Corporate Standard Meeting Minutes

Subgroup 1, Meeting #9

Date: 16 September 2025

Time: 09:00 – 11:00 ET / 15:00 – 17:00 CET

Location: Virtual

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members

1. Catherine Atkin, Carbon Accountable and Stanford CodeX Climate Data Policy Initiative
2. Erika Barnett, Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
3. Tatiana Boldyreva, CDP
4. Robert Gray, DuPont
5. Henk Harmsen, Independent
6. Micheline Khan, World Resources Institute
7. Marine Kohler, CentraleSupelec, Universite Paris-Saclay
8. Dedy Mahardika, International Finance Corporation (IFC)
9. Philippe Missi Missi, UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Center West and Central Africa
10. Ann Marie Moohan-Sidhu, ESGright
11. Patrick Murphy, Sierra Club
12. Sachin Nimbalkar, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
13. Vicky Sullivan, Duke Energy

Guests

None present

GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Hande Baybar
2. Iain Hunt
3. Allison Leach

Documents referenced

1. Slides for the Corporate Standard TWG Subgroup 1 meeting on 16 September 2025

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	***Introduction and housekeeping*** The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the ninth meeting of Subgroup 1 and reviewed the objectives and agenda for the meeting.	No specific outcomes.
2	***Review full TWG and ISB feedback on phase 1 outcomes*** The Secretariat presented a summary of feedback from the full Corporate Standard TWG and the ISB on preliminary phase 1 outcomes.	No specific outcomes.
3	***Follow up on base year recalculation policy*** The Secretariat presented feedback from the full Corporate Standard TWG on preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes on base year recalculation and opened the floor for a brief discussion.	No specific outcomes.
4	***Options for when insufficient data is available for base year recalculation*** The Secretariat shared background information and an analysis of options that may be considered when companies have insufficient data to recalculate base year emissions. Indicative polls were held following a discussion of options.	An indicative poll showed *majority support* for specifying the use of historical activity data and scaling based on proxy data as suitable methods for estimating base year emissions in the absence of historical emissions data, with *split opinions* expressed for other methods considered. An indicative poll showed *split opinions* on whether the term 'backcast' should be maintained or replaced in reference to methods for estimating base year emissions in the absence of historical emissions data. An indicative poll showed *unanimous support* for specifying backcasting/proxy estimation as the preferred option for instances where emissions data is unavailable for base year recalculation in the case of structural changes and *majority support* in the case of other types of events triggering base year recalculation. An indicative poll showed *split opinions* on whether specifying backcasting/proxy estimation as the preferred option should be defined as a requirement or as a recommendation. An indicative poll showed *split opinions* on whether disclosure of no base year recalculation should be maintained as an option. An indicative poll showed *majority support* for maintaining the option of reestablishing the base year as an option.

		An indicative poll showed *majority agreement* with the draft decision tree presented on slide 34, with the need for minor edits.
5	***Wrap up and next steps*** The Secretariat outlined next steps including a request for responses to a feedback survey and dates for upcoming meetings.	The Secretariat will share meeting materials. The Secretariat requested that members respond to a Meeting 9 feedback survey, with the survey deadline to be confirmed. The next meeting of the full Corporate Standard TWG is scheduled for October 21st. The next meeting of Subgroup 1 is scheduled for November 11th.

Summary of discussion and outcomes

1. Introduction and housekeeping

- The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the ninth meeting of Subgroup 1 and reviewed the objectives and agenda for the meeting. (slides 1-12)

Summary of discussion

- In response to member questions on the press release announcing a strategic partnership between GHG Protocol and ISO, the Secretariat noted that a frequently asked questions document is forthcoming to address questions related to partnership.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

2. Review full TWG and ISB feedback on phase 1 outcomes

- The Secretariat presented a summary of feedback from the full Corporate Standard TWG and the ISB on preliminary phase 1 outcomes. (slides 13-15)

Summary of discussion

- No discussion raised.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

3. Follow up on base year recalculation policy

- The Secretariat presented feedback from the full Corporate Standard TWG on preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes on base year recalculation and opened the floor for a brief discussion. (slides 16-20)

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat invited feedback on the preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome to require companies to establish a significance threshold as part of their base year recalculation policy, noting that that members expressed split opinions on whether the requirement should specify a quantitative significance threshold.
    - A member provided clarification on one point of opposition listed on slide 19, noting that some companies may recalculate base year emissions for any acquisition or divestment without specific consideration of a significance threshold.

