

Actions and Market Instruments Meeting Minutes

Full TWG, Meeting #2.08

Date: September 9, 2026

Time: 9:00-11:00 am EST

Location: Virtual meeting

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members

1. Takako Aramaki, Panasonic Operational Excellence, Co., Ltd.
2. Ana Isabel Aubad Lopez, Atmosphere Alternative
3. Matthew Brander, University of Edinburgh
4. Giulia Camparsi, Science Based Targets initiative
5. Kim Carnahan, Center for Green Market Activation
6. Andres Casallas, World Business Council for Sustainable Development
7. Jonathan Crook, Carbon Market Watch
8. Cynthia Cummis, Clime Co
9. Thomas Day, NewClimate Institute
10. Nermin Eltouny, Integral Consult
11. Autumn Fox, Mars
12. Michael Gillenwater, Greenhouse Gas Management Institute
13. Tim Hamers, ERGaR - European Renewable Gas Registry
14. Sitnour Hassan Mohamed Hassan, Sudanese Standards and Metrology Organization / ISO WG4
15. Grant Ivison-Lane, Terra Newt
16. Injy Johnstone, University of Oxford
17. Timothy Juliani, WWF US
18. Hiromi Kawamata, The Japan Iron and Steel Federation
19. Stephen Lamm, BloomEnergy
20. Inken Ohlsen, AP Moller Maersk
21. Silvana Paniagua, SustainCERT SA/ Value Change Initiative
22. Thuy Phung, PepsiCo
23. Jason Pierce, Eastman
24. Spencer Powell, Just Climate
25. Patric Puetz, Smart Freight Centre
26. Steven Rosenzweig, General Mills
27. Josh Taylor, ISEAL
28. William Tyndall, AJW Inc.
29. Mikela Waldman, Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (IC-VCM)

Guests

1. Ibrahim Eryazici, ANSI_USA / ISO WG4 Project leader
2. Puvaneswari Ramasamy, Global Tunikara Sdn Bhd / ISO WG4

GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Yumzhana Daneeva
2. Kevin Kurkul
3. Ralf Pfitzner

Documents referenced

1. Request for Information (RFI) summary report
2. ISO 14064-1 Working Draft 2 (WD2), to be shared in full with TWG members following the meeting
3. AMI subgroup Miro boards (remain open for TWG member comment)

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	<i>Welcome and housekeeping</i> The Secretariat opened the meeting and welcomed TWG members, including a member attending a full TWG meeting for the first time.	No specific outcomes.
2	<i>RFI summary report – findings for Phase 2</i> The Secretariat presented the final summary report of the Request for Information (RFI), the results by question, the five key findings and the proposed Phase 2 priorities on the way to the draft Standard. Members discussed options for road testing the draft Standard and the relative standing of Statements 1 and 2.	No specific outcomes.
3	<i>ISO 14064 WD2 feedback related to AMI</i> The ISO Working Group 4 project leader presented the feedback of ISO WG4 on ISO 14064-1 Working Draft 2 (WD2) as it relates to AMI topics, focusing on Statement 2, together with the rationale for the positions taken. Members discussed the process and status of the joint standard, its principles and multi-statement structure, Statement 2 requirements, chain-of-custody and traceability requirements, and claims.	No specific outcomes.
4	<i>Workplan until end of year</i> The Secretariat presented the updated timeline towards a first complete draft of the AMI Standard and the key dates through publication, and members discussed how they can contribute during the drafting period.	No specific outcomes.
5	<i>Subgroup status</i> The Secretariat presented readouts from the subgroups convened over the preceding weeks, setting out the topics agreed, the open questions and the next steps for each subgroup	No specific outcomes.

Summary of discussion and outcomes

1. Welcome and housekeeping

- The Secretariat opened the meeting and welcomed TWG members, including a member attending a full TWG meeting for the first time (Slides 1–8)

Summary of discussion

- No points of discussion were raised by members.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

2. RFI summary report – findings for Phase 2

- The Secretariat presented the final summary report of the Request for Information (RFI), the results by question, the five key findings and the proposed Phase 2 priorities on the way to the draft Standard (Slides 9–21)

Summary of discussion

- Several members emphasized the importance of road testing or pilot testing the draft Standard, including with certification schemes and standard setters and not only with reporting companies, and warned that omitting a testing step would be a disservice to users.
 - Several members and their organizations offered to dedicate additional time to testing.
 - A member noted that TWG members and their organizations could road test the draft, but that a more formal road-testing process would be preferable.
 - Another member suggested a two-stage approach, with internal testing during drafting to challenge concepts and a formal road test alongside the public consultation.
 - Another member suggested building on existing standards and guidance that have already been tested in practice.
 - The Secretariat responded that internal testing with the TWG is within the plan, particularly once a complete draft of the Standard is available, that whether a formalized public-facing pilot process can be run in parallel with the public consultation and guidance development in 2027 can be evaluated.
- A member asked how the Secretariat determines which issues require policy neutrality, and in particular whether Statement 1 and Statement 2 are to be treated as being of equal importance.
 - The Secretariat responded that the AMI Standard can enable Statement 2 to have equal potential standing through quality criteria, safeguards and careful use of language, without promoting particular instruments.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

