

# Actions and Market Instruments Meeting Minutes

Meeting number 2.04

Date: 22 April 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. Matthew Brander, University of Edinburgh
4. Giulia Camparsi, Science Based Targets initiative
5. Andres Casallas, World Business Council for Sustainable Development
6. Subrata Chakrabarty, World Resources Institute
7. Cynthia Cummis, Deloitte & Touche
8. Nermin Eltouny, Integral Consult
9. Autumn Fox, Mars
10. Tim Hamers, ERGaR - European Renewable Gas Registry
11. Hannah Hunt, Google
12. Injy Johnstone, University of Oxford
13. Timothy Juliani, WWF US
14. Hiromi Kawamata, The Japan Iron and Steel Federation
15. John Kazer, Carbon Trust
16. Kristin Komives
17. Stephen Lamm, BloomEnergy
18. Aditya Mishra, Proforest
19. Inken Ohlsen, AP Moller Maersk
20. Thuy Phung, PepsiCo
21. Jason Pierce, Eastman
22. Patric Puetz, Smart Freight Centre
23. Steven Rosenzweig, General Mills
24. Andrew Rudy, BHP
25. Sanna Setterwall, South Pole / ISO WG4
26. Kai Nino Streicher
27. Josh Taylor, ISEAL
28. William Tyndall, AJW Inc.
29. Xiaxin Zhang, China National Institute of Standardization (CNIS) / ISO WG4

### Guests

1. Anne Grau, France - AFNOR / ISO WG4
2. Ibrahim Eryazici, ANSI\_USA / ISO WG4
3. Mark Staples, Shell / ISO WG4

### GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Adam Beam, Deloitte & Touche
2. Pankaj Bhatia, GHG Protocol
3. Alejandra Bosch, GHG Protocol
4. Ethan Coyle, Deloitte & Touche
5. Cynthia Cummis, Deloitte & Touche
6. Yumzhana Daneeva, GHG Protocol
7. Oliver James, GHG Protocol
8. Kevin Kurkul, GHG Protocol
9. Sam LaFuria, Deloitte & Touche
10. Matt Ramlow, GHG Protocol
11. Ralf Pfitzner, GHG Protocol
12. David Rich, GHG Protocol
13. Bora Youn, Deloitte & Touche

## Documents referenced

- ISO 22095 Chain of custody — General terminology and models
- ISEAL 2025, Chain of Custody Models and Definitions v2
- ISO 14067, WD2, Annex H
- VCI and ISEAL, Physical traceability in Greenhouse Gas accounting

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	<p><b><i>Welcome &amp; Housekeeping</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat presented the agenda and key housekeeping items were highlighted, rules and expectations around the sharing of information, Zoom meeting logistics, guidelines, procedures, and shared values.</p>	N.A.
2	<p><b><i>Quality criteria</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat summarized outcomes of QC subgroup's discussions so far and provided an interim status.</p>	The Secretariat will move ahead into initial requirements drafting.
3	<p><b><i>Traceability</i></b></p> <p>Two members of the TWG presented the ISEAL Chain of Custody (CoC) models and definitions guidance and ISO 22095.</p> <p>The Secretariat presented a summary of initial TWG comments on CoC models and other traceability systems, and outlined six key questions from the issues identified.</p> <p>Time was made available for questions and comments.</p>	TWG members were invited to provide comments asynchronously to the six questions presented.
4	<p><b><i>Next steps</i></b></p> <p>A recap of the next steps was provided to conclude the meeting.</p>	The Secretariat will facilitate a subgroup dedicated to traceability.

## Summary of discussion and outcomes

### 1. Welcome & Housekeeping

- The Secretariat presented the agenda and key housekeeping items were highlighted, 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. Quality criteria

- The Secretariat summarized outcomes so far and provided interim status.

#### Summary of discussion

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

#### Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will move ahead into initial requirements drafting.

### 3. Traceability

- Two members of the TWG presented the ISEAL Chain of Custody (CoC) models and definitions guidance and ISO 22095.
- The Secretariat presented a summary of initial TWG comments on CoC models and other traceability systems, and outlined six key questions from the issues identified.
- Time was made available for questions and comments.

#### Summary of discussion

##### ISEAL Chain of Custody (CoC) models and definitions guidance

- A member suggested that developing guidance around claims would be useful.
  - The presenter added the difference between corporate-level vs product-level claims needs to be considered.
- A member asked about temporal restrictions, since some products can be stored for longer periods and could take years for the impacted product to reach the reporting company.
  - The presenter recognized the challenges of addressing diverse supply chains. Reconciliation periods can be defined based on the realities of the supply chain. Introducing vintages into mass balance is challenging because you would need to segregate by year of production.
- A member asked about recommendations on drawing the line between proportional and non-proportional attribution. Expressing their preference to allow for mass balance in statement 1, drawing the line based on the possibility of physical preference. Multi-site credit transfer would break physical traceability. When it comes to proportional vs non-proportional, in some industries (like the chemical sector) is impossible to calculate a proportion.
  - The presenter recognized the challenges of different industries. The recommendation would be to do it in a way that does not break the physical connectivity.

