

Corporate Standard Meeting Minutes

Full TWG, Meeting #5

Date: 20 January 2026

Option 1: 08:00 – 10:30 ET / 14:00 – 16:30 CET / 21:00 – 23:30 CHN

Option 2: 16:00 – 18:30 ET / 22:00 – 00:30 CET / 05:00 – 07:30 CHN (January 21)

Location: Virtual

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members – Session 1 attendees

1. Christina Abbott, KPMG
2. Christa Anderson, WWF
3. Samuel Anuga, University Mohammed VI Polytechnic, Morocco
4. Catherine Atkin, Carbon Accountable and Stanford CodeX Climate Data Policy Initiative
5. Tatiana Boldyreva, CDP
6. Luis Carvajal, Siemens Energy
7. Jasper Chan, Hang Seng Bank
8. Gonzalo Chiriboga, Central University of Ecuador
9. Debbie Crawshawe, Department of Business and Trade, UK Government
10. Anna Dauteuil, EFRAG
11. Kia Hong Goh, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
12. Robert Gray, DuPont
13. Ron Hechelmann, University of Kassel
14. Burkhard Huckestein, German Environment Agency
15. Gijs Kamperman, TenneT
16. Vincent Kong, BEAM Society Ltd
17. Andy Law, Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants
18. Tomoo Machiba, Zeroboard
19. Felipe Martinez Rodriguez, Hydro
20. Claire McCarthy, We Mean Business Coalition
21. Alexis McGivern, University of Oxford
22. Brandon McNamara, Northern Arizona University
23. Philippe Missi Missi, UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Center West and Central Africa
24. Ann Marie Moohan-Sidhu, ESGright
25. Patrick Murphy, Sierra Club
26. Trinity Makava Ncube, Trinity Consultants
27. Sachin Nimbalkar, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
28. Suresh Krishna Ishwara Palar, Infosys Limited
29. Barbara Porco, Fordham University
30. Doug Rand, Deloitte
31. Max Sonnen, Ecomatters
32. Sheila Scott, Jacobs
33. Alisa Shumm, PricewaterhouseCoopers
34. Zi (Christiana) Wang, JD Logistics

Technical Working Group Members – Session 2 attendees

35. Rob Anderson, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts, Australia
36. Rebecca Berg, Center for Climate and Energy Solutions
37. Victoria Evans, Anthesis Group
38. Ann Radil, KEEN
39. Joanne Richmond, CK Hutchison
40. Judy Ryan, External Reporting Board, New Zealand
41. Jay Shi, Proctor & Gamble
42. Vicky Sullivan, Duke Energy
43. Megan Sutter, Google
44. Margaret Weidner, Impact Pathway

Guests

None present

GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Hande Baybar
2. Iain Hunt
3. Luke Jones
4. Allison Leach

Documents referenced

1. Slides for the Corporate Standard Full TWG meeting on 20 January 2026

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	<p><i>Welcome and housekeeping</i></p> <p>The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the fourth full Corporate Standard TWG meeting and briefly reviewed key housekeeping items from previous meetings.</p>	No specific outcomes.
2	<p><i>Subgroup 1: Base year recalculation</i></p> <p>The Secretariat presented an overview of phase 2 progress to date including selecting a base year, base year recalculation policy and significance thresholds, options for when data is unavailable for base year recalculation, and emissions profile over time. Following discussion, indicative polls were held on the topics presented.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 5 feedback survey. ¹
3	<p><i>Subgroup 3: Justifiable exclusions and data quality</i></p> <p>The Secretariat introduced several questions on the phase 1 topic of justifiable exclusions in response to feedback from the ISB and Scope 2 TWG. The Secretariat presented an overview of phase 2 progress to date including data quality tiers, data quality disclosure, data quality requirements, data quality improvement, and uncertainty. A discussion was held, followed by indicative polls.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 5 feedback survey.
4	<p><i>Subgroup 2: Consolidation approaches</i></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the key pending items under the proposed package of updates to requirements and recommendations for setting organizational boundaries and welcomed clarifying questions. No indicative polls were held during the meeting.</p>	The Secretariat invited members to respond to related poll questions on package of requirements and recommendation for setting organizational boundaries through the Meeting 5 feedback survey.
5	<p><i>ISO partnership updates</i></p> <p>The Secretariat shared an update on the partnership between GHG Procol and ISO, highlighting the key objectives of the partnership and next steps.</p>	No specific outcomes.
6	<p><i>Wrap-up and next steps</i></p> <p>The Secretariat shared a summary of next steps including the schedule for upcoming meetings and the sharing of a post-meeting feedback survey.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will share post-meeting materials, including final slides and meeting minutes.</p> <p>A feedback survey will be shared with all TWG members covering meeting topics, with deadline to respond to be confirmed.</p>

