Low	review and recalculations to mitigate detection risk to low.			
								Inherent	Low	Inherent risk was set to low based on the use of default values in the calculation methodology. Data is based on			
	Indirect emissions from the use of grid-delivered electricity.	Indirect emissions from the use of grid-delivered		Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Control	Medium	client acquired information; therefore, Dillon set the		
								Detection	Low	review and recalculations to mitigate detection risk to low.			

#### Table C.2 ACR1117 | Tradewater US - ODS - #9 Validation and Verification Plan



#### Qualitative Narrative - Uncertainty Risk Assessment

Risk No.	Risk Assessment Consideration	Risk Level	Risk Action
1	Is there a risk of an intentional misstatement in the GHG statement?	Low	
2	Is there a risk of one or more emission sources effecting the overall GHG statement?	Low	
3	Is there a risk of omitting potentially significant emission source?	Medium	Dillon reviewed all available data against validation and verification criteria to determine all significant emission sources.
4	Is there a risk of significant emission sources that have been omitted outside the normal course of business?	Low	
5	Risk of changes to the operations?	Low	
6	Is there risk of determining the project boundary?	Low	
7	Risk of changes from prior periods?	Low	
8	Risk of non-compliance with applicable laws and regulations that will affect the GHG statements?	Low	
9	Risk of significant economic or regulatory changes that will impact the GHG emissions?	Low	
10	Is there a risk of the type of GHG data that is used?	Low	
11	Is there a risk of limited detail or missing GHG data?	Medium	Project complexity increases as a result of the various data sources. Dillon reviewed all available documents, and completed recalculations to ensure all GHG data is included
12	Does the nature and complexity of the quantifications pose a risk?	Low	
13	Is there a risk of subjectivity in the quantification of emissions?	Low	
14	Is there potential for significant estimates in the data?	Low	
15	Is there a risk in how the data is managed and controlled?	Medium	Data management and control risks exist due to the number of information sources and potential for data entry error. Dillon reviewed data and recalculated emission reductions.
16	Is there a risk of their control system not identifying and preventing errors or omissions?	Low	
17	Is there a risk in the controls used to monitor and report the GHG data?	Low	
18	Is the experience, skills and training of the Personnel involved a risk?	Low	
Risk No.	Risk Assessment Consideration	Risk Level	Risk Action
1	Is there a risk that the operating conditions do not reflect the assumptions, limitations,	Low	

MISK NU.	KISK ASSESSITIETIT COTISICETATION	KISK LEVEI	KISK ACTION
1	Is there a risk that the operating conditions do not reflect the assumptions, limitations, methods and uncertainties in the Project Plan?	Low	
2	Is there a risk of complexity or data availability for the baseline calculations?	Low	
3	Is there a risk that the expected emission reductions or removals will be different that the actual emission reductions?	Low	



### Information Request

Number	GHG Source	Percentage of Emissions	Information Requested
General		•	
	Project Boundary	N/A	<ul> <li>The Project's Monitoring Report and the GHG Project Plan (collectively referred to as the Offset Project Report)</li> <li>Location details</li> <li>Other materials/sources that were used to support the Project Boundary information</li> </ul>
	Data Management Systems	N/A	<ul> <li>Data monitoring and storage procedures</li> <li>Meter calibration and field inspection records</li> <li>Records retention policy</li> <li>Operations and maintenance records</li> <li>Project personnel interviews</li> </ul>
SSR			
4	Transport to Destruction Facility	100% Project Emissions (with SSR 6)	<ul> <li>Chain of custody and Point of Origin (POR) documentation</li> <li>Weigh scale data and certificates of destruction (COD)</li> <li>Certificates of analysis (COA)</li> <li>CEMS data</li> <li>ODS and high-GWP blowing agent composition and mass determinations (i.e laboratory reports or other procedure per the ACR Methodology)</li> <li>Weigh scale documentation</li> <li>Sample data</li> <li>Quantification details</li> <li>Calculations/spreadsheets used to create the reports</li> <li>Other materials/sources that were used to support the ACR Project Monitoring Report and GHG Project Plan</li> </ul>
5	Recovered ODS Stockpile	100% Baseline Emissions	<ul> <li>Chain of custody and Point of Origin (POR) documentation</li> <li>Weigh scale data and certificates of destruction (COD)</li> <li>Certificates of analysis (COA)</li> <li>CEMS data</li> <li>ODS and high-GWP blowing agent composition and mass determinations (i.e., laboratory reports or other procedure per the ACR Methodology)</li> <li>Weigh scale documentation</li> <li>Sample data</li> <li>Quantification details</li> <li>Calculations/spreadsheets used to create the reports</li> <li>Other materials/sources that were used to support the ACR project Monitoring Report and GHG Project Plan</li> </ul>
6	Destruction	100% Project Emissions (with SSR 4)	<ul> <li>Permits, Notices of Violations (NOVs) for US facilities, notices or letter of non-compliance for non-US facilities, and any relevant administrative or legal consent orders dating back at least 3 years prior to the project commencement date</li> <li>Employee training and certification certificates</li> <li>Destruction facility monitoring and maintenance information (continuous emissions monitoring data, DRE documentation, calibration procedures, calibration checks and daily zero validations (if applicable), manufacturer guidance pertaining to facility or technology maintenance and permits</li> <li>Quantification details</li> <li>Calculations/spreadsheets used to create the reports</li> <li>Other materials/sources that were used to support the ACR Project Monitoring Report and GHG Project Plan</li> </ul>

