



Template for submitting proposals related to GHG Protocol's *Corporate Standard*, *Scope 2 Guidance*, *Scope 3 Standard*, *Scope 3 Calculation Guidance* and market-based accounting approaches

(Optional)

Proposal instructions

GHG Protocol is conducting four related surveys in reference to the following GHG Protocol standards, guidance and topics:

1. Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition, 2004) ("Corporate Standard")
2. Scope 2 Guidance (2015)
3. Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard (2011) ("Scope 3 Standard"), and Technical Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 Emissions, version 1.0, 2013 ("Scope 3 Calculation Guidance")
4. Market-based accounting approaches

The survey is open until February 28, 2023. To fill out the survey, [click here](#).

As part of the survey process, respondents may provide proposals for potential updates, amendments, or additional guidance to the *Corporate Standard*, *Scope 2 Guidance*, *Scope 3 Standard*, or *Scope 3 Calculation Guidance*, by providing the information requested in this template. You may also use this template to provide justification for maintaining a current approach on a given topic.

Submitting proposals is optional. Respondents may submit multiple proposals related to different topics.

Proposals should be as concise as possible while providing the requested information. Submissions that are outside of the template may not be considered. Proposals may be made publicly available.

To submit the proposal, please save this file and fill out the fields below. When you've completed your proposal, please upload the file via this [online folder](#). Please name your file STANDARD_Proposal_AFFILIATION, e.g., *Scope 2_Proposal_WRI*.

Respondent information

Name

Isabella Todaro

Organization

Climate Neutral

Email address

isabella.todaro@climateneutral.org

If proposals are made publicly available, would you like your proposal to be made publicly available? Please write either “Yes” (make publicly available) or “No” (do not make publicly available).

Yes

If your proposal is made publicly available, would you like it to be made publicly available with attribution (with your name and organization provided) or anonymous (without any name or organization provided)? Please write either “With attribution” or “Anonymous”.

With attribution

Proposal and supporting information

1. Which standard or guidance does the proposal relate to (Corporate Standard, Scope 2 Guidance, Scope 3 Standard, Scope 3 Calculation Guidance, general/cross-cutting, market-based accounting approaches, or other)? If other, please specify.

Corporate Standard

2. What is the GHG accounting and reporting topic the proposal seeks to address?

Completeness and de minimis emissions

3. What is the potential problem(s) or limitation(s) of the current standard or guidance which necessitates this proposal?

Climate Neutral works with many companies and service providers that help companies to measure emissions. There is a common misunderstanding that materiality thresholds permit you to ignore emissions under the set threshold. The Protocol specifically calls out that materiality should be used in verification to assess the risk of errors, but that all emissions should at least be estimated. The Protocol has some language around how to set materiality thresholds, but it does not have guidance on how to establish which emissions are de minimis. I think this is where the confusion arises – companies have the intuitive sense that some emissions are too small to “fuss” over and they latch onto the materiality guidance because the guidance on de minimis emissions is thin.

4. Describe the proposed change(s) or additional guidance.

I suggest that the Protocol helps to define de minimis in more detail and gives specific guidance on what kinds of estimates would be acceptable to stand in for de minimis sources. For example, I believe high-level, spend-based estimates should be enough to stand in for sources of emissions that are less than 5% of total footprint, so long as this is documented in the inventory report. This should only apply to Scope 3. It may make sense to limit the use of de minimis thresholds to companies below a certain size (\$500m in annual revenue, for example).

5. Please explain how the proposal aligns with the GHG Protocol decision-making criteria and hierarchy (A, B, C, D below), while providing justification/evidence where possible.

A. GHG Protocol accounting and reporting approaches shall meet the GHG Protocol accounting and reporting principles (see Annex for definitions):

- Accuracy, Completeness, Consistency, Relevance, Transparency
- Additional principles for land sector activities and CO₂ removals: Conservativeness, Permanence, and Comparability if relevant

This would help to improve completeness and transparency in inventories.

It would also give many companies more confidence in their ability to begin a carbon inventory exercise.

B. GHG Protocol accounting and reporting approaches shall align with the latest climate science and global climate goals (i.e., keeping global warming below 1.5°C). To support this objective (non-exhaustive list):

- Direct emissions reported in a company's inventory should correspond to emissions to the atmosphere. Reductions in direct emissions reported in a company's inventory should correspond to reductions in emissions to the atmosphere.
- Indirect emissions reported in a company's inventory should in the aggregate correspond to emissions to the atmosphere. Reductions in indirect emissions reported in a company's inventory should in the aggregate correspond to reductions in emissions to the atmosphere.

This proposal would align to the second goal listed above. It would get companies who currently use "materiality" as an excuse not to report emissions to instead estimate indirect emissions.

C. GHG Protocol accounting frameworks should support ambitious climate goals and actions in the private and public sector.

- Would this proposal enable organizations to pursue more effective GHG mitigation/decarbonization efforts as compared to the existing standards and guidance? If so, how?
- Would this proposal better inform decision making by reporting organizations and their stakeholders (e.g. related to climate-related financial risks and other relevant information associated with GHG emissions reporting)?

Yes, this would help to clarify a company's carbon measurement exercise and help to answer questions about which data must be collected.

Introducing an allowable de minimis threshold would standardize reporting approaches which would make it easier for companies to benchmark their emissions against industry peers. This would facilitate reduction planning.