¹ Moving forward, results of live meeting polls will not be reported as outcomes. More complete results, aggregated from both live meeting polls and a post-meeting feedback survey, will be reported in materials for the following subgroup meeting. Members who were unable to attend the meeting live will have the opportunity to provide their input and members who did respond to live meeting polls may change their responses.

Summary of discussion and outcomes

1. Welcome and housekeeping

- The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the fifth full Corporate Standard TWG meeting and briefly reviewed key housekeeping items from previous meetings. (Slides 1-8)

Summary of discussion

- No TWG member comments were received.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

2. Subgroup 1: Base year recalculation

- The Secretariat presented an overview of phase 2 progress to date including selecting a base year, base year recalculation policy and significance thresholds, options for when data is unavailable for base year recalculation, and emissions profile over time. Following discussion, indicative polls were held on the topics presented. The following topic was not covered due to time constraints: options for when data is unavailable for base year recalculation. (Slides 9-30)

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat introduced several new Subgroup 1 preliminary outcomes and questions on the phase 2 topic of tracking emissions over time.

Selecting a base year

- The Secretariat provided an overview of the current requirements and recommendations in the corporate suite of standards, including draft the Land Sector and Removal Guidance, related to selecting an inventory base year.
 - A member asked whether the disclosure requirements around the base year would be revised to clarify that they include disclosure of base year emissions, and not only the selected base year. The Secretariat clarified that chapter 9 of the Corporate Standard lists the emissions profile over time as a disclosure requirement.
 - A member asked how the base year is defined and whether it refers to the target base year. The Secretariat clarified that although Subgroup 1 discussed whether the inventory base year and target base year can be the same year, the meeting's discussion will focus on the inventory base year. The Secretariat added that it would be restrictive to limit the base year concept to a target base year, given that not all companies set targets and some use the base year solely to monitor their emissions profile over time. The Secretariat also highlighted that Subgroup 1 will be discussing whether target-setting falls within the purview of the Corporate Standard.
 - Another member expressed concerns that an inventory base year concept does not align with financial reporting and therefore could create confusion. The Secretariat clarified that the term *inventory base year* is already adopted in the current version of the Standard and is intended to guide companies in tracking their emissions over time.
 - A member asked if it is possible to change the base year, suggesting that very old base years (e.g., over 15 years old) can lose their relevance. They suggested that companies could report against a target base year, if they set a target, for a more recent comparison. The

Secretariat noted that Subgroup 1 discussed for the related topic of cases where data to recalculate base year emissions is not available, recommending that the companies could use proxy data rather than changing their base year.