3. ISO 14064 WD2 feedback related to AMI

- The ISO Working Group 4 project leader presented the feedback of ISO WG4 on ISO 14064-1 Working Draft 2 (WD2) as it relates to AMI topics, focusing on Statement 2, together with the rationale for the positions taken (Slides 23–40)

Summary of discussion

Process and status

- Some Members asked how ISO feedback would be weighed against the feedback received from the TWG and through the RFI.
 - The Secretariat responded that there is no weighing between modes of feedback and that each topic would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Some members asked whether the joint GHG Protocol and ISO standard will be freely available.
- The Secretariat responded that the joint standard shall continue to be free for reporters while noting that the position might differ for consultants or organizations using it for commercial purposes.
- A member asked whether the TWG will be able to see working documents for the other standards being developed under the GHG Protocol and ISO partnership, noting that ISO-led work on product carbon footprints has implications for the AMI Standard.

Principles and structure

- The guest reported that Working Group 4 reached consensus to remove conservativeness as a principle, on the basis that it conflicts with accuracy, and to remove permanence, on the basis that

Statements 1 and 2 use an annual net carbon stock change approach consistent with IPCC methodology, while Statement 3 references external standards such as ISO 14064-2.

- The guest reported consensus in Working Group 4 to retain the multi-statement structure, consensus that Statement 4 is out of scope of ISO 14064-1, and consensus that Statement 1 is mandatory, with a minority position paper arguing otherwise.
- The guest reported that there is no consensus on dual reporting for Scope 2, that the working group was evenly split and that two options are therefore retained in the text, with data availability in developing countries cited as a consideration.
- The guest reported that the working group concluded that the statements are not mutually exclusive, and that on the naming of the statements the term Physical GHG Inventory received 25 of 44 votes compared with 15 for Location-based GHG Inventory. These figures are results of ISO Working Group 4 processes and are not indicative poll results of the AMI TWG.
- A member asked how the carbon stock accounting approach proposed for Statements 1 and 2 removes the need for a permanence principle, and whether the underlying text would be shared.
 - The presenter responded that WD2 contains the detail on biogenic emissions and land use, and the Secretariat confirmed that the full text would be shared after the meeting.

Statement 2

- The guest explained that Statement 2 is treated as a complete, standalone contractual or market-based inventory rather than as an adjustment to Statement 1,
- The guest explained that the residual mix concept applies for Scope 2 and that a new residual product concept is introduced for Scope 1 and Scope 3 in Annex N.3.
- The guest explained that WD2 does not set additionality criteria for Statement 2 and that the question is left open for the TWG, and that Table N.1 has been removed from Annex N, with the requirements now set out in the body text.
- No points of discussion were raised by members.

Chain of custody and traceability

- The guest explained that, for Statement 1, the permitted chain-of-custody models are identity preserved, segregated, controlled blending and mass balance on a rolling average basis subject to conditions, and that physical presence and physical delivery are required.
- The guest explained that Statement 2 permits mass balance and book-and-claim subject to Annex N.3, including conformance with recognised chain-of-custody standards, with ISO 22095-2 and ISO 22095-3 cited as examples rather than as normative references, an origination period of no more than 12 months for temporal matching, avoidance of double counting and over-attribution, and the use of residual product factors. Book-and-claim carries additional requirements, including an independent registry, unique claims, retirement or cancellation, emission factors based on physical quantities, and third-party verification, the latter expressed as a recommendation because ISO cannot mandate third-party verification.
- Some members expressed opposition to requiring chain-of-custody systems to comply with ISO 22095, on the grounds that it does not reflect how established chain-of-custody systems operate in practice and that the standard sits behind a paywall.
 - The presenter clarified that ISO 22095 is presented as an example not as a normative reference.
- A member asked who would recognize or benchmark recognized chain-of-custody standards.
 - The presenter suggested that this could be a role for auditors.
- Some members questioned why the additional requirements are specified for book-and-claim rather than applying generally to all chain-of-custody models.
- A member raised the difficulty of continually re-baselining a market-based inventory as supplier-specific or producer-specific emission factors become available and asked how the enhanced substitution approach would be treated.
 - The presenter responded that the issue or rebaselining had not been considered but that a policy could be developed to avoid the perception enhanced substitution as avoided emissions.

