

Actions and Market Instruments Meeting Minutes

Meeting number 2.05

Date: 20 May 2026

Time: 09:00 – 11:00 ET

Location: "Virtual" via Zoom

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members

1. Ana Isabel Aubad Lopez, Atmosphere Alternative
2. Matthew Brander, University of Edinburgh
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. Jonathan Crook, Carbon Market Watch
7. Thomas Day, NewClimate Institute
8. Christopher Duck, Climate Impact Partners
9. Nermin Eltouny, Integral Consult
10. Autumn Fox, Mars
11. Michael Gillenwater, Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
12. Tim Hamers, ERGaR - European Renewable Gas Registry
13. Sitnour Hassan Mohamed Hassan, Sudanese Standards and Metrology Organization / ISO WG4
14. Hannah Hunt, Google
15. Yaning Jin, SinoCarbon Innovation and Investment Co., Ltd.
16. Injy Johnstone, University of Oxford
17. Timothy Juliani, WWF US
18. Hiromi Kawamata, The Japan Iron and Steel Federation
19. John Kazer, Carbon Trust
20. Stephen Lamm, BloomEnergy
21. Aditya Mishra, Proforest
22. Inken Ohlsen, AP Moller Maersk
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. Andrew Rudyy, BHP
29. Josh Taylor, ISEAL
30. William Tyndall, AJW Inc.
31. Emma van de Ven, Rabobank
32. Xiaoxin Zhang, China National Institute of Standardization (CNIS) / ISO WG4

Guests

1. Ibrahim Eryazici, ANSI_USA / ISO WG4
2. Mark Staples, Shell / ISO WG4

GHG Protocol Secretariat

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

Documents referenced

1. Schäfer, M., Herlev Gebara, C., Bjørn, A., & Brander, M. (2025). Identifying options for additionality tests in the context of scope 2 market-based accounting. *Carbon Management*, 16(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17583004.2025.2473910>

Item	Topic and Summary	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.	No specific outcomes.
2	Theories of change The Secretariat presented on theories of change in the context of actions and market instruments and facilitated feedback and discussion from the Technical Working Group.	No specific outcomes.
3	Additionality A TWG member presented a summary of the additionality tests in Schäfer et al (2025), following by TWG discussion.	No specific outcomes.
4	Baselines The Secretariat provided a brief update on the topic of baselines and sought volunteers to further develop related content.	No specific outcomes.
5	Next steps A recap of the next steps was provided to conclude the meeting.	No specific outcomes.

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 TWG members.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

2. Theory of change

- The Secretariat presented on theories of change in the context of actions and market instruments and facilitated feedback and discussion from the Technical Working Group.

Summary of discussion

- A member suggested that 'accurate, robust and comparable GHG quantification and reporting' should be added as an intended outcome.

Statement 2

- Some members suggested that the topics of traceability, additionality, quality criteria and theory of change are connected and require a comprehensive approach.
 - Some members suggested that additionality could be required if the 'connection distance' of an action or market instrument to the reporting company's value chain increases.
- A member suggested that additionality could be assessed at the instrument-, project-, or market-level and that all levels should be considered.
- Some members suggested that different theories of change are not necessarily mutually exclusive.
- A member asked why statement 2 may include additionality if this is not required for statement 1.
 - The Secretariat replied that additionality is just one design element being considered for statement 2 but noted that if the purpose statement 2 is to communicate emission reductions relative to statement 1, then an evaluation of additionality could help to substantiate that emission reduction.
- A member commented that the theory of change should be linked to specific use cases, such as scaling new technologies.
- A member suggested that additionality is a necessary design element.
 - Other member suggested that this is not the only viable theory of change.
- Some members questioned whether there is an intent to demonstrate a decrease in emissions as an outcome and noted that an additionality requirement may pose a challenge.
- A member suggested a relevant distinction should be made between usage claims and impact claims.
 - Some members suggested that statement 2 should focus on improving the accuracy of usage claims, whereas statement 3 should focus on improving the accuracy of impact claims.
- Some members noted that the design of the statements will need to be aligned with the intended reporting claims for statement 2.
- Some members suggested that strict additionality be used in statement 3 while statement 2 is used to articulate the range of ways that instrument purchases may contribute to theories of change.
- Some members suggested that market penetration rate may serve as an effective proxy for additionality.
 - Some members noted potential challenges to this approach related to defining the market and defining the relevant attribute being assessed.
- The Secretariat invited members to continue to submit written feedback to allow for further exploration.

Statement 3

- A member commented that all statements are integrated and should complement each other such that what is not solved by statement 2 should be addressed in statement 3.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- A virtual board was shared for TWG members to provide asynchronous comments on the draft theories of change by Monday May 25th.

3. Additionality

- A TWG member presented a summary of the additionality tests in Schäfer et al (2025).

Summary of discussion

- A member asked the presenter for clarity regarding the topic of causal chains.
 - The presenter responded that often there are a chain of relevant effects that are important to understand individually – first whether the project happens, and second whether and how much emissions reductions are achieved.

- A member suggested that text-based additionality evaluations with a binary 'yes' or 'no' response can be easy to game.
- A member noted that the concept of 'false positives' and 'false negatives' will be helpful for understanding the impact of design choices.
- A member asked whether it is useful to include all possible tests to assess additionality.
 - The presenter suggested that performing all tests would be an unreasonable reporting burden, and that an assessment of practicality should be balanced with the desired level of stringency when selecting a small number of tests to use in combination.
- A member noted the potential for difficulty in assessing all cases of financial additionality – noting the case of financial contributions – and asked about appropriate thresholds.
 - The presenter responded that different tests that could be relevant in different cases but suggested that performing multiple tests in combination can be helpful when in doubt.
- Some members suggested that they believe regulatory additionality is a unique circumstance that requires specific attention.
-

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- A virtual board was shared for TWG members to provide asynchronous comments on the additionality tests, and their relevance for statement 2 and for statement 3, as well as their applicability per sector. TWG members can provide their input by Monday May 25th.

4. Baselines

- The Secretariat provided a brief update on the topic of baselines and sought volunteers to further develop related content.

Summary of discussion

- No points of discussion were raised by TWG members.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

5. Next steps

- The next TWG meeting is scheduled for June 17th.
- The in-person TWG workshop is scheduled for June 30th – July 2nd.

Summary of discussion

- No points of discussion were raised by TWG members.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.