



Verification Report

CAR674 Oneida Herkimer Landfill Ava, NY

Reporting Period: July 15, 2024 – July 14, 2025

Prepared for:

Oneida Herkimer Solid Waste Authority

February 3, 2026

TÜV SÜD America Inc.
750 Main Street Suite 200
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501
(970) 241-9298

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 Project Background & Site Description.....	1
1.2 Responsible Party	1
1.3 Verification Team.....	1
1.4 Objectives	2
1.5 Scope.....	2
1.6 Verification Criteria	2
2 Verification Activities Summary	3
3 Verification Findings.....	3
3.1 Assessment of the GHG Emission Reductions Project Operations	3
3.2 GHG Project Boundary (sources, sinks and/or reservoirs).....	4
3.3 Project Eligibility Criteria	4
3.4 Ownership of Generated Emission Reductions	6
3.5 GHG Monitoring and Management Systems	6
3.6 Instrument QA/QC	7
3.7 Assessment of GHG Emission Reductions Calculations.....	9
4 Verification Results	10
5 Verification Opinion.....	11

1 Introduction

Oneida Herkimer Solid Waste Authority (OHSWA) contracted TÜV SÜD America, Inc. (TÜV SÜD), to perform the verification of the CAR674 Oneida Herkimer Landfill Ava, NY project (Project) for the reporting period spanning July 15, 2024 to July 14, 2025 to the Climate Action Reserve (Reserve) U.S. Landfill Project Protocol Version 6.0 (Protocol). The Project involves greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions from the capture and destruction of landfill gas (LFG) near Ava, New York at the Oneida Herkimer Regional Landfill (Landfill). The Project is currently in its second crediting period, spanning from July 15, 2020 to July 14, 2030.

1.1 Project Background & Site Description

The Oneida Herkimer Landfill is an active municipal landfill with three methane flares owned and operated by OHSWA with an adjacent landfill gas to energy (LFGTE) facility owned and operated by Waste Management Renewable Energy (WMRE). The project became operational in 2010 and the LFGTE facility became operational in 2012. The project currently consists of multiple LFG extraction wells, with associated collection piping, blowers, engines, and flares. Blowers are used to extract the LFG and send it to two Caterpillar G3520C engines for destruction. TÜV SÜD confirmed that the project is not a bioreactor.

1.2 Responsible Party

Project Developer and Landfill Owner: Oneida Herkimer Solid Waste Authority (OHSWA)

Flare Owner: Oneida Herkimer Solid Waste Authority

Landfill Gas-to-Energy Owner: Waste Management Renewable Energy (WMRE)

Consultants: Environmental Attribute Advisors and Barton & Loguidice (B&L)

Environmental Attribute Advisors aids in the carbon credit sale and management. They communicate with engineers at Barton & Loguidice who conduct emission reduction calculations, complete Project documentation, and aid in the verification process. OHSWA is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the GHG statement in accordance with the criteria listed below in Table 1.

1.3 Verification Team

TÜV SÜD is responsible for expressing an opinion on the GHG statement based on the verification. The TÜV SÜD verification team consisted of the following individuals who were selected based upon verification experience and knowledge of landfill gas destruction projects.

Lead Verifier: Ashley Emery

Team Member: Kelli Miller

Independent Reviewer: Garrett Heidrick

Samantha Phillips was listed as a team member on the NOVA/COI but was not utilized during the verification.

1.4 Objectives

The goal of the verification activities was to ensure that the claimed GHG emission reductions were complete, consistent, accurate, transparent, and permanent and that the Project was in compliance with the Reserve's project additionality, monitoring, and reporting requirements. Furthermore, the verification activities ensure that the data provided to TÜV SÜD are well documented and free of any material errors or omissions.

