

Scope 2 TWG Meeting Minutes

Full TWG, Meeting #23

Date: October 6 2026

Time: 9:00 – 11:00 ET

Location: "Virtual" via Zoom

Attendees

Technical Working Group Members

1. Simone Accornero, Flexidao
2. Enam Akoetey-Eyiah, Africa Clean Energy Buyers
3. Avi Allison, Microsoft
4. Pete Budden, NRDC
5. Stephen Buskie, WBCSD
6. Charles Cannon, RMI
7. Yenhaw Chen, Taiwan Institute of Economic Research
8. Jules Chuang, Mt. Stonegate Green Asset Management Ltd.
9. Jessica Cohen, Constellation Energy Corporation
10. Killian Daly, EnergyTag
11. Ivan Debay, ISO representative
12. Stuti Dubey, The D-REC Organization (Global Energy Equity & Climate Action Foundation)
13. Nicholas Fedson, Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
14. Neil Fisher, The NorthBridge Group
15. Andrew Glumac, CDP
16. Zoe Godijn, Rio Tinto
17. Svend Brun Fjendbo Hansen, Ørsted
18. Mariné Iriart, Secretaria de Transición Energética - Gobierno de Córdoba
19. Peggy Kellen, Center for Resource Solutions
20. Matthew Konieczny, Watershed
21. Emma Konet, Tierra Climate
22. Erik Landry, Independent Consultant
23. Lissy Langer, Technical University of Denmark (DTU)
24. Kelly Lichter, PepsiCo
25. Liu Daoxin, State Grid China Corporation
26. Alain Mahieu, Singtel
27. J. Andrea Méndez Velásquez, Atmosphere Alternative
28. Gregory Miller, Singularity Energy
29. Heather Moore, ERM CVS (ISO)
30. Gisele Morgado Duarte da Paz, DNV Det Norske Veritas
31. Dania Piccioli, ISO representative
32. Yiwen Qiu, Independent
33. Henry Richardson, WattTime
34. Wilson Ricks, Clean Air Task Force
35. Alexandra Styles, HIR Hamburg Institut Research
36. Henrik Sundberg, H&M Group
37. Devon Swezey, Google
38. Kae Takase, Renewable Energy Institute
39. Markus Walther, CEBA
40. Linda Wamune, Energy Peace Partners
41. Sophia Wang, Gilead Sciences

Guests

1. Anne Grau, ISO Representative

GHG Protocol Secretariat

1. Michael Macrae
2. Chelsea Gillis
3. Melissa Landman
4. David Rich
5. Wenquan Zhang
6. Oliver James
7. Tim Mohin

GHG Protocol Independent Standards Board

1. Alexander Bassen, Chair of the Independent Standards Board

Documents referenced

1. Scope 2 - Presentation - 2026.10.06
2. TWG memo - MBM
3. TWG memo - LBM
4. Scope 2 Public Consultation Summary of Feedback
5. Consolidated Corporate Standard - Standard Development Plan (SDP)
6. ISO feedback: Comprehensive report for changes to Scope 2 from WD2 of ISO 14064-1

Item	Topic and Summary	Outcomes
1	Housekeeping The Secretariat outlined housekeeping and reviewed document sharing arrangements.	N/A
2	Goal of today's meeting The Secretariat reviewed the goals of the meeting.	N/A
3	Secretariat updates The Secretariat introduced changes to the Secretariat team and the facilitation support engaged for the October workshop.	N/A
4	Process updates The Secretariat reviewed the pathway from the close of the public consultation to the present meeting and the remaining workplan, then covered TWG member feedback from the August TWG survey on the market-based and location-based methods, the AMI multi-statement reporting framework, and the September ISB meeting. The TWG discussed the ISB's direction and the open questions referred to it.	N/A
5	In-person/hybrid TWG workshop (October 20-22, Washington DC) - draft agenda The Secretariat presented the objectives and draft topics for the October workshop.	N/A
6	ISO feedback on public consultation proposal An ISO representative presented ISO Working Group 4 feedback on the public consultation proposal and Working Draft 2 of ISO 14064-1.	N/A
7	Wrap-up and next steps The Secretariat shared next steps.	N/A