Eliminating the need for sustainability analysts to track down every tiny piece of data for their inventory would free up bandwidth to focus on supply chain interventions to reduce major sources of emissions.

D. GHG Protocol accounting frameworks which meet the above criteria should be feasible. (For aspects of accounting frameworks that meet the above criteria but are difficult to implement, GHG Protocol should provide additional guidance and tools to support implementation.)

- What specific information, data or calculation methods are required to implement this proposal (e.g., in the case of scope 2, data granularity, grid data, consumption data, emission information, etc.)? Would new data/methods be needed? Are current data/methods available? How would this be implemented in practice?

- Would this proposal accommodate and be accessible to all organizations globally who seek to account for and report their GHG emissions? Are there potential challenges which would need to be further addressed to implement this proposal globally? What would be the potential solutions?

Clear guidance on de minimis emissions would make preparing carbon inventories more approachable, and would make compliance to the protocol easier for many companies who have already begun measuring.

6. Consistent with the hierarchy provided above, are there potential drawbacks or challenges to adopting this proposal? If so, what are they?

This would 'officially' give companies a viable alternative to collecting data and measuring emissions for every source of emissions. Though, I believe this would only formalize what companies are already doing and in fact make the guidance clearer and stricter on what should be estimated and with what level of precision.

7. Would the proposal improve alignment with other climate disclosure rules, programs and initiatives or lead to lack of alignment? Please describe.

Yes – it would make it easier for companies reporting to investors, voluntary certifications, and the SEC to know how to approach de minimis emissions.

8. Please attach or reference supporting evidence, research, analysis, or other information to support the proposal, including any active research or ongoing evaluations. If relevant, please also explain how the effectiveness of the proposal can be evaluated and tracked over time.

This would be effective if you actually saw companies reporting on more sources of data than they are today. I believe this would be the result because today companies are often under the false impression that they can decide on their own internal “materiality” thresholds.

9. If applicable, describe the process or stakeholders/groups consulted as part of developing this proposal.

We circulated the high level idea behind this proposal with an internal group of leaders at the companies which we certify.

10. If applicable, provide any additional information not covered in the questions above.

Proposal Annex

GHG Protocol Decision-Making Criteria and Hierarchy

- A. First, GHG Protocol accounting and reporting approaches shall meet the GHG Protocol accounting and reporting principles:**
- Accuracy, Completeness, Consistency, Relevance, Transparency
 - Additional principles for land sector activities and CO₂ removals: Conservativeness, Permanence, and Comparability if relevant
 - (See table below for definitions)
- B. Second, GHG Protocol accounting and reporting approaches shall align with the latest climate science and global climate goals (i.e., keeping global warming below 1.5°C). To support this objective (non-exhaustive list):**
- Direct emissions reported in a company's inventory should correspond to emissions to the atmosphere. Reductions in direct emissions reported in a company's inventory should correspond to reductions in emissions to the atmosphere.
 - Indirect emissions reported in a company's inventory should in the aggregate correspond to emissions to the atmosphere. Reductions in indirect emissions reported in a company's inventory should in the aggregate correspond to reductions in emissions to the atmosphere.
- C. Third, GHG Protocol accounting frameworks should support ambitious climate goals and actions in the private and public sector:**
- Accounting framework/s would enable organizations to pursue more effective GHG mitigation/decarbonization efforts as compared to the existing standards and guidance
 - Accounting framework/s would better inform decision making by reporting organizations and their stakeholders (e.g. related to climate-related financial risks and other relevant information associated with GHG emissions reporting)
- D. Fourth, GHG Protocol accounting frameworks which meet the above criteria should be feasible to implement for the users of the frameworks.**
- For aspects of accounting frameworks that meet the above criteria but are difficult to implement, GHG Protocol should provide additional guidance and tools to support implementation.

GHG Protocol Accounting and Reporting Principles

Principle	Definition
Accuracy	Ensure that the quantification of GHG emissions (and removals, if applicable) is systematically neither over nor under actual emissions (and removals, if applicable), and that uncertainties are reduced as far as practicable. Achieve sufficient accuracy to enable users to make decisions with reasonable assurance as to the integrity of the reported information.
Completeness	Account for and report on all GHG emissions (and removals, if applicable) from sources, sinks, and activities within the inventory boundary. Disclose and justify any specific exclusions.

Consistency	Use consistent methodologies to allow for meaningful performance tracking of emissions (and removals, if applicable) over time and between companies. Transparently document any changes to the data, inventory boundary, methods, or any other relevant factors in the time series.
Relevance	Ensure the GHG inventory appropriately reflects the GHG emissions (and removals, if applicable) of the company and serves the decision-making needs of users – both internal and external to the company.
Transparency	Address all relevant issues in a factual and coherent manner, based on a clear audit trail. Disclose any relevant assumptions and make appropriate references to the accounting and calculation methodologies and data sources used.
Conservativeness (Land Sector and Removals Guidance)	Use conservative assumptions, values, and procedures when uncertainty is high. Conservative values and assumptions are those that are more likely to overestimate GHG emissions and underestimate removals, rather than underestimate emissions and overestimate removals.
Permanence (Land Sector and Removals Guidance)	Ensure mechanisms are in place to monitor the continued storage of reported removals, account for reversals, and report emissions from associated carbon pools.
Comparability (optional) (Land Sector and Removals Guidance)	Apply common methodologies, data sources, assumptions, and reporting formats such that the reported GHG inventories from multiple companies can be compared.