

# Corporate Standard Meeting Minutes

## Subgroup 1, Meeting #14

Date: 9 June 2026

Time: 08:30 – 11:00 ET / 14:30 – 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. Stephanie Chow-Ashton, ISO/TC207/SC7/WG4 and Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero
5. Abhilash Desu, Science Based Targets Initiative
6. Victoria Evans, SCS Engineers
7. Robert Gray, Independent
8. Henk Harmsen, Independent
9. Micheline Khan, World Resources Institute
10. Marine Kohler, CentraleSupélec, Université Paris-Saclay
11. Dedy Mahardika, International Finance Corporation (IFC)
12. Philippe Missi Missi, UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre West and Central Africa
13. Sachin Nimbalkar, Oak Ridge National Laboratory
14. Patrick Murphy, Sierra Club
15. Joanne Richmond, CK Hutchison
16. Victoria Sullivan, Duke Energy

### 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 9 June 2026
2. Working draft text document on tracking emissions over time (internal)

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	<p><b><i>Introduction and housekeeping</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the fourteenth meeting of Subgroup 1 and reviewed the objectives and agenda for the meeting.</p>	No specific outcomes.
2	<p><b><i>Base year selection</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to base year selection. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.
3	<p><b><i>Base year recalculation</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to base year recalculation. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.
4	<p><b><i>GHG targets</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to GHG targets. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.
5	<p><b><i>GHG intensity metrics</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to GHG intensity metrics. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items.</p>	Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.
6	<p><b><i>Wrap up and next steps</i></b></p> <p>The Secretariat outlined next steps including requests to respond to a feedback survey and provide comments on working draft text, along with dates for upcoming meetings.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will share meeting materials.</p> <p>The Secretariat requested that members respond to a Meeting 14 feedback survey by Friday, June 26<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>The Secretariat requested that members review working draft text corresponding to phase 2 topics, with comments due by Friday, June 26<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>The Secretariat invited volunteers to be part of an ad-hoc group to assist in revising working draft text and resolving member comments.</p> <p>The next meeting will be a meeting of the full Corporate Standard TWG on Tuesday, June 30<sup>th</sup>.</p>

## Summary of discussion and outcomes

### 1. Introduction and housekeeping

- The Secretariat welcomed TWG members to the fourteenth meeting of Subgroup 1 and reviewed the objectives and agenda for the meeting. (slides 1-12)

#### Summary of discussion

- No discussion raised.

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

- No specific outcomes.

### 2. Base year selection

- The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to base year selection. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items. (slides 13-17)

#### Summary of discussion

- A member asked whether provision 1.2.4 on slide 16 means that choosing the same year as base year for scope 1, scope 2, and scope 3 emissions is optional. The Secretariat responded that as a 'should' statement, the provision recommends that the same base year across scopes but allows different years.
  - Another member suggested that the wording in the second sentence in the provision implies that the selection of a different base year for scope 3 than for scope 1 and scope 2 is an exception only applicable in the case specified, and that wording be revised to frame this as an example rather than an exceptional case. The member added that flexibility should also be provided in choosing the same versus different base years for scope 1 and scope 2 (rather than just for scope 3 versus scopes 1 and 2).
- In reference to provision 1.2.2 on slide 16, a member asked if GHG Protocol has definitions of the terms 'reliable' and 'verifiable'. The Secretariat responded that the glossaries for the Corporate Standard, Scope 3 Standard, and Land Sector and Removals Standard do not include these terms. The Secretariat added that the terms 'reliable' and 'verifiable' are shown in brackets as options, and feedback from members is welcome on which term is preferable.
- **Indicative polls:**
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the updated framing of text on selecting an inventory base year vis-à-vis a target base year in provision 1.2.3 (slide 16)?*
    - Fully support: 11 of 16
    - Support with minor edits: 3 of 16
    - Oppose: 0 of 16
    - Abstain: 2 of 16
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Should provision 1.2.2 (slide 16) be framed as a recommendation ('should') or option ('may')?*
    - Recommendation ('should' statement, status quo): 14 of 16
    - Option ('may' statement): 1 of 16
    - Abstain: 1 of 16

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

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.