- **Representativeness of base year:** The Secretariat presented the preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome to require the base year to be representative of typical conditions or operations.
 - A member commented that the term *representative* needs further clarification with guidance, including indicators that could be used to assess representativeness. Another member agreed. The Secretariat asked members for suggestions on which indicators could be used.
 - A member suggested that companies should avoid selecting a year as its inventory base year if the emissions were estimated using many proxies, and they should ensure there are no significant spikes and drops in operations. The Secretariat noted that the requirement for the inventory base year to be representative is intended to prevent companies from selectively choosing their inventory base year to present a more favorable emissions profile over time.
 - Another member suggested that key financial data, such as revenue and spend data, could be used as an indicator of representativeness alongside activity-based indicators. They added that these indicators may vary across industries.
 - Another member observed that the first year of estimating emissions is often not reliable or accurate, and therefore would often not be representative.
 - Several members referred to years 2020 and 2021, noting that they were not typical years due to COVID, and questioned whether prohibiting or discouraging those years as inventory base years could help promote a more representative base year selection. The Secretariat noted that Subgroup 1 did not specifically discuss this but the guidance on this could be more general and qualitative rather than pointing to certain years.
 - Another member commented that, in addition to years in which the impact of COVID was material, there are increasingly frequent and significant climate-related adverse events that raise the question of what constitutes a typical year anymore.
 - A member expressed concern that many companies frequently undergo structural changes, such as mergers, acquisitions and divestments, making it difficult to define typical operations. The Secretariat noted that additional questions on when to recalculate the base year emissions would be introduced and polled later in the meeting.
 - A member observed that the representativeness of the chosen base year needs to be supported by a qualitative disclosure as justification. The Secretariat confirmed that this is currently captured in the Corporate Standard as part of reporting requirements.
- **Multi-year averages as base period:** The Secretariat presented the following preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome: maintain the option for companies to use a multi-year average to establish a base period in lieu of a single base year.
 - A member suggested that if this option is maintained, it should be supported with guidance on the cases in which a multi-year average base year could be used.
 - The Secretariat invited members to share example cases where using a multi-year average as the base period could be used.
 - A member suggested that companies with significant emissions from land use, such as embodied emissions in crops that can vary greatly due to humidity, may benefit from this option.
 - A member suggested that if a company's emissions profile is volatile, then using a multi-year average would be a more representative option. Another member expressed support.
 - A member, referring to external databases analyzing companies' GHG emissions disclosures, noted that they have not come across a case where a company used a multi-year average to set a base period.

- A member asked about the intention of recommending and not requiring a single base year. The Secretariat noted that this was mainly due to feasibility challenges associated with limiting it to a single year. The Secretariat added that external reporting or target setting programs may also have specific requirements around base year selection.
- Another member asked whether the “shall” statement requiring the base year/period to be representative takes precedence over the “should” statement recommending that a single year be set as the base year. The Secretariat confirmed that “shall” statements setting requirements take precedence over “should” statements introducing recommendations.
- A member suggested that providing these options as a hierarchy could be more helpful, such as 1. Earliest year the inventory was prepared, and 2. If the earliest year is not representative, then use the soonest year that is representative.
- **Single base year across the scopes:** The Secretariat introduced the question of whether the status quo (as currently specified in the Scope 3 Standard) of recommending (but not requiring) companies to establish a single base year across the emissions scopes should be maintained.
 - A member asked about the intention behind setting the same base year for all scopes. The Secretariat clarified that this was a recommendation, not a requirement, to allow companies flexibility in cases where they do not have sufficient data to set the same base year across all scopes, enabling them instead to select different base years across scopes.
- **Indicative polls:**
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the following preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome: Establish a requirement (“shall” statement) that a **base year be representative** of typical conditions or operations?*
 - Support: 35 of 41 members
 - Oppose: 4 members
 - Abstain: 2 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the following preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome: Maintain option for companies to use a **multi-year average to establish a base period** in lieu of a single base year?*
 - Support: 37 of 41 members
 - Oppose: 2 members
 - Abstain: 2 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the status quo (as currently specified in the Scope 3 Standard) of recommending (but not requiring) companies to establish a **single base year across the emissions scopes**?*
 - Support: 34 of 40 members
 - Oppose: 2 members
 - Abstain: 4 members

Base year recalculation policy and significance thresholds

- The Secretariat presented the preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes on base year recalculation policy, including a requirement for companies to establish a quantitative significance threshold, recommendations on how the threshold should be applied across scopes and different types of events, and whether a prescriptive significance threshold should be provided as a recommendation.
 - A member asked whether the significance threshold would apply cumulatively to all scopes or separately to each scope. The Secretariat confirmed that it was the latter, in order to prevent changes in scopes with relatively lower emissions from going undetected. The member asked a follow up question: in the case of an acquisition that exceeds the significance threshold only for scope 3, would the company need to recalculate all scopes to reflect this change or only scope 3? The Secretariat noted that Subgroup 1 has not yet discussed this specific case and will look into it.