1.5 Scope

The scope of the verification consisted of the following independent and objective activities:

- Review the reporting period's Project Monitoring Plan;
- Review the Project data acquisition and quality control procedures;
- Review the Project's baseline emissions and confirm the baseline and Project boundaries;
- Review the Project's evidence of environmental and regulatory requirements to ensure that the Project is additional;
- Review the Project's emission reductions calculations;
- Review the Project documents and data against the criteria listed in Table 1;
- Issue requests for additional documentation, clarifications, non-material findings, and corrective actions as necessary; and
- Issue a verification report, verification opinion, and list of findings to OHSWA and the Reserve.

1.6 Verification Criteria

Table 1. Summary of Verification Criteria

Criteria	Details
Standard of Verification	• Climate Action Reserve U.S. Landfill Project Protocol, V6.0, June 2022 • Errata and Clarifications to the Protocol, V6.0, April 2023 • Reserve Verification Program Manual, February 2021 • Reserve Offset Program Manual, V9.2, April 2024 • Policy Memo: Use of Global Warming Potential Values for All Offset Protocols, July 13, 2022
Verification Process	The Reserve Verification Program Manual and ISO 14064-3:2019 "Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas statements."
Level of Assurance	Reasonable assurance
Materiality	99% accuracy level (less than 1% error) for the 2024 and 2025 reporting periods because emission reductions are >100,000 tCO ₂ e annually.

2 Verification Activities Summary

As the first step in verification activities, TÜV SÜD developed a verification plan to be followed throughout the verification. The verification plan consisted of the following activities:

- TÜV SÜD completed a NOVA/COI form to identify any potential conflict of interest with the Project, the project developer, or the technical consultant. The NOVA/COI form was submitted to the Reserve and the COI assessment revealed no conflicts of interest and was approved by the Reserve on October 15, 2025.
- TÜV SÜD held a verification kick-off meeting with OHSWA on October 20, 2025. During the kick-off meeting TÜV SÜD reviewed the verification objectives and process, reviewed the verification schedule, and requested the verification background documents.
- TÜV SÜD performed a strategic analysis and risk assessment of the received data and support documents to understand the scope and areas of potential risk in the GHG emissions inventory.
- TÜV SÜD developed a risk-based evidence-gathering plan based upon the strategic analysis and risk assessment. The evidence-gathering plan was used throughout the verification and was revised as needed based upon additional risk assessments.
- TÜV SÜD conducted a site visit during the previous verification on November 6, 2024. During the site visit TÜV SÜD performed key personnel interviews; inspected the Project equipment; and observed the onsite GHG management systems and data gathering, monitoring, and handling practices.
- TÜV SÜD performed a risk-based desktop review of the submitted verification documents. The desktop review included an assessment of the GHG calculation methods and inputs, source data completeness, GHG management and monitoring systems, evidence of regulatory compliance, and record retention practices.
- TÜV SÜD submitted requests for corrective actions, non-material findings, additional documentation, and clarifications, as necessary to OHSWA throughout the verification.
- TÜV SÜD's independent reviewer conducted a review of the verification plan and evidence gathering plan, report, and opinion.
- TÜV SÜD issued a final verification report, verification opinion, and list of findings.
- TÜV SÜD held an exit meeting with OHSWA.

3 Verification Findings

3.1 Assessment of the GHG Emission Reductions Project Operations

The Landfill currently collects LFG and destroys it via combustion in two engines and three flares. The LFG is pulled by blowers through a gas collection system that consists of vertical wells and a leachate collection and removal system. TÜV SÜD confirmed that the landfill is not a bioreactor and

does not re-circulate leachate nor add any liquid other than leachate in a controlled fashion to accelerate or enhance the anaerobic biodegradation of the waste.