### 3. Base year recalculation

- The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to base year recalculation. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items. (slides 18-36)

### Summary of discussion

- Discussion and polls on base year recalculation were organized according to five major subtopics as summarized below.
- **General provisions and events triggering base year recalculation:** The Secretariat presented two pending items for consideration related to events triggering base year recalculations: recalculation for insourcing or outsourcing when emissions shift between scopes and the use of consistent GWP values between the base year and current year. (slides 20-24)
  - A member expressed support for including a provision specifying that when insourcing or outsourcing of activities results in emissions shifting across scopes, these shifts should be reflected in the base year in addition to the current year. They also noted that acquisitions and divestments (in addition to insourcing and outsourcing) can result in emissions shifting between scopes, and if a provision were to be added, it should be framed more generally to include different types of structural changes.
    - Another member suggested that insourcing and outsourcing differ from acquisitions and divestments in that the former simply move operations to different places in the value chain, while the latter entails adding or removing operations.
    - Another member noted that companies may set targets separately for scope 1 and 2 versus scope 3, and that this should justify shifting emissions across scopes in the base year to be consistent with the current year when activities are insourced or outsourced.
  - A member suggested that recalculating base year emissions when GWP values are updated to reflect the latest IPCC assessment report should be required, noting that, for example, companies with significant N<sub>2</sub>O emissions may see a significant change in the inventory due to updated GWP values. Another member expressed agreement. The Secretariat noted that the approach proposed for consideration, recommending that the same GWP values be used for the base year, with recalculation being contingent of the significance of the change, would address these cases and ensure that emissions are recalculated for significant changes.
  - A member suggested that determining whether to recalculate emissions due to methodological changes based only on a quantitative significance threshold may be risky, considering that while the change may not be deemed significant in the current year, it may become significant in the longer term.
  - A member noted that there is a minor typo in provision 2.1.1 (slide 23), which should read "discovery *of* significant errors" rather than "discovery *or* significant errors".
  - **Indicative polls:**
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support including a provision specifying that when insourced/outsourced activities shift between emissions scopes, that these shifts should also be applied to base year emissions?*
      - Support as a requirement ('shall'): 6 of 15
      - Support as a recommendation ('should'): 6 of 15
      - Oppose: 0 of 15
      - Abstain: 3 of 15
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support maintaining a provision recommending ('should' statement) that the same GWP values be used for the base year inventory and current year inventory (noting that whether the base year is recalculated depends on the significance of the methodological change)?*
      - Support: 14 of 16
      - Oppose: 1 of 16
      - Abstain: 1 of 16
- **Base year recalculation policy and significance thresholds:** The Secretariat presented three pending items for consideration related to base year recalculation policies and significance thresholds:

threshold level for a recommended maximum significance threshold, whether to define the separate application of significance thresholds by emissions scope as a requirement or a recommendation, and whether to define the application of a single significance threshold across all types of events triggering a base year recalculation as a requirement or a recommendation. (slides 25-28)