- A member expressed concern, suggesting that providing prescriptive and quantitative rules should be avoided and the Standard should be principles-based to acknowledge different circumstances. Several members expressed support noting it should be left to companies to decide what is significant for them. They added that a quantitative significance threshold could be provided as an example for guidance but should not be recommended.
 - A member expressed disagreement, suggesting that multiple departments are often involved in GHG accounting and their interpretation of a principle could vary. They added that a quantitative threshold as guidance could therefore be helpful for consistent application. They added that their organization, which undergoes many mergers, acquisitions and divestments, applies a 5% significance threshold, noting that this value was deemed relevant to their organization.
- Another member observed that, in financial reporting, different types of events are treated differently when maintaining comparative information: when a structural change occurs, it is added prospectively to the accounting, whereas when the accounting policies or methodology change, the change is applied retrospectively to preserve comparability. The member suggested that a similar approach could be adopted for GHG accounting and reporting.
- A member asked whether a company that divests from an emissions-intensive business needs to recalculate its base year emissions to reflect this change. The Secretariat responded that divestments do not result in elimination of emissions but rather divested emissions move out of the reporting company's organizational boundary. The Secretariat continued that to monitor progress over time, the base year emissions need to be revised accordingly so consistency is maintained. The member observed that this adjustment could be inconsistent with how companies currently report on their climate transition plans as part of TCFD and IFRS S2 disclosures.
 - A member suggested that such divestments could be part of a net zero strategy.
 - A member observed that in cases of structural changes, the company needs to reflect the change to its base year emissions so the comparison of emissions over time remains possible. They added that this should be done even in cases where the data to recalculate base year emissions is not available, using proxy data. Another member noted that using proxy data can increase uncertainty, which is a topic to be covered later in the meeting.
 - Another member observed that net zero strategies for companies are different from governments who introduce public policies with the intent to reduce overall emissions. Another member agreed.
- A member asked whether emissions intensity is based on product volume or revenue. The Secretariat responded that different metrics could be used to measure emissions intensity and the mentioned two metrics were provided as examples. The Secretariat continued that this will be further discussed in future Subgroup 1 meetings.
- A member suggested that the individual purchase of a equipment or an asset could trigger scope 3 recalculation but would not affect scopes 1 and 2. The Secretariat noted that if the said equipment/asset consumes fuel and/or energy, it would impact scope 1 and 2 emissions as well.
- A member asked whether the discussions on setting and applying a significance threshold considered how this could apply to different companies. The Secretariat confirmed that this was the main reason why the preliminary outcome was a recommendation that the significance threshold to apply separately to each scope.
- A member gave an example from their organization that has separate significance thresholds, one applying to scopes 1 and 2 combined, and the other applying to scope 3.
- A member asked whether a company making an acquisition—whose impact on emissions falls below the significance threshold—could voluntarily recalculate and report their revised base year emissions. The Secretariat confirmed that the Corporate Standard sets the minimum requirements and recommendations for GHG accounting and reporting, and that companies

may go beyond these minimum requirements on a voluntary basis. The member responded by adding that their assurance provider notes otherwise as making adjustments for a small volume of emissions changes complicates matters.

- A member expressed concern about applying a single significance threshold cumulatively for all types of events. They added that this could introduce unnecessary complexity.
- **Indicative polls:**
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the following preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome: Require companies to **establish a quantitative significance threshold** as part of their base year recalculation policy?*
 - Support: 27 of 43 members
 - Oppose: 11 members
 - Abstain: 5 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the following preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome: Significance thresholds should **apply separately across each emissions scope**?*
 - Support: 25 of 43 members
 - Oppose: 10 members
 - Abstain: 8 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the following preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome: A single significance threshold should **apply cumulatively across all types of events** triggering a base year recalculation?*
 - Support: 29 of 43 members
 - Oppose: 10 members
 - Abstain: 4 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the following preliminary Subgroup 1 outcome: A **prescriptive quantitative significance threshold** should be defined as a recommendation ("should" statement)?*
 - Support: 30 of 42 members
 - Oppose: 5 members
 - Abstain: 7 members