3.2 GHG Project Boundary (sources, sinks and/or reservoirs)

The Protocol designates that CO₂ and CH₄ are the only GHGs included from the baseline and Project activities. The project emissions must be deducted from the baseline emissions to calculate GHG emission reductions. The GHG SSRs include methane generated from biodegradation of the landfill waste vented to the atmosphere, methane consumed by soil bacteria through natural oxidation, incomplete combustion of methane via Project destruction devices, fossil fuel use, and electricity use. The SSRs reviewed during the verification of the Project are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of the Project GHG Sources, Sinks and Reservoirs

Activity	GHG Sources, Sinks & Reservoirs
Baseline	- CH₄ vented to the atmosphere. - Percent CH₄ oxidized by soil bacteria. As the landfill is not covered with a synthetic liner, a 10% oxidation factor resulting from natural oxidation by soil bacteria was applied to the baseline emissions.
Project	- CH₄ from the incomplete combustion of LFG sent to the flare. - CO₂ from the combustion of fossil fuels used during operation and maintenance of the Project activity. - CO₂ resulting from the consumption of imported electricity.

3.3 Project Eligibility Criteria

The Protocol specifies five eligibility rules that a project must meet to register emission reductions with the Reserve: Location, Project Start Date, Project Crediting Period, Additionality, and Regulatory Compliance. Below is a summary of the Reserve eligibility requirements and the Project's compliance to each requirement.

- **Eligibility Rule 1: Location**

The Project is a U.S.-based landfill located near Ava, NY, USA. The Project therefore meets this eligibility requirement.

- **Eligibility Rule 2: Project Start Date**

The Landfill Project Protocol states a project start date is the date when methane was first continuously destroyed in a qualifying destruction device at the site. TÜV SÜD reviewed a start-up letter from OHSWA to B&L confirming that the first continuous methane destruction began on July 15, 2010 (the Project start date). A revised Project submittal form submitted to the Reserve on May 14, 2010 was also reviewed, which states that the first flare was installed on July 1, 2010.

- **Eligibility Rule 3: Project Crediting Period**

The Project's first crediting period began on July 15, 2010 and ended on July 14, 2020. TÜV SÜD reviewed the second crediting period Project Submittal Form, which was submitted to the Reserve on January 7, 2020. The second crediting period began on July 15, 2020 and ends on July 14, 2030.

- **Eligibility Rule 4: Additionality**

Performance Standard Test

Prior to the Project activity, the Landfill was collecting and destroying LFG in passive flares located at leachate cleanouts and horizontal collector locations. TÜV SÜD confirmed this with Landfill staff during the site visit for the previous verification.

Thus, the Project passes the Performance Standard Test number 3a since it involves:

"Installation of a new qualifying destruction device at an eligible landfill where landfill gas was collected and destroyed at any time prior to the project start date using: a non-qualifying destruction device."

Limits on Credit Stacking

The LFGTE facility does generate RECs, but it's not considered to be credit stacking. There is no additional evidence of credit stacking at the Project area, nor is there any indication the Landfill is receiving any type of mitigation credit other than offsets.

Legal Requirement Test

TÜV SÜD confirmed that there are currently no laws or ordinances requiring the Landfill to collect and destroy LFG. The Landfill is a municipal solid waste (MSW) Landfill that exceeds the design capacity of 2.5 million megagrams (Mg) or 2.5 million cubic meters as specified in the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) codified in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 60, Subpart WWW and Subpart Cf. The Landfill is therefore subject to the requirements of the NSPS for MSW Landfills.

TÜV SÜD reviewed the most recent NMOC modeling results for the Landfill. The estimated NMOC emission rates for 2024 and 2025 of 25.51 Mg/year and 26.14 Mg/year, respectively, are below the 34 Mg/year threshold for a required gas collection and combustion system.

TÜV SÜD also reviewed the Project's Monitoring Plan which defines how the Project continues to exceed the Legal Requirement Test. Landfill personnel and their consultant, B&L, review local, state, and federal regulations prior to each verification period in order to confirm that there are no new requirements or laws that mandate the GCCS be in place. The Attestation of Voluntary Implementation form was also signed after the end of the reporting period and uploaded to the Reserve registry which states that the Project was implemented and established voluntarily.

During the review of the supporting evidence, TÜV SÜD did not observe any indication that the Landfill was mandated to destroy LFG. Additionally, there are no local, state, or federal requirements for the installation of a GCCS at the Landfill. Therefore, the results of the review indicated that OHSWA is following its Monitoring Plan procedures to assure that it passes the Legal Requirement Test.