##### ISO 22095

- A member complemented that ISO's GHG quantification standards are building on ISO 22095.
- A member asked if the mass balance credit method respects input-output ratios.
  - The presenter responded that both proportional and non-proportional allocation are possible under the credit method.
- A member asked if the multi-site mass balance term was inclusive of group-level mass balance, and if there is a geographical boundary of a small country.
  - The presenter addressed that the term group-level is not explicitly in the standard, but multi-site is flexible.
  - The presenter added that group-level mass balance is more common at the start of the supply chain and it is capped, so country-level would probably not be a group.

##### Physical GHG inventory

- A member commented that there are industries where there is infrastructure for the physical delivery, but the molecules leaving the producer maybe don't reach the purchaser. For example, when buying renewable gas, it is going to be delivered to the local distribution utility, and the proportion reaching your factory might be one in a million molecules. But there is a contract in place to have physical delivery. Probably similar to SAF. So the question is if that counts as physical delivery and can go in the physical inventory.
  - The Secretariat responded that physical connectivity refers to the likelihood of those molecules being physically present, and by strengthening the system boundaries that likelihood could increase.
- A member wanted to highlight the fact that a company can use a global factor to report in their physical GHG inventory, but when it is linked to a specific impact then it needs traceability to that site. So, it is not always about the differentiation about physical traceability and physical connectivity, but also the size of the scope. Because if the scope is global, it can be called physical traceability. So, the difference comes down to reporting emissions or reporting an impact.

### Statement 2

- A member wanted to highlight that the market-based method reflects the purchase of attributes, not necessarily the purchase of goods and services. Buying the commodity and buying the attribute are two distinct things. So, the question on physical connectivity comes back to what we are trying to achieve with statement 2 and the types of claims we want to allow. In some cases, physical connectivity can help stimulate and achieve impacts, in other cases it might get in the way.
  - The Secretariat agreed the theory of change needs to be developed and will help clarify these issues.
- A member added that statement 2 should not cover just unbundled transactions, because bundled transactions that don't meet statement 1 should be in statement 2. Nothing should end up in the middle.
- A member clarified that statement 2 should reflect the purchase and ownership of attributes, and whether they are bundled or unbundled should not be relevant.

### Statement 3

- A member commented that traceability is relevant to statement 3, but CoC models would be complex to implement.
- Some members commented that we cannot define traceability for statement 3 without first refining further the definitions for the different subcategories. Beyond value chain would not require traceability, but if there are subcategories closer to the supply chain, we need to define what we mean by that.
- A member suggested that if statement 3 applies to actions both inside and outside the value chain, we could say that perhaps traceability is less relevant than other quality criteria. Since it is not a requirement to be reported in statement 3, even if it is considered for subcategories.
- A member added that perhaps the line we draw between statement 1 and 2, can be the same line we draw between within the value chain vs outside the value chain in statement 3.

### Challenges with CoC models

- A member commented that we need to consider that producers don't know what quality criteria they need to meet, since they don't know if the product is going to be mass balanced or not.

### Applicability across sectors

- A member highlighted the importance of distinguishing between three types of products: impacted product, source product and product that you use for reporting, and consider how to measure the data fit between these three products. A matrix based on empirical uncertainty would help to quantitatively measure a qualitative assessment of data fit and it could be a way to set thresholds to ensure a credible comparison between these three products.
- A member expressed concerns about using CoC models to explicitly distinguish between statement, since supply chains can have 3 or 4 tiers and it's unclear what happens when each supplier does mass balance. CoC models can be a good way to demonstrate quality criteria, but not the only criteria to distinguish.
  - The Secretariat agreed that the solution does not have to be exclusive to CoC models.
  - A member added that it would still be a good exercise to map the CoC models to the statements, to understand under which conditions other systems could fit in.
  - The Secretariat agreed CoC models can be the starting point because they are an instrument to demonstrate traceability, but recognize these may not work in all cases and quality criteria needs to be established.
  - A member added that there are sectors where it is challenging to apply that to, such as the transport sector, since it is hard to understand the boundary.
  - The Secretariat agreed and emphasized the need to have practical examples or case studies.

### Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will work with TWG members to develop examples or case studies.

#### 4. Next steps

- TWG members were invited to express their interest in being part of a Traceability subgroup.
- The next TWG meeting was scheduled for May 20<sup>th</sup>.
- An optional informative session on TCAT sectoral approach will be scheduled.

#### Summary of discussion

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

#### Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will form and facilitate a subgroup dedicated to traceability.
- The Secretariat will confirm the date of the in-person meeting.

### Summary of written submissions received prior to meeting

N/A