Emissions profile over time

- The Secretariat presented the preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes regarding recommendations on an emissions profile over time, including recalculated time series, original/historical (not recalculated) time series, and target-relevant time series.
 - A member, referring to items 4.1 and 4.2 (see slide 30), suggested that the number of intervening or recent years for which the Corporate Standard recommends that companies report recalculated emissions should not be specified, and instead should be expressed as a recommendation that companies report emissions provided for all years in their inventory on a comparative basis. They added that how many prior years a company chooses to disclose should be related to their reporting objectives, which vary across companies. Two members agreed.
 - A member commented that recommending rather than requiring companies to report recalculated emissions for recent years may result in companies having the data or doing the recalculation but not reporting those recalculated values.
 - A member asked why this preliminary outcome is framed as a recommendation rather than an option (i.e., "may" statement). They stressed the importance of distinguishing between what constitutes the Standard and what constitutes guidance, and added that they believe this recommendation would better be framed as guidance. They also noted that

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 5 feedback survey.

3. Subgroup 3: Justifiable exclusions and data quality

- The Secretariat introduced several questions on the phase 1 topic of justifiable exclusions in response to feedback from the ISB and Scope 2 TWG. The Secretariat presented an overview of phase 2 progress to date including data quality tiers, data quality disclosure, data quality requirements, data quality improvement, and uncertainty. A discussion was held, followed by indicative polls. The topic of disaggregation by scope 1 activity type was not covered due to time constraints. (Slides 31-56)

Summary of discussion

Justifiable exclusions

- The Secretariat introduced several new questions on the phase 1 topic of justifiable exclusions, which were in response to feedback from the ISB and the Scope 2 TWG.
- **De minimis:** The Secretariat presented the following de minimis provision for scope 1 and scope 2 emissions: *"Companies may exclude de minimis emissions as part of the 1% exclusion threshold, provided that total exclusions (de minimis and non-de minimis) are not reasonably expected to exceed 1% of total scope 1 emissions or total scope 2 emissions."*
 - A member voiced their support for the de minimis provision for scopes 1 and 2.
 - A member said that although they support the 1% exclusion threshold for scopes 1 and 2 for large companies, the threshold could reflect a very small quantity of emissions for companies with low scope 1 emissions. They suggested setting a different exclusion threshold for scopes 1 and 2 for companies with low scope 1 emissions.
 - A member observed that if emissions can be quantified, then they should be reported. The Secretariat replied that a company may wish to exclude small uncertain emissions sources from their public report. In addition, a requirement to quantify 100% of emissions would not be defensible from an assurance perspective, as any missing emissions sources would mean that the reporter is not in compliance.
 - A member asked for examples of de minimis versus non-de minimis exclusions. The Secretariat replied that examples may include refrigerant leakage, fertilizer application for landscaping, and emissions from generators. The Secretariat continued that the exact distinction would vary by company, but the main difference is whether the emission must be quantified to justify exclusion. Most emissions would need to be quantified to justify their exclusion; de minimis emissions would not. A proposed definition for de minimis emissions is "emissions reasonably expected to be insignificant or negligible."
 - A member observed that de minimis exclusion sounds like a qualitative approach to exclusions. The Secretariat confirmed that it would be qualitative because de minimis emissions exclusions would not require quantification.
 - A member asked if the idea is to allow companies to focus on their relevant emission sources. The Secretariat replied in the affirmative, also noting that the scope 1 and scope 2 exclusion thresholds are also intended to promote complete reporting of emissions.
 - A member asked if reporters would assume that certain emissions are de minimis and fall below the threshold, or must they calculate emissions to demonstrate this. The Secretariat replied that the de minimis provision is intended to give reporters flexibility in that they would NOT be required to quantify de minimis sources to justify their exclusion. The Secretariat continued that guidance would be provided to help reporters identify de minimis sources.
 - A member expressed concern that the de minimis provision could allow companies to stop quantifying emissions to justify exclusions. The Secretariat welcomed suggestions on the wording to avoid this.

