QUALITY REPORT

Off Grid Solar PV Project at Iamgold Essankane SA Gold Mine

VCS-2434 · Verified Carbon Standard · Burkina Faso (Africa)

Report ID: CM-0D90A307 · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

Overall Score		
4.8 Overall Score out of 10	Integrity (35%)	4.2
	Transparency (25%)	5.6
	Claim Safety (25%)	4.8
	Documentation (15%)	5.0

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

The project is a VCS renewable energy activity using AMS-I-A with VVB-confirmed additionality and no material findings reported, which supports basic credibility. However, key integrity elements are weakened by inconsistent leakage treatment across monitoring reports and conflicting verified ER figures across validation reports, alongside multiple corrective actions tied to metering and reporting completeness.

Project Details

Registry	Verified Carbon Standard
Registry ID	VCS-2434
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Burkina Faso (Africa)
Vintage	2019
Project Methodology	AMS-I-A 16.0
Crediting Period	2018 — 2025
VVB	4Kearthscience
Verified ERs	22,113 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2024 — 2025
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	25 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- ■ Conflicting verified emission reduction figures across validation reports (22,113 vs 27,179), creating over-/under-crediting uncertainty
- ■ Leakage treatment is inconsistent across monitoring reports (negligible vs not addressed), with no quantified leakage deduction reported
- ■ Corrective actions cite discrepancies between meter readings and invoices and inconsistent meter serial numbers, raising MRV reliability concerns

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 4.2 / 10

+ Additionality is confirmed by the VVB (validation report).

- Leakage is inconsistently treated and not quantified (monitoring reports 2021 vs 2025).

The validation report indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB, which supports the integrity case for a renewable energy activity under AMS-I-A. Baseline setting appears project-specific and the timing of any baseline reassessment is not stated in available documents, which adds uncertainty. Leakage is a key weakness: one monitoring report deems leakage negligible (2021), while the more recent monitoring report states leakage is not addressed (2025), and no leakage deduction is reported in the extracted record.

Transparency — 5.6 / 10

+ Monitoring period and crediting period are clearly stated (monitoring report 2025).

- Reported ER figures are inconsistent across validation reports and the claimed ER is not found in the extracted record.

The monitoring report (2025) clearly specifies the monitoring period (2024-01-01 to 2025-05-31) and the crediting period is provided (2018-06-01 to 2025-05-31). However, the total emission reductions claimed are not found in the extracted record, limiting traceability between calculations and issuance. Transparency is further reduced by conflicting verified ER figures across validation reports and by the number of corrective actions required to complete and reconcile monitoring information.

Claim Safety — 4.8 / 10

- Conflicting verified ER values (22,113 vs 27,179) increase over-crediting/claims risk (validation reports 2024 vs 2025).

~ CORSIA and CCP status are not stated in available documents, limiting confidence in downstream claim constraints.

Over-crediting/claims risk is elevated because the validation reports provide different verified ER totals (27,179 in 2024 vs 22,113 in 2025), and the extracted record does not include a claimed ER value to reconcile against. Leakage is either treated as negligible or not addressed depending on the monitoring report, which increases uncertainty around whether all relevant emissions sources were considered. CORSIA eligibility and CCP status are not stated in available documents, so buyers cannot rely on those labels to reduce double-claim or eligibility-related reputational risk.

Documentation — 5.0 / 10

+ A relatively broad document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance).

- Multiple corrective actions were required, including metering/invoicing discrepancies and missing supporting documents (monitoring report 2025).

The extracted record references multiple document types (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) and uses a relatively large set of documents overall (20). Extraction confidence is medium, suggesting the documents were readable but not perfect. Documentation quality is weakened by numerous corrective actions in the 2025 monitoring report, including missing required sections, missing capacity support documents, and inconsistencies between meter serial numbers, meter readings, and invoices.

Risk Indicators

Additionality	VVB-confirmed additionality
Permanence	Avoidance project; no reversal risk indicated
Leakage	Leakage inconsistent / not quantified
Baseline	Project-specific baseline; reassessment timing unclear
Safeguards	FPIC and grievance mechanism documented
Double-claim	CORSIA/CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish a clear reconciliation table linking monitoring calculations, any claimed ER, verification conclusions, and issuance quantities for the period, resolving the 27,179 vs 22,113 discrepancy.

→ Provide a consistent leakage assessment aligned to AMS-I-A (explicitly negligible with justification or quantified with a stated deduction) and include it in the monitoring report and ER spreadsheet.

→ Close corrective actions by submitting capacity evidence, correcting MR sections/dates, and providing an auditable meter-to-invoice trail with consistent meter serial numbers and readings.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- ERR Calculation Spreadsheet
- Communications Agreement
- Listing Representation
- Registration Representation
- Draft Project Description
- Project Description
- Verification Report
- Verification Representation
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-0D90A307 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy