

Actions and Market Instruments Meeting Minutes

Meeting number 2.01

Date: 28 January 2026

Time: 09:00 – 11:00 ET

Location: "Virtual" via Zoom

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members

1. Ana Isabel Aubad Lopez, Atmosphere Alternative
2. Anastasia Behr, UL Solutions
3. Giulia Camparsi, Science Based Targets initiative
4. Kim Carnahan, Center for Green Market Activation
5. Andres Casallas, World Business Council for Sustainable Development
6. Chris Davis, High Tide Foundation
7. Thomas Day, NewClimate Institute
8. Christopher Duck, Climate Impact Partners
9. Gilles Dufresne, European Commission
10. Nermin Eltouny, Integral Consult
11. Autumn Fox, Mars
12. Michael Gillenwater, Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
13. Tim Hamers, ERGaR - European Renewable Gas Registry
14. Grant Ivison-Lane, Terra Newt
15. Yaning Jin, SinoCarbon Innovation and Investment Co., Ltd.
16. Timothy Juliani, WWF US
17. Joni Jupesta, IPB University, Indonesia
18. Hiromi Kawamata, The Japan Iron and Steel Federation
19. John Kazer, Carbon Trust
20. Kristin Komives
21. Aditya Mishra, Proforest
22. Hans Näsman, CDP
23. Silvana Paniagua, SustainCERT SA/ Value Change Initiative
24. Thuy Phung, PepsiCo
25. Jason Pierce, Eastman
26. Patric Puetz, Smart Freight Centre
27. Steven Rosenzweig, General Mills
28. Kai Nino Streicher
29. Josh Taylor, ISEAL
30. William Tyndall, AJW Inc.

GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Alejandra Bosch, GHG Protocol
2. Cynthia Cummis, Deloitte & Touche
3. Yumzhana Daneeva, GHG Protocol
4. Kevin Kurkul, GHG Protocol
5. Ralf Pfitzner, GHG Protocol

Documents referenced

N/A

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	<i>Housekeeping</i> The Secretariat presented the agenda and key housekeeping items were highlighted, including introducing new Secretariat members, rules and expectations around the sharing of information, Zoom meeting logistics, guidelines, procedures, and shared values.	No specific outcomes.
2	<i>2026 AMI outlook</i> The Secretariat presented on the 2026 AMI workplan and shared further details of the GHG Protocol and ISO partnership.	No specific outcomes.
3	<i>White Paper v2.0 draft review</i> The Secretariat presented an overview of updates made to the AMI white paper based on feedback from the technical working group and independent standards board members and shared the process for finalizing the paper.	See poll results.
4	<i>Public consult</i> Technical working group members discussed the public consultation period that will accompany the release of the AMI white paper.	No specific outcomes.
5	<i>Next steps</i> Time was made available at the end of the meeting to field remaining questions from TWG members. A recap of the next steps was provided to conclude the meeting.	The Secretariat will share additional materials in advance of the next working group call.

Summary of discussion and outcomes

1. Housekeeping

- The Secretariat presented the agenda and key housekeeping items were highlighted, including introducing new Secretariat members, rules and expectations around the sharing of information, Zoom meeting logistics, guidelines, procedures, and shared values.

Summary of discussion

- No points of discussion were raised by working group members.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

2. 2026 AMI outlook

- The Secretariat presented on the 2026 AMI workplan and shared further details of the GHG Protocol and ISO partnership.

Summary of discussion

- Some members suggested that sufficient advanced notification will help to plan for developing case studies and for planning for potential in-person workshop travel.
- A member asked for clarity about the scope of work related to instrument-related topics for scope 2.
 - The Secretariat suggested that the standard development plans contain the full scope of work, but summarized the expectation that electricity accounting in scope 3 of physical

inventory will be led by scope 2 TWG and scope 3 TWG collaboration, scope 2 market-based method will be led by the scope 2 TWG, electricity accounting in scope 3 of contractual inventory and the consequential approach in statement 3 will be led by the AMI TWG. The Secretariat further clarified that coordination between these efforts will be led by the Secretariat.

- A member requested clarity on the distinction between eligibility criteria and quality criteria.
 - The Secretariat responded that these are distinct concepts that will be further defined and explored in the next TWG meeting.
- Some members questioned whether the final co-branded ISO and GHG Protocol Standards would be freely available to the public.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

3. White Paper v2.0 draft review

- The Secretariat presented an overview of updates made to the AMI white paper based on feedback from the technical working group and independent standards board members and shared the process for finalizing the paper.