# **Appendix B**

Validation and Verification Opinion







# ACR Validation and Verification Opinion

**INSTRUCTIONS** ACR requires that a Validation Opinion be provided by the validation body at each ACR GHG Project validation and that a Verification Opinion be provided by the verification body at each ACR GHG Project verification. To facilitate this requirement, use of this Validation and Verification Opinion template is required. Follow all instructions found within each section and provide all requested information. If a field is not applicable, respond with "N/A." The Opinion must be signed by the duly authorized Lead Validation/Verifier and Independent Reviewer and saved as a PDF prior to uploading to the ACR Registry. Terminology as defined in the *ACR Standard* applies to this document.

SECTION I: VALIDATION/VERIFICATION BODY DETAILS			
1	Document date	April 10, 2025	
2	Validation/Verification Body (VVB)	Dillon Consulting Limited	
3	VVB physical address Street name and number, city, state, zip	51 Breithaupt Street, Suite 200 Kitchener, Ontario N2H 5G5	
4	VVB mailing address (if different)	Same as above	
5	VVB email address	vchan@dillon.ca	
6	VVB phone number	226-750-4062	
SEC	TION II: PROJECT DETAILS		
1	Project title	Tradewater US - ODS - #9	
2	ACR project ID (ACRXXXX)	ACR1117	

THIS VERSION 1.2 OF THE VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION OPINION TEMPLATE IS REQUIRED IF FIRST SUBMISSION IS UPLOADED AFTER OCTOBER 31, 2024.

Template Version 1.2 (2024-10-11)

3	Project Proponent	Tradewater, LLC		
4	Validation and/or verification kickoff call/meeting date	February 5, 2025		
SEC	TION III: CRITERIA USED TO FORM THE OPINI	ON		
1	ISO 14064–3 version year (YYYY)	2019		
2	ISO 14065 version year (YYYY)	2020		
3	ACR Standard version applied at validation	8.0		
4	ACR Standard version applied at verification, if applicable	8.0		
5	ACR Validation and Verification Standard version applied	1.1		
6	ACR-approved Methodology title and version applied	Methodology for the Quantification, Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Removal from The Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High-GWP Foam, Version 2.0, ACR, February 2023		
7	Other criteria applied (e.g., dated Errata & Clarifications)	Errata and Clarifications – Destruction of Ozone Depleting Substances and High-GWP Foam, Version 2.0, ACR, 2025-02-18		
SEC	SECTION IV: VALIDATION OPINION DETAILS (IF APPLICABLE)			
1	Is a validation opinion being provided? <sup>1</sup> ⊠ Yes □ No			

If Yes, complete remaining question in this section.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> If both validation and verification services were conducted at the same time by the same VVB, complete Section IV as well as Sections V and VI.

