

Actions and Market Instruments Meeting Minutes

Meeting number 2.02

Date: 25 February 2026

Time: 09:00 – 11:00 ET

Location: "Virtual" via Zoom

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members

1. Aditya Mishra, Proforest
2. Ana Isabel Aubad Lopez, Atmosphere Alternative
3. Anastasia Behr, UL Solutions
4. Andres Casallas, World Business Council for Sustainable Development
5. Autumn Fox, Mars
6. Chris Davis, High Tide Foundation
7. Christopher Duck, Climate Impact Partners
8. Cynthia Cummis, Deloitte & Touche
9. Grant Ivison-Lane, Terra Newt
10. Hans Näsman, CDP
11. Hiromi Kawamata, The Japan Iron and Steel Federation
12. Jason Pierce, Eastman
13. John Kazer, Carbon Trust
14. Jonathan Crook, Carbon Market Watch
15. Josh Taylor, ISEAL
16. Kai Nino Streicher
17. Kim Carnahan, Center for Green Market Activation
18. Kristin Komives
19. Michael Gillenwater, Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
20. Nermin Eltouny, Integral Consult
21. Sanna Setterwall, South Pole / ISO WG4
22. Silvana Paniagua, SustainCERT SA/ Value Change Initiative
23. Sitnour Hassan Mohamed Hassan, Sudanese Standards and Metrology Organization / ISO WG4
24. Steven Rosenzweig, General Mills
25. Subrata Chakrabarty, World Resources Institute
26. Thomas Day, NewClimate Institute
27. Thuy Phung, PepsiCo
28. Tim Hamers, ERGaR - European Renewable Gas Registry
29. Timothy Juliani, WWF US
30. William Tyndall, AJW Inc.
31. Yaning Jin, SinoCarbon Innovation and Investment Co., Ltd.

Guests

1. Anne Grau, France – AFNOR / ISO WG4
2. Ibrahim Eryazici_ANSI_USA / ISO WG4
3. Mark Staples – Shell / ISO WG4
4. Puvaneswari Ramasamy, Global Tunikara Sdn Bhd / ISO WG4
5. Wong Zhi Xiang, TÜV SÜD / ISO WG4

GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Adam Beam, Deloitte & Touche
2. Alejandra Bosch, GHG Protocol
3. Bora Youn, Deloitte & Touche
4. Cynthia Cummis, Deloitte & Touche
5. David Rich, GHG Protocol
6. Elliott Engelmann, GHG Protocol
7. Ethan Coyle, Deloitte & Touche
8. Kevin Kurkul, GHG Protocol
9. Ralf Pfitzner, GHG Protocol
10. Sam LaFuria, Deloitte & Touche
11. Yumzhana Daneeva, GHG Protocol

Documents referenced

N/A

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	<p><i>Housekeeping</i></p> <p>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. The Secretariat introduced the ISO representatives joining the working group.</p>	No specific outcomes.
2	<p><i>AMI workplan</i></p> <p>The Secretariat shared feedback from the ISB meeting and the feedback on AMI White paper, and provided an update on expectations for upcoming working group meetings and a potential in-person workshop.</p>	No specific outcomes.
3	<p><i>Quality and eligibility criteria</i></p> <p>The Secretariat presented an overview of quality and eligibility criteria based on Deloitte research and working group feedback.</p>	No specific outcomes.
4	<p><i>Next steps</i></p> <p>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 .</p>	The Secretariat will facilitate a subgroup dedicated to quality and eligibility criteria.

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. The Secretariat introduced the ISO representatives joining the working group.

Summary of discussion

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

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

2. AMI workplan

- The Secretariat shared feedback from the ISB meeting and the feedback on AMI White paper, and provided an update on expectations for upcoming working group meetings and a potential in-person workshop.

Summary of discussion

- Some members expressed support of the creation of subgroups to more fully explore certain topics.
- Some members expressed support of in-person workshop in Europe, noting potential travel efficiencies surrounding London Climate Action Week.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

3. Quality and eligibility criteria

- The Secretariat presented an overview of quality and eligibility criteria based on Deloitte research and working group feedback.