Summary of discussion

- **Statement names:**
 - The Secretariat conducted indicative voting to assess working group opinion of presentation of topics within the AMI white paper. Outcomes are presented below, with the number of working group member votes conveyed in parentheses after each option.
 - A member suggested that statement 2 does not represent an inventory as defined and should instead be referred to as a contractually-adjusted or market-adjusted inventory.
 - Some members noted a potential misalignment between this terminology and the terminology of the scope 2 market-based method.
 - Some members suggested that market-adjusted inventory may be an effective name but would require reconciling with scope 2 terminology.
 - A member suggested "GHG Outcome Statement" as an alternative name for statement 3.
 - A member suggested that using 'mitigation' in the name of statement 3 could clash with the use of the term in other programs.
 - Some members suggested that short names will be necessary for efficiently communicating concepts to their internal and external stakeholders.
 - Some members suggested that there is a balance needed between technical accuracy and approachability for lay audiences.
 - Some members suggested that the word 'transition' is key for statement 4 and that the purpose of the statement is unclear without that focus.
- **Statement 3 substructure:**
 - Some members suggested that the sectoral subcategory could be particularly useful in agricultural contexts where interventions related to the same commodity outside of the reporter's value chain could be differentiated from other beyond value chain mitigation actions.
 - A member suggested an example of peat restoration near palm plantations as an action that may make use of the sectoral associated subcategory.
 - Some members suggested that the within organizational boundary subcategory should be removed.
 - A member suggested that the category could be used to report actions that occur within an organizational boundary but have impacts beyond the value chain, such as through the installation of combined heat and power.
 - Some members questioned how this would be reported separately from the physical inventory.

- Some members suggested that it is difficult to vote with a more precise definition of what would be included in each subcategory.
- Some members suggested that the sector associated subcategory was particularly not well defined and should be updated to better reflect member feedback.
 - The Secretariat noted that the definition would be revisited and likely updated.
- A member suggested that the subcategories within the white paper could be presented as current examples rather than as definitive subcategories.
- A member requested additional clarity on the avoided emission subcategory.
- **Other topics:**
 - Some members suggested that the introduction of the annex with draft ISO text is helpful for overall understanding. The member further noted that it will be important to explore further in 2026 how instruments are nested and propagated across value chains and reported across the statements.
 - Some members noted that they have further questions about the topics presented in the annex but suggested that those questions can be explored when the working group explores traceability considerations in phase 2.
 - Some members expressed hesitancy over whether the GHG Protocol can or should attempt to standardize the contents of statement 4 but suggested that the topic would be further explored in phase 2.
 - Some members suggested that SBTi's potential inclusion of non-GHG based targets for scope 3 presents a clear need and value for statement 4.
 - A member suggested that the inclusion of the statement can help reflect that some key aspects of climate transition may not always be easily quantified in CO₂.
 - Some members suggested that the role of GHG Protocol may be to provide only high level guidance and best practices for this statement.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- **Question 1:** What should the working name of statement 2 be for use in the AMI white paper?
 - Contractual GHG Inventory (4)
 - Contractually-adjusted GHG Inventory (6)
 - Market-based GHG Inventory (18)
 - Contractual-impact GHG Inventory (0)
 - Market-adjusted GHG Inventory (0)
 - Market-based Measures GHG Inventory (0)
 - Abstain (1)
- **Question 2:** What should the working name of statement 3 be for use in the AMI white paper?
 - GHG Impacts of Actions (5)
 - GHG Impact Statement (16)
 - GHG Mitigation Intervention Statement (3)
 - GHG Outcomes of Actions (0)
 - Mitigation Impact Statement (5)
 - Abstain (1)
- **Question 3:** What should the presented substructure for statement 3 be for use in the AMI white paper?
 - Remain as currently presented (Within organizational boundary impacts, Value chain associated impacts, Sector associated impacts, Beyond value chain and sector (global) impacts, GHG impacts of sold products (e.g. avoided emissions)) (13)
 - Remove sectoral subcategory (Within organizational boundary impacts, Value chain associated impacts, Beyond value chain impacts, GHG impacts of sold products (e.g. avoided emissions)) (11)
 - Abstain (3)
- **Question 4:** What should the working name of statement 4 be for use in the AMI white paper?
 - Non-GHG indicators (17)
 - Non-emission indicators (4)
 - Key performance indicators (not expressed in CO₂e) (6)
 - Sectoral indicators (not expressed in CO₂e) (1)

- Abstain (0)

4. Public consult

- Technical working group members discussed the public consultation period that will accompany the release of the AMI white paper.

Summary of discussion

- Some members suggested that the public consultation survey could include a question to ask if any topics are missing from the list in annex A.
- Some members note that many stakeholders are experiencing survey fatigue and therefore suggested that questions should be optional wherever possible and that key questions should be made clear to respondents.
 - Some members suggested that a few key questions should be required, and the remaining questions could be optional.
 - A member suggested that it is better to provide a long survey for those stakeholders who want to provide detailed feedback with the option for a shorter response from those who do not.
- A member suggested that the public consultation should not include any questions on topics that have not yet been adequately explored by the working group.
- Some members suggested that a question should be added to assess whether stakeholders feel confident in their understanding of the topics presented within the white paper.
- Some members suggested that all questions should be available as a PDF to allow for easy response coordination.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

5. Next steps

- Time was made available at the end of the meeting to field remaining questions from TWG members. A recap of the next steps was provided to conclude the meeting.
- The next TWG meeting was scheduled for February 25th.

Summary of discussion

- A member requested that pre-read materials for the next TWG meeting be shared with members at least one week in advance to allow adequate review time.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

Summary of written submissions received prior to meeting

The following notes reflect opinions submitted by one member:

- The member suggested that the 'limits of physical traceability' should be clarified within the AMI white paper.
- The member suggested further exploring the boundaries and distinctions between reporting elements of statement 3.