

Independent Standard Board – Meeting #10 Summary

Date: 21 May 2025

Time: 08:00 – 11:00 ET / 14:00 – 17:00 CET

Location: Virtual

Attendees

Members

Alex Bassen, Chair
Anthony Cheung
Danny Cullenward
Pieter Gagnon
Suzanne Greene

Owen Hewlett
Christina Hood
Stuart Jefford
Heather Keith

Observing Entities

Bastian Buck (GRI)
Alberto Carillo Pineda (SBTi)

Bing Leng (ISSB)
Amir Sokolowski (CDP)

GHG Protocol Secretariat

Pankaj Bhatia
Alejandra Bosch
David Burns
Elliott Engelmann
Alexander Frantzen
Chelsea Gillis
Maia Kutner

Oliver James
Ralf Pfitzner
Michael Macrae
Matt Ramlow
David Rich
Amir Safaei
Anna Stanley-Radière

Guests – Agenda Item #5

Francois Binard (EY)
Ishita Cheliah (EY)

Johannes Tintner-Olifiers (EY)
Weza Bombo Joao (EY)

Agenda and Decisions

Item	Topic and Summary	Decisions
1	<i>Welcome and Introduction</i> The Chair welcomed all members and noted that Observing Entities would join from agenda item #3.	The ISB was not asked to make any decisions.
2	<i>Partnership Update</i> The Secretariat presented an update on GHG Protocol’s partnership strategy, responded to member questions and took member feedback.	The ISB was not asked to make any decisions.

3	<p><i>Implementation of Standards Updates</i></p> <p>The Secretariat introduced implementation of the standards updates, noting that it is a strategic decision with cross-cutting impacts, which GHG Protocol hasn't had to address in the past. The Secretariat will seek to understand how transition periods, differentiated requirements by reporter type, and exemptions or legacy contracts have been addressed by other programs, including by the Observing Entities, and regulators. The Secretariat further noted the importance of distinguishing between the role of GHG Protocol and other programs in establishing these requirements. Members and Observing Entities were asked to provide written inputs on the topic, which will be revisited at a future meeting.</p> <p>Observing Entities requested sufficient lead time to adequately consider implications and make any necessary amendments to their respective standards.</p>	The ISB was not asked to make any decisions.
4	<p><i>Scope 2: Phase 1 Outcomes</i></p> <p><i>Consequential Measures Update</i></p> <p>The Secretariat presented an overview of the Scope 2 Consequential Subgroup's work, which was launched in February. The subgroup aims to develop a complementary method that accounts for the climate impacts of electricity procurement outside inventory boundaries.</p> <p>Two proposals developed by the Scope 2 Consequential Subgroup were described:</p> <p>Proposal 1: A "routine," performance-oriented consequential metric combining induced consumption and avoided emissions.</p> <p>Proposal 2: A project-level accounting approach aligned with existing project protocols.</p> <p>Via a pulse check poll, ISB members indicated support for the development of consequential accounting tools for the electricity sector, and agreed that consequential assessments can be valuable, however several also raised concerns that the framework, as proposed, could allow for significant overestimation of impacts from generation projects. Members highlighted the additionality criteria as an area that will require closer examination to ensure appropriate guardrails.</p> <p>Members also stressed the importance of clarity of purpose and robustness of methodology. The proposed method needs to have a clear role in relation to other electricity-related reporting methods and needs an equivalent level of rigor to ensure appropriate use.</p> <p><i>Revised Inventory Methods and Feasibility Provisions</i></p> <p>The secretariat summarized updates to the location-based and market-based methods. The ISB was briefed on key elements of the proposed consolidated draft, including on hourly matching and deliverability requirements for market-based instruments and feasibility measures (estimated load profiles, load-based exemption thresholds, legacy contract clauses and limited volumetric exemptions).</p> <p>ISB members expressed strong directional support for the Scope 2 revision draft, including unanimous backing for hourly matching under</p>	The ISB was not asked to make any decisions.

	<p>MBM. Feedback affirmed confidence in the overall framing, with recognition that implementation details remain critical.</p> <p>Some ISB members voiced concerns around volumetric exemptions, the framing of threshold-based exemptions and potential misalignment between what the standard permits and how corporate claims are publicly interpreted.</p> <p>ISB members emphasized that implementation details are central and encouraged continued work to refine and document these mechanisms.</p> <p>The Secretariat will share the ISB feedback with the TWG and prepare and submit the revised Scope 2 revision draft and marginal emission impact metric and accompanying memos for the ISB to review in the July ISB meeting.</p>	
5	<p><i>Land Sector and Removals: Forest Carbon Accounting</i></p> <p>The Secretariat introduced members of the EY team that are supporting the Secretariat in managing the Forest Carbon Accounting (FCA) TWG and presented an overview of the two Forest Carbon Accounting Approaches under consideration: Managed Land Proxy “Plus” (MLP+) and Activity Based Accounting (ABA).</p> <p>The Secretariat presented an overview of the different elements of the FCA TWG proposals associated with each approach respectively, highlighting the distinctions in how each addresses key elements within the general quantification approach (carbon pools, spatial boundary of analysis, temporal boundary analysis, separation of anthropogenic and natural effects, baseline considerations, methodology, data requirements, and additional considerations). The Secretariat further provided an overview of the different elements and the advantages and disadvantages of each methodology against the GHG Protocol Decision-Making Criteria as identified by FCA TWG members. The Secretariat noted that the FCA TWG did not have time to pilot test both approaches, nor adapt the approaches to region- or country-specific contexts.</p> <p>ISB members provided feedback and discussed the best method for moving forward on assessing the approaches.</p>	The ISB was not asked to make any decisions.
6	<p><i>All Other Business</i></p> <p>The Secretariat announced that the <i>Technical Working Group Membership Memo</i> for June 2025 will be circulated for e-vote.</p>	<p>Decision:</p> <p>E-vote (concluded 30 June 2025): The ISB unanimously approved TWG membership updates to the Corporate Standard, Scope 2, and AMI TWGs.</p> <p>Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 ET / 17:00 CET

Members Voting Electronically (Agenda Item #6)

1. Alex Bassen, Chair
2. Anthony Cheung
3. Danny Cullenward
4. Pieter Gagnon
5. Suzanne Greene
6. Owen Hewlett
7. Christina Hood
8. Stuart Jefford
9. Heather Keith
10. Viola Lutz
11. Paul Munter