Claims

- The guest explained that claims fall outside the remit of the relevant ISO committee and that Working Group 4 has not proposed claim language.

- No points of discussion were raised by members

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

4. Workplan until end of year

- The Secretariat presented the updated timeline towards a first complete draft of the AMI Standard and the key dates through publication (Slides 42–43)

Summary of discussion

- A member asked how TWG members could be most useful as a sounding board on difficult topics during the drafting period.
 - The Secretariat responded that it expects to use asynchronous straw polling for topics that can be condensed into a clear set of options and that operate relatively in isolation, that it may convene a subgroup where a topic is substantial, particularly where one requirement is upstream of several others.
- A member requested that polls and requests for input focus on the rationale and justification for each option, including for options not listed.
 - The Secretariat agreed and noted that rationale will be a necessary component of how decisions are communicated to the Independent Standards Board.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

5. Subgroup status

- The Secretariat presented readouts from the subgroups convened over the preceding weeks, setting out the topics agreed, the open questions and the next steps for each subgroup (Slides 45–52)

Summary of discussion

Double counting and mutual exclusivity

- A member asked whether text defining the intersections could be shared.
 - The Secretariat responded that the work to date was conducted through case studies and examples rather than requirements language, and that requirements language is in development following the subgroup meetings.

Additionality and impact

- A member asked for an explanation of the timing, common practice and barrier tests.
 - Members provided definitions and a published paper describing these and other tests was shared with the group.
- A member cautioned that common practice and market penetration tests do not work in all contexts, for example where the market is difficult to define or where there is significant heterogeneity within a product category or type of intervention, and that the investment and barrier tests should therefore not be framed as relevant only where a common practice test is not met.
 - The Secretariat agreed that it is difficult to describe a benchmark for common practice in each market.
- Members noted difficulties in applying the legal test to attributes generated through national or jurisdictional systems where producers are legally required to comply, and difficulties in applying the common practice test where a certification programme is saturated within a given region.
 - A member suggested that many interventions, particularly at farm level, are reversible, and that failing to recognise existing practice could create an incentive to discontinue and later re-adopt good practices.

- A member noted in response that the next step in such cases would be the barrier or investment test.
- A member suggested that misunderstandings remain about additionality and why it is required.
- A member asked if the additionality requirement applied to Statement 2 are distinct from Statement 3.
 - The Secretariat responded that additionality must be present in Statement 3 and that a majority of the members participating in the subgroup considered that there should be at least impact requirements for Statement 2. The Secretariat described the direction of travel as being that what is reported in Statement 2 should have a demonstrated impact going beyond business as usual.

Traceability

- A member framed the underlying issue as how to treat regulatory programmes that are not effective in furthering mitigation.
 - The Secretariat noted the need to distinguish between regulations that legally prescribe a particular technology and regulations that set a quota with associated incentives and penalties, and that the objective is to avoid excluding instruments that create an impact on a formalistic view while ensuring that 'business as usual' is not made eligible in Statement 2.
- A member suggested that there are cases in which companies wish to source particular commodities but the traceability challenges are too complex, that requiring additionality in Statement 2 adds further complexity because continued investment is needed even where practices have been in place for a long time.
 - A member suggested that the interface between additionality and traceability would benefit from ongoing testing against specific examples and programmes so that such programmes do not fall through the cracks.

Statement 2 design

- A member raised a concern that disaggregation continues to increase complexity.
 - The Secretariat suggested that complexity is a concern but that disaggregated data is needed for verifiability, while what should be publicly disclosed remains to be determined.
- The Secretariat noted that the appropriate approach on one topic frequently depends on the approach taken to other topics, which is a principal reason for consolidating the subgroup outputs into a single comprehensive first draft.

Statement 3 design

- No points of discussion raised by members.

Statement 2 claims

- No points of discussion raised by members.

Statement 3 claims

- Members commented on the use of the term reduced emissions rather than avoided emissions in the proposed claim language, and a member suggested that Statement 3 claims should refer to an estimation of avoided emissions.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- No specific outcomes.

6. Wrap-up and next steps

- The Secretariat closed the meeting by summarising the next steps on drafting the Standard and confirming the arrangements for the next TWG call (Slide 53)

Summary of discussion

- No points of discussion were raised by members.

Outcomes (e.g., recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will share the full text of ISO 14064-1 Working Draft 2 with TWG members following the meeting, together with the recording, the slides and the meeting minutes.
- TWG members are invited to provide comments on the open subgroup questions through the subgroup Miro boards, which remain open.
- Next TWG call: Wednesday, October 7, 2026 (TWG Meeting 2.09).