- **Eligibility Rule 5: Regulatory Compliance**

TÜV SÜD reviewed the procedures described in OHSWA's monitoring plan to ensure that the Project remains in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal requirements. TÜV SÜD searched the Environmental Protection Agency's Enforcement & Compliance History Online (ECHO) database and found a CWA violation listed during the reporting period. TÜV SÜD reviewed effluent exceedance documentation and determined the event did not pertain to the GCCS, flares, or the LFGTE facility. Search of the ECHO database found no noncompliance events for the LFGTE facility. TÜV SÜD also reached out to the Landfill's New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) to confirm regulatory compliance, but no response was provided.

TÜV SÜD also reviewed the Landfill's environmental and operating permits including the Landfill's air permit and municipal solid waste permit. The municipal solid waste permit expired during the previous reporting period. TÜV SÜD reviewed a letter from NYSDEC granting OHSWA an extension to continue operating under the terms of their existing permit. All other permits were in effect for the entirety of the reporting period.

TÜV SÜD confirmed signature of the Attestation of Regulatory Compliance, after the end of the reporting period, which was uploaded to the Reserve.

3.4 Ownership of Generated Emission Reductions

TÜV SÜD reviewed the Landfill Gas Rights Agreement between OHSWA and WMRE, which states that although WMRE owns the electricity generation facility, OHSWA retains ownership of carbon credits associated with the destruction of methane. TÜV SÜD also reviewed the completed Attestation of Title which was uploaded to the Reserve following the end of the reporting period.

3.5 GHG Monitoring and Management Systems

TÜV SÜD reviewed the data management systems during both desktop review and the previous verification's site visit. The onsite review included an assessment of the Project data collection, processing and handling procedures, recordkeeping and data storage, quality control and assurance procedures, record retention systems, and a field tour of the Project equipment. The desktop review included a detailed review of the Project Monitoring Plan and its conformance to Protocol requirements, confirmation that the Project was implemented according to the procedures laid out in the Monitoring Plan, and clarification of any discrepancies via the list of findings.

The primary Project data included the LFG flow to the engines and flares, methane content of the LFG, engine operation, and flare operation. During the reporting period, the LFG flow was

continuously measured by several different flow meters, including five Thermal Instrument Company (TI) flow meters and one ABB flow meter. TÜV SÜD confirmed when each meter was used for each destruction device. All flow meters internally correct for temperature and pressure at 60°F and 1 atm.

All monitored data is recorded continuously by a Yokogawa data recorder. The methane content of LFG sent to the flares was measured continuously by a Landtec Biogas 3000 gas analyzer (SN G300695), which was used to measure methane content of LFG sent to the flares. Loaner gas analyzers (SN G300922 and G300918) were used while G300695 underwent its annual factory calibrations. The methane content of LFG sent to the engines was measured continuously by an ABB Model NGC8203 gas analyzer (SN T112455143).

During the desktop review, TÜV SÜD reviewed the data storage and retention policies of OHSWA and verified they were in conformance with the Protocol requirements and documented in the Monitoring Plan. All data is kept for a period of ten years after the information is generated or seven years after the last verification.

3.6 Instrument QA/QC

TÜV SÜD reviewed evidence that the flow meters and methane analyzers met instrument QA/QC requirements as outlined in the Protocol for cleaning, inspection, and calibration. The Project Monitoring Plan describes the procedures for instrument field checks and calibrations. These procedures in the Monitoring Plan are in compliance with the Protocol requirements. Landfill staff performed quarterly checks on the entire LFG destruction system, which includes the flow meters and methane analyzers. These quarterly checks ensure that all pieces of equipment are functioning properly, and equipment is fixed or calibrated in a timely manner, if necessary.