- A member suggested that quantitative significance thresholds need to be considered in conjunction with claimed emissions reductions over time, wherein the level of the significance threshold corresponds to an additional level of uncertainty around reported reductions. The Secretariat noted that suggestions from members are welcome on whether and how to establish guardrails on emission reduction claims, considering this uncertainty.
- A member asked if the threshold level in provision 2.2.2 (c) on slide 22 constitutes a recommendation only and if companies would be allowed to use a different value. The Secretariat confirmed that as a 'should' statement it constitutes a recommendation only and that companies would be allowed to select a different value.
- A member asked if there was any sense of current prevailing practices with regard to threshold levels. The Secretariat responded that while CDP's public data set provides large sample of corporate GHG reports, its platform does not include a reporting field for significance thresholds (only an open field for base year recalculation policy), and therefore a comprehensive picture is not available.
  - The member then asked if there were any insights from members who are practicing auditors on materiality thresholds typically applied. No members responded, but the Secretariat noted that this might be an area to get additional perspectives from the full Corporate Standard TWG.
- A member noted that providing recommended significance threshold levels will help provide a reasonable benchmark for companies to apply, and help align expectations between sustainability and financial departments within a company on what constitutes a material change.
- A member noted that defining a threshold level of a percentage basis is challenging as the magnitude of emissions in each scope may differ significantly for a given company (e.g., scope 1 may be very small compared to scope 2 and scope 3). They added that, for the purpose of target setting, scopes 1 and 2 are often treated together (i.e., included in the same target).
- A member noted that a purpose of applying significance thresholds is to manage error in presenting an emissions profile over time. They added that, as practices evolve, the feasibility of reducing error should improve. They suggested that proposed threshold levels under consideration are appropriate for the current context, but that these may need to be made more stringent in the future. The Secretariat noted that threshold levels can be reviewed again in future revision cycles.
- A member suggested that specific language be added under 2.2 (slide 27) that the significance threshold for scope 3 may differ from those for scope 1 and 2.
- **Indicative polls:**
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support a threshold level of 5% for scope 1 and scope 2 (for a recommended maximum significance threshold for base year recalculation)?*
    - Support: 14 of 15
    - Oppose: 0 of 15
    - Abstain: 1 of 15
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *What value should be established as the threshold level for scope 3 (for a recommended maximum significance threshold for base year recalculation)?*
    - 5%: 10 of 16
    - 10%: 4 of 16
    - Other: 0 of 16
    - Abstain: 2 of 16
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *How should the proposed provision that significance thresholds be applied separately for each emissions scope be implemented?*

- Requirement ('shall' statement): 7 of 15
  - Recommendation ('should' statement): 5 of 15
  - The provision should be reconsidered: 2 of 15
  - Abstain: 1 of 15
- The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *If significance thresholds are applied separately by emissions scope, what scope of emissions should be recalculated when a significance threshold for a given scope is exceeded?*
  - Recalculate emissions only for the scope(s) where the significance threshold was exceeded: 12 of 15
  - Recalculate emissions for the full scope 1 + scope 2 + scope 3 inventory: 2 of 15
  - Abstain: 1 of 15
- The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *How should the proposed provision that a single significance threshold be applied across structural, methodological, and other types of changes that trigger a base year recalculation be implemented?*
  - Requirement ('shall' statement): 6 of 15
  - Recommendation ('should' statement): 7 of 15
  - Abstain: 2 of 15
- **Options for when data unavailable for base year recalculation:** The Secretariat provided an overview of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes and pending items related to options that should be specified for companies for instances when sufficient data is unavailable for base year recalculation. (slides 29-32)
  - No comments were provided by members.
  - **Indicative polls:**
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Should the following text in provision 2.2.3 (slide 31) be defined as a recommendation ('should') or option ('may').? "To estimate base year emissions, the organization [should/may] establish a reliable GHG inventory for recent year(s) and then scale based on proxy data (e.g., revenue) to the base year."*
      - Recommendation ('should'): 8 of 14
      - Option ('may'): 5 of 14
      - Abstain: 1 of 14
    - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the working draft text in provision 2.2.3 (slide 31) as appropriately reflecting the decision tree on slide 30 previously supported by Subgroup 1 members?*
      - Fully support: 10 of 14
      - Support with minor edits: 1 of 14
      - Oppose: 0 of 14
      - Abstain: 3 of 14
- **Timing of base year recalculation for structural changes:** Topic skipped due to time constraints, with no major pending items to resolve.
- **Reporting provisions:** Topic skipped due to time constraints, with no major pending items to resolve.

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

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.

#### **4. GHG targets**

- The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to GHG targets. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items. (slides 37-45)

#### Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat shared poll results and a summary of comments received from members via the Subgroup 1 meeting 13 feedback survey on the topic of GHG targets.
- A member suggested that the list of criteria to be considered when setting a GHG reduction target in provision 3.2.2 (slide 42) be reframed as a list of example criteria, as the current wording implies the criteria listed are exhaustive.
- A member highlighted the interconnectivity between different provisions discussed related to GHG targets, wherein if a provision is included recommending the setting of GHG targets, it implies that information related to GHG targets shall/should be reported.
- The Secretariat noted that meeting 13 poll results on reporting provisions for GHG targets indicated a gap that should be reconsidered, wherein members expressed support for including a reporting provision on the target base year, but not the target completion year. Several members expressed agreement that omitting the target completion year in reporting provision would be a critical gap.
- A member noted that the bullet in provision 3.3.1 (slide 44) “progress in reaching the target” may be interpreted in different ways by users. Recognizing that providing a more prescriptive requirement might be more appropriately left to external programs, they added that providing more detail in terms of examples (e.g., % reduction achieved as compared to the target base year) may be considered.
- **Indicative polls:**
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support the following approach to providing detailed specifications on targets Provide general criteria/ considerations (provision 3.2.2 on slide 42) and referring to external programs (provision 3.2.3 on slide 42)?*
    - Support: 14 of 15
    - Oppose: 1 of 15
    - Abstain: 0 of 15
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support a requirement ('shall' statement) to report information on GHG targets?*
    - Support: 13 of 15
    - Oppose: 2 of 15
    - Abstain: 0 of 15
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support including a reporting element on target completion year (in addition to those support by a majority of subgroup members in meeting 13: target boundary, target base year, type of target, progress in reaching target)?*
    - Support: 15 of 15
    - Oppose: 0 of 15
    - Abstain: 0 of 15

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

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.

## 5. GHG intensity metrics

- The Secretariat provided a summary of preliminary Subgroup 1 outcomes, pending items, and working draft text related to GHG intensity metrics. Discussion and polls were held to address pending items (slides 46-51)

#### Summary of discussion

- A member asked if GHG Protocol has a definition of GHG intensity that’s being reviewed. The Secretariat noted that ‘intensity ratios’ is a glossary term in the Corporate Standard and that the term ‘intensity metric’ is used in Scope 3 Standard, but without a definition given. The Secretariat added work is happening between GHG Protocol and ISO to align on terminology.
  - The Secretariat also noted that the term ‘organization’ was used in working draft text in place of ‘company’, and that which term will be used moving forward is under discussion with ISO. A member asked if the term used impacts the applicability of the standard to different types

of organizations. The Secretariat noted that while the Corporate Standard currently uses 'company', the standard includes language to specify that it can apply to any type of organization (e.g., non-profits, universities), in addition to businesses. The term 'organization' can also be applied to different types of organizations.

- Members provided comments related to different use cases for GHG intensity metrics including:
  - A member noted that performing scope 3 emissions calculations based on supplier emissions intensity (i.e., supplier emissions divided by supplier revenue) provides a method to fill the gap between EEIO data and product-level data. They added that revenue data is not recalculated due to structural changes, and thus that internally consistent emissions intensities must use originally reported emissions (i.e., without recalculation) for historical years. They suggested that it be specified that originally reported emissions be used for historic intensity metrics, given that when companies publish these, it's unclear whether these include recalculation.
  - A member noted that companies commonly use GHG intensity metrics as way to benchmark their performance as compared to peers and thus that external consistency (i.e., between companies) is important in addition to internal consistency over time. They suggested that disclosure requirements might help inform stakeholders on whether reported intensity metrics are comparable between companies.
  - A member noted that considerations for developing intensity metrics may differ depending on the purpose served by the metric. They added that making comparisons between companies on the basis of emissions intensity can be challenging given different organizational structures (e.g., levels of vertical integration). They also noted that determining emissions per unit of a physical quantity (e.g., per tonnage of product sold) ultimately boils down to a product carbon footprint.
  - The Secretariat reminded members that a reason for including the topic of emissions intensity metrics in the scope of work was feedback from stakeholders proposing intensity metrics as a way to track a company's performance over time. The Secretariat recognized the other important use cases raised in the meeting discussion.
- A member asked if the topic of intensity metrics has been considered by the Scope 3 TWG. The Secretariat responded that scope of work items related to tracking emissions over time have been led by the Corporate Standard TWG, given the volume of scope of work items being addressed by the Scope 3 TWG.
- **Indicative polls:**
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support a recommendation to report GHG intensity metrics if relevant to reporting objectives (provision 4.4.1 on slide 50)?*
    - Fully support: 12 of 15
    - Support with minor edits: 1 of 15
    - Oppose: 0 of 15
    - Abstain: 2 of 15
  - The Secretariat conducted an indicative poll asking the question: *Do you support a provision on ensuring consistent boundaries for the numerator and denominator when GHG intensity metrics are reported (provision 4.1.1 on slide 50)?*
    - Support as a requirement ('shall'): 9 of 15
    - Support as a recommendation ('should'): 5 of 15
    - Oppose: 0 of 15
    - Abstain: 1 of 15

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

- Outcomes from indicative polls will be reported following completion of the Meeting 14 feedback survey.

