

Corporate Standard Meeting Minutes

Subgroup 1, Meeting #13

Date: 28 April 2026

Time: 09:00 – 11:00 ET / 15:00 – 17:00 CET

Location: Virtual

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members

1. Robert Anderson, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts, Australia
2. Catherine Atkin, Carbon Accountable and Stanford CodeX Climate Data Policy Initiative
3. Erika Barnett, Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
4. Tatiana Boldyreva, CDP
5. Luis Carvajal, Siemens Energy
6. Stephanie Chow-Ashton, ISO/TC207/SC7/WG4 and Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero
7. Robert Gray, DuPont
8. Burkhard Huckestein, German Environment Agency
9. Philippe Missi Missi, UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre West and Central Africa
10. Ann Marie Mohan-Sidhu, EcoEra
11. Joanne Richmond, CK Hutchison

Guests

1. Ibrahim Eryazici, ISO/TC207/SC7/WG4 and Dow

GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Hande Baybar
2. Iain Hunt
3. Allison Leach

Documents referenced

1. Slides for the Corporate Standard TWG Subgroup 1 meeting on 28 April 2026

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	<p><i>Introduction and housekeeping</i></p> <p>The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the thirteenth meeting of Subgroup 1 and reviewed the objectives and agenda for the meeting.</p>	No specific outcomes.
2	<p><i>GHG targets</i></p> <p>The Secretariat presented three subtopics for discussion related to GHG targets: whether targets should be recommended or optional, whether GHG Protocol should provide more detailed specifications on targets, and reporting information related to targets.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 13 feedback survey.
3	<p><i>GHG intensity metrics</i></p> <p>The Secretariat presented background information related to GHG intensity metrics and invited discussion on two related subtopics: reporting of GHG intensity metrics and specifications for developing GHG intensity metrics.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 13 feedback survey.
4	<p><i>Wrap up and next steps</i></p> <p>The Secretariat outlined next steps including a request for responses to a feedback survey and dates for upcoming meetings.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will share meeting materials.</p> <p>The Secretariat requested that members respond to a Meeting 13 feedback survey, with responses requested by Monday, May 11th, 2026.</p> <p>The next meeting of Subgroup 1 is scheduled for June 9th, 2026.</p>

Summary of discussion and outcomes

1. Introduction and housekeeping

- The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the thirteenth meeting of Subgroup 1 and reviewed the objectives and agenda for the meeting. (slides 1-9)

Summary of discussion

- No discussion raised.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

2. GHG targets

- The Secretariat presented three subtopics for discussion related to GHG targets: whether targets should be recommended or optional, whether GHG Protocol should provide more detailed specifications on targets, and reporting information related to targets. (slides 11-25)

Summary of discussion

- **Whether targets should be recommended or optional:** The Secretariat shared final poll results from Subgroup 1 Meeting 12 on what (if any) specifications the Corporate Standard should provide on the setting of targets. The Secretariat noted that there were split opinions between specifying targets as optional ('may' statement) and recommending that companies set targets ('should' statement). Members were invited to provide additional comments on the two options.
 - Comments in favor of specifying targets as optional ('may' statement):
 - Limiting to a 'may' statement maintains GHG Protocol's role as a GHG accounting and reporting standard.
 - Limiting to a 'may' statement helps ensure the longevity of the standard and its continued interoperability with external programs.
 - If a 'should' statement is adopted, there needs to be a clear reason for doing so. Moving toward a recommendation now may point toward going a step further in the next iteration in adopting a requirement.
 - With the potential adoption of a multi-statement reporting framework (including a GHG impacts of actions statement), leaving targets as optional ('may' statement) could be preferable to avoid potential conflict or confusion.
 - Comments in favor of recommending that companies set targets ('should' statement):
 - A 'should' statement provides a stronger signal than a 'may' statement in supporting global best practice without compromising GHG Protocol's role as an accounting and reporting standard. Any concerns that a 'should' statement could be perceived as GHG Protocol extending its role beyond GHG accounting and reporting can be allayed by referring to external target setting programs.
 - A 'should' statement leaves targets as optional, but helps encourage companies to set targets.
 - Additional comments:
 - A member highlighted a tension with the issue of targets wherein it's important to maintain the integrity of GHG Protocol as an accounting and reporting standard, but that a key reason for accounting for GHG emissions is to set emissions reduction targets.
 - A member asked if it's possible to provide reference to external target setting programs. The Secretariat noted that this will be one of the options to be considered later in the meeting related to detailed provisions on targets.
 - Another member suggested that in lieu of a 'should' statement, providing a reference to external target-setting programs is a way to sufficiently promote target setting.