- A member suggested that the exclusion threshold be modified to “1% of an emission category” rather than 1% of a scope.
- The Secretariat clarified that the de minimis indicative poll question is asking if members support adding a de minimis provision as part of the 1% exclusion thresholds for scopes 1 and 2.
- The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support adopting a **de minimis provision** for the scope 1 and scope 2 exclusion threshold?*
 - Yes, fully support: 33 of 43 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 7 members
 - No: 2 members
 - Abstain: 1 member
- **Scope 2 TWG feedback:** The Secretariat presented indicative poll results and suggestions from Scope 2 TWG members on the Corporate Standard TWG’s preliminary outcome on justifiable exclusions.
 - A member asked whether the Scope 2 TWG discussed if the 1% exclusion threshold for scope 2 would apply for the location-based or market-based approach. The Secretariat replied that the TWG was not polled on this topic, but that some members suggested that the exclusion threshold should apply first to the location-based approach, and the same boundary should then be adopted for the market-based approach. The Secretariat will follow up with the Scope 2 TWG to confirm this point.
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you agree that **justification of exclusions** should NOT be limited to a **list of acceptable reasons** for exclusion?*
 - Yes, fully support: 34 of 43 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 5 members
 - No: 1 member
 - Abstain: 3 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you agree that an additional **MWh exclusion threshold** should NOT be defined for **scope 2**?*
 - Yes, fully support: 36 of 43 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 0 members
 - No: 0 members
 - Abstain: 7member

Data quality

- The Secretariat presented an overview of phase 2 progress to date including data quality tiers, data quality disclosure, data quality requirements, data quality improvement, and uncertainty. Although the data quality tiers are defined based on data specificity and calculation method, they will be referred to as “data quality tiers” in the minutes. All terminology is still under review.
- **Data quality tiers:**
 - A member asked whether the specific emission factors for the specific data quality tier would have the same temporal requirements as the Scope 2 public consultation hourly matching requirements. The Secretariat replied that the data quality tiers would be more general in that temporal representativeness would be a component, but the same level of precision as the scope 2 hourly matching proposal would not be applicable.
 - A member asked if the specific data quality tier would allow for the use of annual emission factors in all cases. The Secretariat replied that the Subgroup 3 Task Force is considering emission factor guidance, and the data quality tiers are about disclosure – not requirements.

- A member commented that they generally like the tiering approach to data quality. They then asked how companies with a wide range of data sources at different levels of quality would report. The Secretariat replied by showing an example reporting template (see slide #48), which shows that companies would report the quantity of GHG emissions by data quality tier. The Secretariat added that the proposal includes an “unclassified” option that companies could use if they are unable or unwilling to disaggregate their emissions by tier.
- A member asked about the difference between the “other” and “unclassified” tiers. They continued that if “unclassified” is an option but not a tier, then it would not be useable from an assurance perspective. The Secretariat replied that the “other” tier is a combination of the Scope 3 partially/non-specific tier and EEIO/spend-based tier, whereas “unclassified” is used when the reporter does not disaggregate emissions by quality. The member suggested that terminology should be consistent across scopes. The Secretariat replied that the tier names are under revision.
- A member asked how the “other” tier would be treated by verifiers and asked if there would be a minimum standard of data required. The Secretariat replied that the data quality tiers are about disclosure, and are not setting any minimum data quality requirements.
- A member asked for more clarification on the measured tier. The Secretariat replied that the measured tier includes any direct monitoring of emissions (e.g., Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems) and emissions calculated from the mass balance method or stoichiometry method. A member replied that some UK companies are in the early stages of direct measurement of emissions from the water treatment process.
- A member observed that measured emissions may not necessarily be higher quality than emissions in the specific tier.
- Following discussion, the Secretariat clarified that spend-based emission factors would not be eligible for the scope 1 measured or specific tiers, and instead would be categorized as “other.”
- A member noted that they spoke with auditors who noted that it is sometimes not possible for companies to provide sufficient documentation for verification of measured/specific data, which leads some reporters to revert back to spend-based emissions. Another member noted that this can be the case for supplier-specific data that is not well documented.
- A member shared that verifiers already frequently request details on data sources by data quality level for each scope.
- A member noted that the data quality tiers could bring value and promote transparency, but it is important to be careful in defining the data quality tiers and to consider the feasibility challenges introduced by this framework. Another member agreed.
- A member noted that they have reservations about making data quality disaggregation a requirement. The Secretariat replied that the poll questions are posed to separate out support for the tiers framework itself versus whether it should be a requirement.
- A member questioned the value of doing the data quality disaggregation, which would have added time and cost for reporters.
- A member stated that they do not think disaggregation by data specificity would require significant additional time and costs, since most preparers would already have the required information available.
- A member expressed concern about confusing GHG emission reports with further disaggregation. Another member agreed, noting that the tiers could add complexity with information that may not be material to users.
- A member observed that reporters are already required to disclose calculation methods, and therefore the data quality tiers are not needed.
- A member observed that it is unclear who would benefit from data quality disaggregation, and noted that investors are not requesting this level of detail. A member replied that the