    - A member expressed support for specifying that quantitative thresholds be established because significance thresholds should be considered in conjunction with the level of uncertainty and level of reductions pledged in targets.
    - The Secretariat asked if members had examples of what would constitute a sufficiently rigorous and defensible qualitative significance threshold. A member suggested that recalculating base year emissions in the event of any significant acquisition or divestment would represent a qualitative approach. The Secretariat asked if they meant using a proxy measure such as the level of production of an acquired facility. The member noted that a proxy measure would be more challenging to apply than an emissions threshold. Another member suggested that proxy measures might not be reliable indicators of emissions.
- The Secretariat invited feedback on the preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome to establish a prescriptive quantitative significance threshold in the Corporate Standard, noting that that members expressed split opinions on whether it should be defined as a requirement or as a recommendation.
    - A member noted that they oppose the establishment of a prescriptive significance threshold and would be in favor of a principles-based rather than rules-based approach.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

4. Options for when insufficient data is available for base year recalculation

- The Secretariat shared background information and an analysis of options that may be considered when companies have insufficient data to recalculate base year emissions. Indicative polls were held following a discussion of options. (slides 21-35)

Summary of discussion

- **Methods for estimating base year emissions:** The Secretariat presented an analysis of potential methods that companies may use to estimate base year emissions in the absence of sufficient emissions data (slide 30) and invited members to comment.
    - A member asked why the overlap technique was rated 'low' in terms of method feasibility. The Secretariat noted that the method is comparatively more complicated to implement than others on the list. The member suggested the method be rated as 'medium', noting that they see the method as a common practice for companies. Another member expressed agreement with a 'medium' rating.
    - A member asked whether all methods listed entail backcasting, or extrapolating back to be the base year based on data from recent years. The Secretariat noted that not all methods involve extrapolation, with some relying on proxy data for the base year. The Secretariat added that methods may be used in combination. Another member suggested that because not all methods entail backcasting, the term 'backcasting' should be removed from the title of the list.
    - A member asked whether the 'scale based on proxy data' method specifically refers to using company-specific data. The Secretariat confirmed that this was the case, citing examples of proxy data such as revenue or amount of product produced.
    - A member suggested that using national-level emissions intensity data, such as from the US EPA, can be relatively high quality and questioned the 'low' quality rating for the 'industry average emissions intensity' method. The Secretariat responded that in some jurisdictions, reliable national-level data may be available, but in others only global data or data from other countries would exist, so there could be a range in data quality.
    - A member suggested that activity data be separated from emission factors for evaluating data quality.
    - A member noted that companies may use historical weather and production data to estimate fuel and electricity use.
    - A member noted that when historical activity data is available, it is easy to simply use that data.

- **Options for addressing situations where insufficient data is available for base year recalculation:** The Secretariat presented an analysis of options that may be considered for situations where data is unavailable for base year recalculation (slide 31) and invited members to comment.
    - A member suggested that the target setting process requires a robust base year to ensure that changes in the inventory represent actual changes to emissions, adding that they support backcasting as the priority option.
- **Scenarios for base year recalculation:** The Secretariat presented three scenarios for base year recalculation in the absence of historical emissions data, considering a structural change, a methodology improvement, and a boundary change (slide 32). The Secretariat asked members which options would be most appropriate for addressing the lack of data in each situation.
    - Responding to a member question, the Secretariat clarified that for scenario 1 (structural change), the acquired company did exist in the base year, but had not previously performed a GHG inventory.
    - A member suggested that an important first step in the case of an acquisition is to develop a robust GHG inventory for the current year to get a reliable baseline of the acquired company's emissions. Another member agreed that this should be the first step.
    - A member asked what happens in instances where a company closes a facility and either stops production or moves its production to another facility. The Secretariat clarified that if a facility is closed (rather than transferring ownership to another company), the change is an organic change and base year emissions shall not be recalculated.
    - A member noted that estimating base year emissions entails uncertainty, adding that this presents problems considering that companies are currently not required to perform an uncertainty assessment.
    - A member noted that scenario 2 (methodological improvement) presents a common challenge for companies when they improve data/methods for their scope 3 inventories. They suggested that backcasting is essential to make sure that changes in the inventory represent actual changes in emissions. They added that when switching from LCA to supplier-specific emission factors, companies may assume that supplier-specific emission intensities haven't changed unless suppliers are able to provide evidence of changes. Another member highlighted the importance of the interconnection between product-level GHG data and corporate-level GHG data in providing reliable data.
    - In response to scenario 3 (boundary change), a member asked whether the base year for different scope 3 categories must be the same or may differ. The Secretariat noted that this will be discussed in a future meeting, acknowledging the interconnectivity between topics. The member suggested that companies should be able to establish separate base years for individual scope 3 categories and that if a single base year is required across all categories, they should be able to reestablish the base year for their scope 3 inventory.
- **Decision tree:** The Secretariat shared a draft of a decision tree to help companies evaluate options for instances where insufficient data is available for base year recalculation (slide 34) and invited members to comment.
    - A member suggested that the decision tree should first specify that companies establish a GHG inventory for the current year. They added that backcasting from the current year's inventory should be distinguished from other estimation methods.
    - A member asked if suggestions for updating the decision tree would be requested as part of the post-meeting feedback survey. The Secretariat confirmed that they would.
- **Indicative polls: methods for estimating base year emissions**
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Which methods should be specified as suitable methods for "backcasting" or estimating base year emissions?* There was *majority support* for two of the six options presented, with opinions split on the remainder. No 'other' options were suggested by members.
        - **Historical activity data: 10 of 12 members support**
        - **Scale based on proxy data: 8 of 12**
        - Industry average emission intensities: 7 of 12
        - Overlap technique: 6 of 12
        - Similar assets as proxy: 5 of 12