- A member asked if an option could be to recommend (or even require) targets in certain cases depending on the purpose of the GHG inventory (e.g., for external reporting or for mitigation planning). The Secretariat responded that a 'should, if relevant' statement is possible with this approach having been applied in other instances.
 - A member suggested that most companies who report their GHG emissions also set targets and whether a 'may' or a 'should' statement is included in the Corporate Standard should not be expected to make a significant difference on user practice.
 - A member suggested that if just specifying targets as an option is not a strong enough stance, a requirement should be established rather than a recommendation, noting that from a verification/validation perspective a 'should' is similar to a 'may'.
 - A member asked if a viable path would be to adopt a recommendation to set targets but not provide specific requirements/recommendations on targets. The Secretariat responded that during Meeting 12 members suggested that a 'should' statement might imply increased stakeholder expectations for detailed provisions on targets, but that this does not mean that detailed specifications have to be established. A guest noted that in ISO standards, a 'should' statement does not require that additional details be provided.
- **Detailed specifications on GHG targets:** The Secretariat shared background information on the topic of detailed specifications related to GHG targets, including a summary of provisions and guidance currently included in GHG Protocol standards, and specifications from external programs. The Secretariat invited members to comment.
 - A member suggested that language in ISO 14064-1 specifying that companies 'should consider' certain criteria when establishing targets is not any stronger than a 'may' statement.
 - A guest noted that the ISO10460 Net Zero Aligned Organizations Draft International Standard will be available for public consultation from June 17th to September 9th and that stakeholders can request the draft from and send comments to their national standards body to be submitted to ISO.
 - A member noted that targets may relate to different claims (e.g., carbon neutrality, net zero), and that such claims require consideration of complex issues such as the role of offsets. Providing detailed provisions on targets may entail a slippery slope in terms of having to weigh in on issues like these.
 - A member commented that the target setting ecosystem is constantly evolving and that for this reason, GHG Protocol should avoid providing any detailed specifications.
 - A member suggested that if companies set targets, the targets should meet SMART (specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, terminated) criteria, with these criteria serving as guidance. They added that the criteria listed on slide 19 mostly align with SMART criteria, but that 'terminated' and 'ambitious' are not fully addressed.
 - A member suggested including a cross-reference to text related to the base year. The Secretariat highlighted that an outcome from prior Subgroup 1 discussions was to maintain an inventory base year and a target base year as separate concepts.
- **Reporting specifications on GHG targets:** The Secretariat shared background information on reporting specifications related to GHG targets, including provisions currently defined in GHG Protocol Standards and by external programs. The Secretariat invited members to comment.
 - A member suggested that requiring disclosure of information related to GHG targets may pose risks to some companies in the current market, noting that some companies may set targets for internal management purposes but should not be forced to disclose them.
 - Another member expressed agreement, but added that in cases where companies do choose to disclose information related to targets, there does need to be transparency regarding details of the target, especially in instances where companies try to make claims. They also noted that some reporting elements could be designated as required, while others could be optional.
 - A member noted that it is important that disclosures related to GHG targets provide a level of specificity, but that particular details may differ depending on the company and claims made, and thus that requirements should not be over-prescribed.

- A member suggested that there may be some inconsistency between making the setting of targets optional while requiring detailed disclosures related to targets.
- A member noted that in a complex organization, different entities across the organization may each set their own internal targets. They suggested that guidance for these situations should be considered, but without encroaching on the role of target setting programs.
- Members provided comments related to specific reporting elements including:
 - A member suggested a disclosure provision on the standard or method followed for targets.
 - A member noted that a provision on the pathway used for setting the target is missing from the list on slide 24. They added that such a provision could be conditional, wherein if a company's target is not set according to a standard (e.g., SBTi, ISO 14060), they should be required to disclose information related to the target pathway.
 - Another member suggested that other provisions (e.g., target base year, target completion year) may not be as essential to report on if a company discloses the target setting standard followed and these items are defined prescriptively in the standard applied.
- **Indicative polls:**
 - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *What general specification should the Corporate Standard provide on the setting of GHG targets?*
 - Recommend that companies set GHG targets ('should' statement): 5 of 11
 - Specify the setting of GHG targets as optional ('may' statement): 6 of 11
 - Abstain: 0 of 11
 - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *What overall approach should the Corporate Standard take to providing more detailed specifications on GHG targets?*
 - Include specific provisions ('shall'/'should' statements) that apply when companies choose to set GHG targets: 1 of 11
 - Reference general criteria/considerations ('should consider'/'may consider'): 6 of 11
 - Refer to external programs: 3 of 11
 - Do not provide any specific provisions/guidance (be silent): 1 of 11
 - Abstain: 0 of 11
 - A member asked if the general approach to providing detailed specifications on GHG targets could include both providing general guidance and referring to external programs. The Secretariat noted that while the meeting poll only allows for one option to be selected, the post-meeting feedback survey will allow for more than one option to be selected and that members will have to the opportunity to update their responses.
 - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *What criteria/specifications on GHG targets should be included? Check all that should apply.*
 - Target boundary: 6 of 11
 - Type of target: 5 of 11
 - Target timeframe: 6 of 11
 - Target level: 5 of 11
 - Policy content (international, national, etc.): 3 of 11
 - Sectoral context : 3 of 11
 - Other: 3 of 11 (specific suggestions for other criteria were not provided)
 - None (no specifications should be provided): 4 of 11
 - Abstain: 0 of 11
 - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *What overall approach should the Corporate Standard take to specifying reporting provisions on GHG targets?*
 - Require the reporting of information related to GHG targets ('shall' statements): 4 of 11
 - Recommend the reporting of information related to GHG targets ('should' statements): 5 of 11
 - Specify reporting of information related to GHG targets as optional ('may' statements): 1 of 11