- disaggregation could be beneficial for less sophisticated companies as they learn about their data quality.
- A member stated that it is critical that the recommendations align between the Corporate Standard and the Scope 3 Standard. The Secretariat replied that they are coordinating with the Scope 3 Secretariat to harmonize the approaches, which are being developed in parallel.
 - A member voiced their support for stratifying emissions by data quality, noting that the highest quality information is necessary for making informed decisions on emissions reductions. They continued that they have concern about the scope 1 tiers presenting a false narrative that “measured” emissions are always better than “specific” emissions, as specific emissions can also be very high quality. Two members agreed.
 - A member expressed concern about conflating the concepts of “data quality” and “data specificity,” as the tiers refer to the latter.
 - A member noted that IFRS S2 requires that companies disclose the sources, quality, assumptions, and limitations of climate-related data, including the use of estimates and proxies. They continued that poor quality data must be explained, not excluded.
 - A member stated that they do not understand why it is necessary to separate emissions results by data quality tiers. The member continued that the transparency principle already requires companies to mention data quality, and that current reporting is sufficient. The Secretariat replied that the intent is to bring further quantitative transparency to data quality. The member expressed concern about adding an additional emissions results table, suggesting that a column be added to the existing reporting table that indicates a qualitative assessment of data quality by scope (e.g., low, medium, high).
 - A member shared a link to an Australian program that provides good insight into the data quality topic titled “National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act Measurement Determination.”
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the proposed **data quality tiers** for scope 1 (i.e., measured, specific, other, unclassified)?*
 - Yes, fully support: 19 of 38 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 14 members
 - No: 2 members
 - Abstain: 3 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support defining **scope-specific tiers** (i.e., different tiers for scope 1 versus scope 3)?*
 - Yes, fully support: 24 of 38 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 2 members
 - No: 8 members
 - Abstain: 4 members
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support **requiring the disaggregation** of scope 1 emissions results by data quality tier?*
 - Yes, fully support: 16 of 38 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 6 members
 - No: 14 members
 - Abstain: 2 members
 - **Minimum data quality and improving data quality over time:**
 - A member stated that the term “best available data” is challenging because the “best available data” may not be best in all situations. The Secretariat replied that this term can be changed and/or better defined, and noted that the current discussion should focus on

whether members support a general recommendation for data quality, as opposed to setting minimum data quality requirements.