There are three flares within the Project: Flare 25, Flare 26, and Flare 27. There is one methane analyzer (SN G300695) for all three flares while each has their own flow meter. The flare flow meters were inspected on August 7, 2024, November 8, 2024, March 6, 2025, and May 20, 2025. The methane analyzers for the flares were inspected on August 8, 2024, November 7, 2024, February 12, 2025, and May 20, 2025.

The methane analyzer for the flares was installed from the beginning of the reporting period through November 20, 2024 and then reinstalled December 10, 2024 through July 9, 2025. The methane analyzer was calibrated by QED on July 22, 2025; no later than the commencement of verification activities. Temporary loaner analyzers were employed while the main analyzer was sent in for calibration. Loaner G300922 was installed from November 21, 2024 through December 9, 2024 and was calibrated by QED November 18, 2024 prior to installation and found to be within the Protocol required $\pm 5\%$ accuracy threshold. Since the analyzer was not installed for more than 60 days no other accuracy or calibration checks were required. Loaner G300918 was installed from July 10, 2025 through the end of the reporting period and calibrated by QED July 2, 2025; prior to installation and within two months of the end of the reporting period. The analyzer was found to be within the Protocol required $\pm 5\%$ accuracy threshold.

Flare 27 is the main flare utilized in the Project and utilized two flow meters during the reporting period, SN 2022019 and SN 2020374. Flow meter SN 2022019 was installed from the beginning of the reporting period through January 24, 2025 and calibrated March 5, 2025; calibrated by the manufacturer prior to the commencement of verification activities. During the calibration, the meter was found to be overreporting by 5.2%. TÜV SÜD confirmed the appropriate adjustment based on the greatest calibration drift was applied from the start of the reporting period through January 24, 2025. The meter was brought back within the allowable accuracy threshold during the calibration service. Flow meter SN 2020374 was installed January 24, 2025 through the end of the reporting period and calibrated by the manufacturer August 4, 2025; within two months of the end of the reporting period. The flow meter was found to be within the Protocol required $\pm 5\%$ accuracy threshold.

Flare 25 utilized two flow meters during the reporting period, SN 2011156 and SN 2014201. Flow meter SN 2011156 was installed from the beginning of the reporting period through November 14, 2024 and then reinstalled to measure Flare 26's flow later in the reporting period. The meter was calibrated by the manufacturer on December 5, 2024, between uses, and found to be reading accurately. Flow meter SN 2014201 was installed November 14, 2024 through the end of the reporting period and calibrated by the manufacturer August 1, 2025; within two months of the end of the reporting period. During the calibration, the meter was found to be overreporting by 6.5%. An accuracy check was performed May 20, 2025 by RL Stone that found the meter to be reading accurately. TÜV SÜD confirmed the appropriate adjustment based on the greatest calibration drift was applied from May 20, 2025 through the end of the reporting period. The meter was brought back within the allowable accuracy threshold during the calibration service.

Flare 26 utilized two flow meters during the reporting period, SN 2010175 and SN 2011156. Flow meter SN 2010175 was installed from the beginning of the reporting period through February 14, 2025 and calibrated by the manufacturer March 18, 2025. During the calibration, the meter was found to be overreporting by 14.3%. An accuracy check was performed August 7, 2024 by B&L that found the meter to be reading accurately. TÜV SÜD confirmed the appropriate adjustment based on the greatest calibration drift was applied from August 7, 2024 through February 14, 2025. The meter was brought back within the allowable accuracy threshold during the calibration service. Flow meter SN 2011156 was installed February 14, 2025 through the end of the reporting period and calibrated by the manufacturer August 4, 2025; within two months of the end of the reporting period. During the calibration, the meter was found to be overreporting by 5.6%. An accuracy check was performed May 20, 2025 by RL Stone that found the meter to be reading accurately. TÜV SÜD confirmed the appropriate adjustment based on the greatest calibration drift was applied from May 20, 2025 through the end of the reporting period. The meter was brought back within the allowable accuracy threshold during the calibration service.