- Make no specification on reporting of information related to GHG targets (be silent): 0 of 11
- Abstain: 1 of 11
- The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *What information should be specified in reporting provisions on GHG targets? Check all that should apply.*
 - Target boundary: 6 of 11
 - Target base year: 7 of 11
 - Target completion year: 7 of 11
 - Type of target: 6 of 11
 - Target level: 6 of 11
 - Progress in reaching target: 7 of 11
 - Use of offsets/credits: 4 of 11
 - Target setting standard followed: 4 of 11
 - Third party validation of targets: 5 of 11
 - Statement on scientific basis: 4 of 11
 - Other: 3 of 11
 - None (no specifications should be provided): 0 of 11
 - Abstain: 3 of 11

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 13 feedback survey.

3. GHG intensity metrics

- The Secretariat presented background information related to GHG intensity metrics and invited discussion on two related subtopics: reporting of GHG intensity metrics and specifications for developing GHG intensity metrics. (slides 26-34)

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat shared background information related to GHG intensity metrics, including stakeholder feedback received and relevant provisions in current GHG Protocol standards and from external programs.
 - A member suggested that SASB standards be taken into account, as companies are required to consider SASB standards for industry-specific metrics under IFRS S1 and S2.
- To help frame subsequent discussion on accounting and reporting provisions related to GHG intensity metrics, the Secretariat first asked members for comments on the **purposes that GHG intensity metrics serve**:
 - A member highlighted the calculation of scope 3 emissions as an important use case, wherein companies may calculate economic emission intensity factors for their suppliers based on reported emissions and economic data and multiply these by the amount spent on products and services supplied. They noted that issues arise with consistency between the numerator and denominator as emissions data is recalculated for structural changes but economic data is not. They added that requiring companies to also disclose their original historical emissions data can help solve the issue.
 - The Secretariat asked if requiring companies to disclose intensity metrics could also solve the issue. The member responded that they thought that it would.
 - A member noted that from their experience product carbon footprints are the most valuable to stakeholders. They added that emissions intensity at the organization level is of limited utility considering the diversity of products and services that might comprise a given company's portfolio.
 - A member highlighted financial institutions as users of organization-level emissions intensity information.
- Members provided the following comments on **reporting of GHG intensity metrics**:

- A member suggested that reporting of GHG intensity metrics be optional because the Corporate Standard is a sector-agnostic standard and is thus not positioned to provide much in the way of prescriptive uses on intensity metrics and because of the potential of intensity metrics being misinterpreted or misused.
- A member advocated for required reporting of organization-level GHG intensity metrics to support the use case of customers calculating their scope 3 emissions. They noted that while product-carbon footprints may be preferable, they are not always available and that organization-level emissions intensities are a valuable alternative to using EEIO emission factors.
- Members provided the following comments on **specifications for developing GHG intensity metrics**:
 - A member suggested that it be specified that boundaries of the numerator be the same as for the denominator when reporting GHG intensity metrics, noting that while GHG emissions are recalculated for structural changes, other metrics typically are not.
 - A member noted that as a sector-agnostic standard the Corporate Standard cannot provide too prescriptive of requirements. They added that there may, however, be some universal considerations like boundary consistency between numerator and denominator that can be highlighted through guidance or recommendations. They also noted that being silent can increase the risk of misinterpretation of emissions intensity metrics when they are reported.
- Other comments:
 - A member suggested that chain of custody is an important topic to consider and that it can be applicable not only to scope 3 but also to scope 1. They added that ISO has relevant standards on the topic to consider.
 - The Secretariat noted that chain of custody is a topic being addressed by the AMI TWG, building on what's been established on the topic in the Land Sector and Removals Standard, and that relevant standards from ISO are being considered.
 - A guest noted that the AMI TWG is also considering work underway through the GHG Protocol-ISO partnership on product carbon footprints and that some of this work was integrated into the [AMI White Paper](#) forming the basis for a [Request for Information](#).
 - The member also suggested that the topic of allocation should be considered. The Secretariat noted that the topic is being addressed by the Scope 3 TWG. Another member requested that an update on where the Scope 3 TWG is on this topic would be helpful, with the Secretariat responding that this can be provided.
 - A member noted that absolute emissions and intensity data are typically disclosed in annual or sustainability reports, and that because of this it's important that users understand the key drivers behind changes in emissions over time. They added that structural changes can make intensity metrics appear misleading, and that companies should transparently explain the impact of such changes on overall emissions performance.
 - Another member responded that recalculation of prior years' emissions data masks the impact the structural changes have on emissions intensity.
- **Indicative polls:**
 - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *How should reporting of GHG intensity metrics be specified in the Corporate Standard at the company/organization level?*
 - Required ('shall' statement): 0 of 9
 - Recommended ('should' statement) for all reporters: 6 of 9
 - Recommended ('should' statement) if relevant (e.g., if they have targets based on emissions intensity metrics): 3 of 9
 - Optional ('may' statement) (status quo): 0 of 9
 - Make no specification (be silent): 0 of 9
 - Abstain: 0 of 9
 - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *How should reporting of GHG intensity metrics be specified in the Corporate Standard at the product level?*
 - Required ('shall' statement): 1 of 9
 - Recommended ('should' statement) for all reporters: 4 of 9