Summary of discussion

- Some members suggested creating a subgroup dedicated to continuing to explore the criteria after this meeting.
 - The Secretariat noted that after the meeting they will create a survey to further gather feedback from the working group and initiate the creation of a subgroup.
- A member offered to share an eligibility criteria analysis mapped to the potential AMI statements.

Quality criteria:

- Some members suggested that the term 'quality criteria' was misapplied in this context, and that some of the concepts presented are closer to data quality.
- A member asked for specification on how the criteria would be applied to each statement in the presented materials.
- Some members suggested that it is important to acknowledge that chain of custody models are a tool with existing rules and criteria.
- A member expressed concern about the difference in the definitions of eligibility and quality criteria.
- A member suggested that clarification is needed regarding whether the quality criteria should be universal, should be relevant only to particular statements, or should be relevant at different levels for each statement.
- A member suggested that quality criteria can be more difficult for tier 1 suppliers rather than for tier 2 suppliers because the tier 1 suppliers may do allocation internally.

Additionality in the context of quality criteria:

- A member also raised concern about the quality of some market instruments offered to companies, and some members suggested that actions and market instruments would be reported with low or zero additionality should be considered lower quality.
- A member suggested that an issue with additionality is that conditions can change each year and as a result it is often difficult to prove.
 - The Secretariat noted the necessity of a deeper discussion which should include financial additionality, transition barriers, and regulatory surplus.
- A member highlighted the importance of geographic and boundary concepts (activity pools).
 - A member emphasized that association between company and instrument (for example in geography) is separate from scientific quality.
 - A member supported clearer separation of instrument quality versus company-instrument association.
- A member suggested having nuance around which quality criteria apply depending on the chain of custody and the type of market instrument, noting the ISEAL credibility principles which might be relevant for commodity certificates.
- A member proposed a way to make progress by first agreeing on whether impact or additionality should be a quality criteria in Statement 3, which they suggest is more straightforward, and then discussing additionally in the context of Statement 2.
- A member suggested that "financial additionality" should be replaced with a causality-based approach, given its long-standing practical problems, and notes that definitions of leakage from the land sector don't translate well to other sectors.
 - A member suggested that governance requirements should not assume the existence of a formal program, since many company-supplier decarbonization efforts operate outside such structures.

- Some members noted potential challenges with temporal and geographic considerations, net zero contribution tests, and baseline definitions, all of which they believe require substantial reworking to be practical across sectors and instrument types.
- A member suggested that quality criteria should remain focused on scientific integrity, such as additionality, baselines, and permanence and it should be independent of who purchases the intervention. The member further suggested that eligibility criteria should instead function as routing rules that determine which statement an instrument belongs to based on factors like physical traceability or supply shed alignment.
- Some members proposed a distinction between criteria that address how well an action or its effects can be measured (such as data quality, timing and the reliability of quantification) and criteria related to traceability and the strength of a company's claim to that action.
- A member mentioned a need to map the criteria across different statements and figure out which criteria needs to be applied to each statement.
 - The Secretariat confirmed that mapping by statement is a next step.
- A member suggested doing a survey of working group members for additional feedback on the criteria.
 - The Secretariat supported this proposal.

Eligibility criteria

- A member expressed concern regarding the eligibility criteria being the same for all statements, suggesting that some criteria cannot be used as a basis for Statement 2.
- Some members questioned the possibility of applying the eligibility criteria to Statement 1.
- A member suggested that the definition of the physical traceability should avoid putting certain sectors at disadvantage, citing the example of the steel sector where traceability is often strictly managed.
- A member raised a concern about whether the term "physical inventory" is being interpreted through a chain of custody lens, which may not be the right conceptual foundation for evaluating criteria.
 - A member suggested that the more meaningful distinction between statements is the ability to measure and claim change, referring to baselines and evidence of improvement rather than the physical movement of goods.
- A member suggested that traceability should be in Statement 3 and not in Statement 2.
- A member proposed moving matching criteria to Statement 4.
 - Some members suggested that Statement 4 might become unnecessary.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

4. 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 March 25th.

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat is to form a subgroup of TWG on criteria.
- The Secretariat is to set a poll on the date of the in-person meeting.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

Summary of written submissions received prior to meeting

N/A