The LFGTE facility utilized one flow meter (SN 267CS502016255) and one methane analyzer (SN T112455143) for Project data monitoring; both installed for the entirety of the reporting period. Both instruments were calibrated on June 17, 2025; within two months of the end of the reporting period. Both instruments were found to be within the Protocol required $\pm 5\%$ accuracy threshold. The flow

meter and methane analyzer were inspected August 22, 2024, December 19, 2024, March 4, 2025, and June 17, 2025.

TÜV SÜD reviewed calibration and accuracy check documentation for the flow meters and methane analyzers. The flow meters and analyzers were calibrated according to the manufacturer's guidance (Table 3).

Table 3. Cleaning and Inspection, Accuracy Checks, and Factory Calibrations

Serial Number	Meter Type	Dates of Use	Calibration Date(s)
2011156	Flare Flow Meter	7/15/2024 – 11/14/2024 (Flare 25) 2/14/2025 – 7/14/2025 (Flare 26)	11/17/2023, 12/5/2024, 8/4/2025
2014201	Flare Flow Meter	11/14/2024 – 7/14/2025 (Flare 25)	6/25/24, 8/1/2025
2010175	Flare Flow Meter	7/15/2024 – 2/24/2025 (Flare 26)	2/16/24, 3/18/2025
2022019	Flare Flow Meter	7/15/2024 – 1/24/2025 (Flare 27)	2/7/24, 3/5/2025
2020374	Flare Flow Meter	1/24/2025 – 7/14/2025 (Flare 27)	1/15/24, 12/30/24, 8/4/2025
G300695	Flare Methane Analyzer	7/15/2024 – 11/20/2024 12/10/2024 – 7/9/2025	5/8/24, 8/8/24, 11/7/24, 2/12/25, 5/20/25, 7/22/2025
G300922	Loaner Flare Methane Analyzer	11/21/2024 – 12/9/2024	11/18/2024
G300918	Loaner Flare Methane Analyzer	7/10/2025 – 7/14/2025	7/2/2025
267CS6502016255	Engine Flow Meter	7/15/2024 – 7/14/2025	5/15/24, 8/22/24, 12/19/24, 3/4/25, 6/17/25
T112455143	Engine Methane Analyzer	7/15/2024 – 7/14/2025	5/15/24, 8/22/24, 12/19/24, 3/4/25, 6/17/25

3.7 Assessment of GHG Emission Reductions Calculations

The emission reduction calculation assessment included a review of Project assumptions, raw data inputs, and accuracy of calculations. TÜV SÜD assessed the completeness of the raw data and how the data are transferred to the calculation spreadsheet. TÜV SÜD reviewed the formulas and raw data inputs for accuracy and compliance with Protocol requirements.

The Project data consisted of raw data in the form of spreadsheets of continuous engine and flare flow, continuous LFG concentration, and the emission reduction calculation workbook. TÜV SÜD compared raw data in the spreadsheets to the respective daily sums, then compared those data and the methane readings to the calculation workbook. TÜV SÜD confirmed operational activity of the engines by checking that the kWh and/or MMBtu output was positive and operational activity of the flare using thermocouple readings above 500 °F supplied in the raw data. TÜV SÜD confirmed that a 93.6% destruction efficiency was assigned to the Project's lean burn engines and a 96% destruction

efficiency was assigned to the Project’s open flares. TÜV SÜD confirmed that the proper discount for the oxidation factor associated with an unlined landfill was applied as required.

TÜV SÜD reviewed OHSWA’s pre-project destruction calculations for the passive flares and confirmed that they followed all Protocol requirements.

TÜV SÜD reviewed source documentation for Project emissions from purchased electricity and propane consumption, confirmed that appropriate emission and conversion factors were used, and reviewed the use of Protocol equations for Project emissions in OHSWA’s calculation workbook.

During the reporting period, only methane content to the flares was substituted for a total of 136.1 hours with the maximum of 38.2 hours of substitution. TÜV SÜD independently confirmed the appropriate data substitution methodology was applied as described in Appendix D of the Protocol.