Template Version 1.2 (2024-10-11)

2	Crediting Period dates Start date: January 19, 2025 End date: February 4, 2025	
3	Validated GHG Project Plan (provide exact filename, <i>including any attachments, appendices, or addendums</i> ) ACR_GHGPP_TWUSODS9_VF2_04092025 - signed.pdf	
4	Validated GHG Project Plan document date April 9, 2025	
5	Responsibility (provide the Project Proponent name) The GHG Project Plan and its contents are the responsibility of: Tradewater, LLC	
6	Does the VVB attest that the GHG Project Plan has been validated in accordance with the criteria identified in Section III? ⊠ Yes □ No	
7	As a result of validation, what type of opinion is the VVB providing? ⊠ Positive □ Negative	
8	If Negative, describe the reasons the VVB is providing this validation opinion. Not Applicable (N/A)	
The actual GHG emission reductions and removals achieved may differ from the validated forecast of future GHG emission reductions and removals, as the forecast is based on assumptions that may change in the future.		
SEC	TION V: VERIFICATION OPINION DETAILS (IF APPLICABLE)	
1	Is a verification opinion being provided? ⊠ Yes □ No If Yes, complete remaining question in this section.	
2	Is a verification opinion being provided based on a full verification including a site visit? □ Yes ⊠ No	

Template Version 1.2 (2024-10-11)

3	Reporting Period dates Start date: January 19, 2025 End date: February 4, 2025
4	Level of assurance Reasonable
5	Verified Monitoring Report (provide exact filename, <i>including any attachments, appendices, or addendums</i> ) ACR_MR_TWUSODS9_04092025 - signed.pdf
6	Verified Monitoring Report document date April 9, 2025
7	Responsibility (provide the Project Proponent name) The Monitoring Report and its contents are the responsibility of: Tradewater, LLC
8	Does the VVB attest that the Monitoring Report has been verified to the specified Level of Assurance in accordance with the criteria identified in Section III? ⊠ Yes □ No
9	Does the VVB attest that the GHG statement, as detailed by the Monitoring Report and provided in Section VI below, is without material misstatement (as defined by the ACR Standard)? ⊠ Yes □ No
10	As a result of verification, what type of opinion is the VVB providing? ⊠ Positive □ Negative
11	If Negative, describe the reasons the VVB is providing this verification opinion. N/A

Template Version 1.2 (2024-10-11)

# SECTION VI: GHG STATEMENT (APPLICABLE FOR VERIFICATION OPINIONS)

*Omit or provide additional rows for Vintages as needed* 

ALL GHG PROJECTS		AFOLU & GEOLOGIC SEQUESTRATION PROJECTS ONLY			
Vintage	Total ERRs	Removals Subset of Total ERRs (if applicable)	Emission Reductions Subset of Total ERRs (if applicable)	Buffer Pool / Reserve Account Contribution (if applicable)	Net ERRs (if applicable)
2025	133,280	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTALS*	133,280	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
*Totals may not sum due to rounding					

Proceed to attestation on next page.

# SECTION VII: ATTESTATIONS

#### INSTRUCTIONS

- The Validation/Verification Opinion must be signed by the duly authorized Lead Validation/Verifier and Independent Reviewer.
- The signatures may not be inserted by typing or affixing an image file.
- The signatures may be executed:
  - ♦ via encrypted digital signature (i.e. DocuSign), or
  - by printing the signature page, using a wet signature, scanning the signature page, and inserting it into the final PDF.
- The signature dates should be on or after:
  - $\circledast\,$  the document date at the top of this report,
  - ◈ the document date of the GHG Project Plan being validated, if applicable,
  - $\circledast$  the document date of the Monitoring Report being verified, if applicable, and
  - ♦ the document date of the accompanying Validation/Verification Report being submitted.

Lead Validator/Verifier Signature

X Nahi chon

Lead Validator/Verifier Name

Lead Validator/Verifier Title

Lead Validator/Verifier Organization

Lead Validator/Verifier Signature Date

Valerie Chan

Associate

Dillon Consulting Limited

April 10, 2025

Template Version 1.2 (2024-10-11)

Independent Reviewer Signature	X /1.5/
Independent Reviewer Name	Robert Morgan
Independent Reviewer Title	Associate
Independent Reviewer Organization	Dillon Consulting Limited
Independent Reviewer Signature Date	April 10, 2025