- Recommended ('should' statement) if relevant (e.g., if they have targets based on emissions intensity metrics): 3 of 9
- Optional ('may' statement) (status quo): 0 of 9
- Make no specification (be silent): 1 of 9
- Abstain: 0 of 9
- The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *What general approach should the Corporate Standard take to providing specifications on the development of GHG intensity metrics at the company/ organization-level (for cases when companies report intensity metrics)?*
 - Provide detailed provisions (conditional 'shall'/'should') statements: 4 of 8
 - Provide general guidance only (status quo): 4 of 8
 - Be silent: 0 of 8
 - Abstain: 0 of 8

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 13 feedback survey.

6. Wrap up and next steps

- The Secretariat outlined next steps including a request for responses to a feedback survey and dates for upcoming meetings. (slides 35-37)

Summary of discussion

- No discussion raised.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will share meeting materials.
- The Secretariat requested that members respond to a Meeting 12 feedback survey, with responses requested by Monday, May 11th, 2026.
- The next meeting of Subgroup 1 is scheduled for June 9th, 2026.

Summary of written submissions received prior to meeting

No written input on meeting agenda topics was provided prior to the meeting, but complete poll results (including responses from both live meeting polls and post-meeting surveys) are provided below for the most recent prior Subgroup 1 meeting.

Subgroup 1 Meeting 12: Complete poll results

The Secretariat invited Subgroup 1 members to respond to indicative poll questions both live during the meeting and via a feedback survey after the meeting. This Section reflects final indicative poll results, combining both live meeting polls and feedback survey responses.

Poll question	Responses
<i>Timing of base year recalculation</i>	
Do you support maintaining the following Corporate Standard provisions related to the timing of base year recalculations for structural changes?	
Recommend recalculation be performed in the year that a structural change occurs ('should' statement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support: 9 of 17 • Support with minor edits: 3 of 17 • Oppose: 4 of 17 • Abstain: 1 of 17
Allow recalculation to be performed in the next year after a structural change ('may' statement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support: 12 of 17 • Support with minor edits: 3 of 17

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose: 1 of 17 • Abstain: 1 of 17
Recommend that recalculation apply to the entire year (rather than the remainder of the year after the structural change occurred), "all-year" option ('should' statement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support: 8 of 17 • Support with minor edits: 6 of 17 • Oppose: 2 of 17 • Abstain: 1 of 17
Allow recalculation for only the portion of the year after a structural change in the year of the change, with the full recalculation taking place in the following year, "pro-rata" option ('may' statement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support: 7 of 17 • Support with minor edits: 5 of 17 • Oppose: 1 of 17 • Abstain: 4 of 17
Reporting requirements on base year recalculations	
<p>Do you support adopting a provision requiring reporting of additional details for base year recalculations (like that in the LSR Standard)?</p> <p><i>Companies shall disclose... Any recalculations of base year/period levels, including the rationale for recalculation and which assumptions and values were changed, with a comparison of updated values to original values.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support: 8 of 18 • Support with minor edits: 7 of 18 • Oppose: 2 of 18 • Abstain: 1 of 18
GHG targets	
What specifications (if any) should the Corporate Standard provide on the setting of GHG targets?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require that companies set GHG targets ("shall" statement): 1 of 18 • Recommend that companies set GHG targets ("should" statement): 8 of 18 • Specify the setting of GHG targets as optional ("may" statement): 9 of 18 • Make no specification (i.e., be silent on the topic): 0 of 18 • Abstain: 0 of 18