- A member noted that the Corporate Standard Phase 1 Progress Update discussed keeping policies and approaches consistent across an organization's measurement. They continued that this may not always be possible because, for example, the best data may vary by geography. They said it is not clear what should be prioritized: consistency or accuracy.
- A member noted that the recommendations do not consider the growing concern that scope 3 emissions may not be the most effective way for companies to track value chain activities. They continued that this would argue that companies should not spend time tracking down "perfect" supplier data. Another member agreed. The Secretariat replied that the recommendations under consideration are for scope 1.
- A member observed that for a very small category of emissions, it may not be worthwhile to obtain the best available data. The Secretariat replied that this is part of the rationale for defining this as a recommendation rather than a requirement.
- The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support maintaining a general **recommendation** that companies should use the **best available data**?*
 - Yes, fully support: 30 of 38 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 4 members
 - No: 3 members
 - Abstain: 1 member
- The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support maintaining a general **recommendation** that companies should **improve data quality** over time?*
 - Yes, fully support: 31 of 38 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 3 members
 - No: 3 members
 - Abstain: 1 member
- **Uncertainty:**
 - A member asked how "uncertainty assessment" is being defined. The Secretariat replied that the preliminary outcome is to leave the specific type of uncertainty assessment up to the reporter. The Secretariat continued by confirming that the term "uncertainty assessment" would be defined, starting from the definitions of "uncertainty" in the Corporate Standard and Scope 3 Standard.
 - The Secretariat posed an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you supporting adopting a **recommendation** that companies complete an **uncertainty assessment**, and that the type of uncertainty assessment should at the discretion of the reporter?*
 - Yes, fully support: 19 of 36 members
 - Yes, with minor edits: 6 members
 - No: 5 members
 - Abstain: 6 member

Outcomes (e.g., recommendations, options)

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 5 feedback survey.

4. Subgroup 2: Consolidation approaches

- The Secretariat presented the key pending items under the proposed package of updates to requirements and recommendations for setting organizational boundaries and welcomed clarifying questions. No indicative polls were held during the meeting. (Slides 57-63)

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat introduced the key pending items related to the package of requirements and recommendations for setting organizational boundaries.

Pending item on alternative terminologies to clarify when package item #3 should apply

- A member expressed concern about how applicable the “fair presentation” principle is to GHG accounting. They added that proceeding with this term would require significant further clarification and application guidance.
- Another member asked to clarify whether Subgroup 2 was able to identify examples of emissions under operational control but not under financial control. The Secretariat responded by sharing the following examples: oil and gas companies where the operator (exerting operational control) often does not have financial control over the operation, and large companies operating heavily through joint venture (JV) structure.
- A member suggested that in the case of JVs, the partners would report the associated emissions under scope 3 category 15 based on equity owned, and the operator would report these emissions under scopes 1 and 2.
- The Secretariat noted that in cases where one of the JV partners has operational control, these emissions “under their control” would be buried in scope 3. The Secretariat added that the aim of the additional recommendation outlined in package item #3 is to enable reporters to transparently disclose emissions under their control, both financial and operational, in cases where financial control fails to provide a full picture of the emissions under control. Additionally, the Secretariat added that the operator of the JV would not be able to account for associated emissions under operational control only in scopes 1 and 2 as per the recommended financial control approach (package item #2) unless they also have financial control.

Outcomes (e.g., recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat invited members to respond to related poll questions on package of requirements and recommendation for setting organizational boundaries through the Meeting 5 feedback survey.

5. ISO partnership updates

- The Secretariat shared an update on the partnership between GHG Procol and ISO, highlighting the key objectives of the partnership and next steps. (Slides 64-65)

Summary of discussion

- No TWG member comments were received.

Outcomes (e.g., recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

6. Wrap-up and next steps

- The Secretariat shared a summary of next steps including the schedule for upcoming meetings and the sharing of a post-meeting feedback survey. (Slides 68-70)

Summary of discussion

- No TWG member comments were received.

Outcomes (e.g., recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will share post-meeting materials, including final slides and meeting minutes.
- A feedback survey will be shared with all TWG members covering meeting topics, with deadline to respond to be confirmed.

Summary of written submissions received prior to meeting

- The Secretariat received 2 comments prior to the meeting. The feedback included:
 - Comments on broadening the explanation of the IFRS S2 requirements on an emissions profile over time to include requirements from IFRS S1.
 - Request to revise to the presentation of IFRS, US GAAP, and SEC requirements for retrospective restatement of prior periods, noting that comparative information generally must be restated.

Points shared with sufficient notice prior to the meeting have been incorporated into the presentation slides.