        - Trend extrapolation: 5 of 12
        - Other (specify in chat): 0 of 12
        - Abstain: 2 of 12
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Should the term "backcast" be maintained or replaced?* Respondents expressed *split opinions*.
        - The term should be maintained: 6 of 12 respondents
        - The term should be replaced: 5 of 12
        - Abstain: 1 of 12
- **Indicative polls: options for when data unavailable for base year recalculation**
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Should backcasting/proxy estimation methods be the preferred option when a method can be feasibly applied to develop a reasonable estimate of base year emissions and provide for a consistent emissions profile over time?* Respondents expressed *unanimous* agreement with specifying backcasting/proxy estimation methods as the preferred option in the case of structural changes and a *majority* expressed agreement in the case of other types of events triggering base year recalculation.

Level of agreement	**Structural changes**	**Other types of events triggering base year recalculation**
Strongly agree	**5 of 11 respondents**	**4 of 11 respondents**
Agree	**6 of 11**	**5 of 11**
Neutral	0 of 11	2 of 11
Disagree	0 of 11	0 of 11
Strongly disagree	0 of 11	0 of 11
Abstain	0 of 11	0 of 11

    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *If backcasting/proxy estimation methods is specified as the preferred option, how should it be defined?* Respondents expressed *split opinions* on whether it should be defined as a requirement or as a recommendation.
        - **Requirement (shall statement): 6 of 11 respondents**
        - **Recommendation (should statement): 4 of 11**
        - Guidance only: 1 of 11
        - Abstain: 0 of 11
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Should the disclosure of no base year recalculation be maintained as an option?* Respondents expressed *split opinions* for maintaining the option in both the case of structural changes and in the case of other types of events triggering base year recalculation.

Level of agreement	**Structural changes**	**Other types of events triggering base year recalculation**
Strongly agree	2 of 10 respondents	1 of 10 respondents
Agree	1 of 10	2 of 10
Neutral	2 of 10	3 of 10
Disagree	3 of 10	1 of 10
Strongly disagree	2 of 10	3 of 10
Abstain	0 of 10	0 of 10

- The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Should reestablishing the base year be maintained as an option?* A *majority* of respondents expressed agreement with maintaining the option both in the case of structural changes and in the case of other types of events triggering base year recalculation.

Level of agreement	**Structural changes**	**Other types of events triggering base year recalculation**
Strongly agree	**4 of 10 respondents**	**3 of 10 respondents**
Agree	**3 of 10**	**3 of 10**
Neutral	0 of 10	1 of 10
Disagree	2 of 10	2 of 10
Strongly disagree	0 of 10	0 of 10
Abstain	1 of 10	1 of 10

- The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you agree with the draft decision tree presented (on slide 34)?* A *majority* of respondents expressed agreement, with a need for minor edits.
  - Yes, fully agree: 0 of 9 respondents
  - **Yes, with minor edits: 8 of 9**
  - No: 1 of 9
  - Abstain: 0 of 9

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- An indicative poll showed *majority support* for specifying the use of historical activity data and scaling based on proxy data as suitable methods for estimating base year emissions in the absence of historical emissions data, with *split opinions* expressed for other methods considered.
- An indicative poll showed *split opinions* on whether the term 'backcast' should be maintained or replaced in reference to methods for estimating base year emissions in the absence of emissions data.
- An indicative poll showed *unanimous support* for specifying backcasting/proxy estimation as the preferred option for instances where emissions data is unavailable for base year recalculation in the case of structural changes and *majority support* in the case of other types of events triggering base year recalculation.
- An indicative poll showed *split opinions* on whether specifying backcasting/proxy estimation as the preferred option should be defined as a requirement or as a recommendation.
- An indicative poll showed *split opinions* on whether disclosure of no base year recalculation should be maintained as an option in both the case of structural changes and in the case of other types of events triggering base year recalculation.
- An indicative poll showed *majority support* for maintaining the option of reestablishing the base year as an option in both the case of structural cases and in the case of other types of events triggering base year recalculation.
- An indicative poll showed *majority agreement* with the draft decision tree presented on slide 34, with the need for minor edits.

5. Wrap up and next steps

- The Secretariat outlined next steps including a request for responses to a feedback survey and dates for upcoming meetings. (slides 36-38)

Summary of discussion

- A member noted that the date of the next Subgroup 1 meeting on November 11th coincides with COP30.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will share meeting materials.
- The Secretariat requested that members respond to a Meeting 9 feedback survey, with the survey deadline to be confirmed.
- The next meeting of the full Corporate Standard TWG is scheduled for October 21st.
- The next meeting of Subgroup 1 is scheduled for November 11th.

Summary of written submissions received prior to meeting

- No written feedback received on meeting topics prior to the meeting.