## 6. Wrap up and next steps

- The Secretariat outlined next steps including requests to respond to a feedback survey and provide comments on working draft text, along with dates for upcoming meetings. (slides 52-54)

### 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 14 feedback survey by Friday, June 26<sup>th</sup>.
- The Secretariat requested that members review working draft text corresponding to phase 2 topics, with comments due by Friday, June 26<sup>th</sup>.
- The Secretariat invited volunteers to be part of an ad-hoc group to assist in revising working draft text and resolving member comments.
- The next meeting will be a meeting of the full Corporate Standard TWG on Tuesday, June 30<sup>th</sup>.

## 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 13: 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. Qualitative comments from members provided via the feedback survey are summarized in meeting slides.

Poll question	Responses
<b>GHG targets</b>	
What general specification should the Corporate Standard provide on the setting of GHG targets?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendation ('should'): 11 of 18</li> <li>Optional ('may'): 7 of 18</li> <li>Abstain: 0 of 18</li> </ul>
What overall approach should the Corporate Standard take to providing more detailed specifications on GHG targets? <i>Note: Members were allowed to select more than one option.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include detailed provisions: 4 of 18</li> <li>Reference general criteria/considerations: 9 of 18</li> <li>Refer to external programs: 9 of 18</li> <li>Be silent: 2 of 18</li> <li>Abstain: 0 of 18</li> </ul>
What criteria/considerations on GHG targets should be included?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target boundary: 11 of 18</li> <li>Type of target: 10 of 18</li> <li>Target timeframe: 11 of 18</li> <li>Target level: 8 of 18</li> <li>Basis in climate science: 4 of 18</li> <li>Policy context: 6 of 18</li> <li>Sectoral context: 3 of 18</li> <li>None (no specifications should be made): 6 of 18</li> <li>Abstain: 0 of 18</li> </ul>
What overall approach should the Corporate Standard take to specifying reporting provisions on GHG targets?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirement ('shall'): 9 of 18</li> <li>Recommendation ('should'): 6 of 18</li> <li>Optional ('may'): 2 of 18</li> <li>No specification (be silent): 0 of 18</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstain: 1 of 18</li> </ul>
What information should be specified in reporting provisions on GHG targets?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target boundary: 14 of 18</li> <li>Target base year: 14 of 18</li> <li>Target completion year: 5 of 18</li> <li>Type of target: 13 of 18</li> <li>Progress in reaching target: 13 of 18</li> <li>Use of offsets/credits: 8 of 18</li> <li>Target setting standard followed: 2 of 18</li> <li>Third-party validation of targets: 6 of 18</li> <li>Statement on scientific basis: 5 of 18</li> <li>None (no specifications should be made): 0 of 18</li> <li>Abstain: 3 of 18</li> <li>Other: 2 of 18</li> </ul>
<b><i>GHG intensity metrics</i></b>	
How should reporting of GHG intensity metrics be specified in the Corporate Standard? (At the company/organization level)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Required ('shall'): 3 of 17</li> <li>Recommended for all ('should'): 7 of 17</li> <li>Recommended if relevant ('should'): 3 of 17</li> <li>Optional ('may'): 3 of 17</li> <li>No specification (be silent): 0 of 17</li> <li>Abstain: 1 of 17</li> </ul>
How should reporting of GHG intensity metrics be specified in the Corporate Standard? (At the product level)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Required ('shall'): 2 of 17</li> <li>Recommended for all ('should'): 8 of 17</li> <li>Recommended if relevant ('should'): 5 of 17</li> <li>Optional ('may'): 1 of 17</li> <li>No specification (be silent): 1 of 17</li> <li>Abstain: 0 of 17</li> </ul>
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)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed provisions ('shall'/'should'): 10 of 16</li> <li>Guidance only (status quo): 5 of 16</li> <li>Be silent: 1 of 16</li> <li>Abstain: 0 of 16</li> </ul>