TÜV SÜD independently recalculated project emissions, baseline emissions, and overall GHG emission reductions using electricity consumption documentation and raw flow and CH₄ concentration data provided by OHSWA. TÜV SÜD compared their results to OHSWA’s results to determine if the reported GHG emission reductions were materially correct.

TÜV SÜD reviewed the Project GHG emissions and reductions calculations for compliance with the Protocol’s calculation methodologies. There are no material misstatements in the final Project GHG reductions calculations and results (see Table 4).

Table 4. Comparison of Emission Reductions (MTCO₂e)

TÜV SÜD	OHSWA	% Difference
216,225	214,333	-0.88%

Percent difference was calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Percent Error} = \text{abs} \left(\frac{\text{Stated reductions} - \text{Verified reductions}}{\text{Verified reductions}} \right) \times 100$$

4 Verification Results

OHSWA provided sufficient evidence and documentation of its emission reductions, data collection procedures, and monitoring and quality control procedures. The verification process focused on verifying the emission reduction calculations and the source data used to quantify the emission reductions in accordance with the Reserve Landfill Project Protocol 6.0. The following is a summary of the verification results.

The Project reported emission reductions of 214,333 metric tons of CO₂e from July 15, 2024 to July 14, 2025. During final review, TÜV SÜD identified no material misstatements in the data or emission reductions calculations. Tables 5 and 6 define the emission reductions verified for the reporting period. During the verification process, TÜV SÜD made requests for material findings, non-material findings, additional documentation, and clarifications to complete the verification. OHSWA sufficiently addressed all requests. The details of these requests are documented in TÜV SÜD’s List of Findings provided to the Reserve and OHSWA.

5 Verification Opinion

TÜV SÜD America Inc. conducted the verification of the CAR674 Oneida Herkimer Landfill Ava, NY Project according to the requirements found in ISO 14064-3:2019, 14065:2020, and 17029:2019. The objective of this verification was to ensure that the GHG statement is materially correct and conforms to all relevant criteria. The GHG statement is the responsibility of OHSWA. A summary of the GHG statement is as follows:

- GHG-related activity: Methane destruction at the Name of Landfill
- GHG statement period
 - o Reporting Period: July 15, 2024 through July 14, 2025
 - o Crediting Period: July 15, 2020 through July 14, 2030
- Criteria:
 - o Reserve Offset Program Manual, V9.2, April 2024
 - o Reserve Verification Program Manual, February 2021
 - o Reserve U.S. Landfill Project Protocol, V6.0, June 2022
 - o Errata and Clarifications to the Protocol, V6.0, April 2023
 - o Policy Memo: Use of Global Warming Potential Values for All Offset Protocols, July 13, 2022

The data and information supporting the GHG statement were historical in nature.

TÜV SÜD has ensured OHSWA's effective use of controls related to the GHG statement. TÜV SÜD concludes that there is sufficient and appropriate evidence to support OHSWA's GHG statement and is issuing an Unmodified Opinion.

TÜV SÜD confirms that the GHG statement has been prepared:

- Without material discrepancy,
- In accordance with all applicable criteria, and
- Verified to a reasonable level of assurance.

Emissions reductions are stated by vintage year and reporting period in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Emission Reductions MT CO₂e Verified by Vintage Years

Year	Baseline Emissions	Project Emissions	Pre-Project Deductions*	Emission Reductions
2024	102,234	82	3,285	102,153
2025	112,273	94	3,768	112,180
Total	214,508	175	7,052	214,333

Table 6. Emission Reductions MT CO₂e Verified by Reporting Period

Reporting Period	Baseline Emissions	Project Emissions	Pre-Project Deductions*	Emission Reductions
July 15, 2024 – July 14, 2025	214,508	175	7,052	214,333

*Note: Due to rounding, individual values might not equal totals and values are not representative of raw data used in the emission reductions calculation. *Pre-project deductions are included in the Baseline Emissions calculations. They are stated here for transparency purposes.*

Lead Verifier Signature



Ashley Emery

Independent Reviewer Signature



Garrett Heidrick