Summary of discussion and outcomes

1. Housekeeping

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat outlined housekeeping and confirmed that the recording, slides and minutes would be shared after the call.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- N/A

2. Goal of today's meeting

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat reviewed the goals of the meeting, being to review progress since the last TWG meeting across public consultation, ISO, TWG survey, and ISB feedback; to prepare for the October 20-22 TWG workshop; and to hear from an ISO representative on Working Group 4 feedback to the public consultation proposal.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- N/A

3. Secretariat updates

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat reported the departure of a staff member and introduced the GHG Protocol Chief Executive Officer, the Technical Director overseeing the standard development workstreams, and three further staff members assigned to support the Scope 2 workstream.
- The Secretariat announced that the Consensus Building Institute will provide facilitation support for the workshop.
- The Secretariat underscored the role of the TWG in carrying the process forward.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- N/A

4. Process updates

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat reviewed the pathway from the close of the public consultation to the present meeting, and the remaining workplan to produce the revised scope 2 standard, as part of the consolidated Corporate Standard, for public consultation in Q2 2027.
- The Secretariat advised that the ISB meeting on TWG outcomes has moved from November to December 15, 2026, with materials due to the ISB by December 5, 2026, and that Secretariat drafting in January 2027 is a consolidation exercise across the Corporate Standard, Scope 2, Scope 3 and Actions and Market Instruments workstreams.

4.1 TWG member feedback (August survey)

- The Secretariat recalled that in July the ISB asked the TWG for further work on both the market-based and location-based methods, and reviewed the questions put to members in the August survey on the overall direction of each method and on design and implementation details.

4.2 TWG member feedback August survey: MBM

- The Secretariat reported three broad perspectives in members' responses: Method 1 as the inventory method with Method 2 reported separately as a procurement or matching metric; Method 2 retained

as a tCO₂e inventory method with Method 1 optional or recommended; and a single market-based figure, with views differing on what it should measure.

- The Secretariat reported areas of convergence, including continuity for existing targets and investments, additional indicators on procurement characteristics, and further development of consequential accounting. Members' views differed on whether a two-metric approach removes the need for a legacy clause.

4.3 TWG member feedback August survey: LBM

- The Secretariat reported three core groups of alignment: granularity and scientific integrity; a standardized comparability baseline; and principles with restriction to authoritative sources.
- The Secretariat reported general alignment that, where independent data providers are permitted, they should meet criteria such as publicly documented calculation methodologies, version control and reproducible data pipelines. Further location-based discussion will take place at the October workshop.

4.4 The AMI multi-statement reporting framework

- The Secretariat set out how members' survey feedback maps onto the AMI multi-statement framework, explaining that the AMI TWG sets the framework and the purpose of each statement while the Scope 2 TWG develops the electricity-specific details.
- The Secretariat reported that at its September meeting the ISB unanimously supported developing an electricity-sector consequential accounting methodology for Statement 3, and unanimously supported starting that work in Q2 2027, with broad support for either a joint Scope 2 and AMI TWG subgroup or co-development with external partners. Decisions on resourcing and prioritization rest with the Steering Committee and Chief Executive Officer.
- A member asked about the timeline for determining the approach to electricity sector consequential accounting and whether that work would begin in 2027. The Secretariat responded that the AMI TWG must first complete its framework, anticipated by late 2026 or early 2027, and that advancing the work would also depend on sufficient funding, capacity, and potentially external partners.
- Members asked whether an impact quality criterion applies to Statement 2 alone or to all statements. The Secretariat responded that Statements 2 and 3 are both likely to carry an impact quality criterion and that impact may be assessed at system or market level in the aggregate. Members suggested that impact is a consequential concept and that the purpose of each statement has not been resolved.

4.5 September ISB meeting

- The Secretariat reviewed how the consultation, TWG survey, ISO and AMI feedback were synthesized into three options for the ISB. They reported that the ISB drew elements from all three into a hybrid proposal, agreed that Method 1 is what Scope 2 should transition to, with the pathway being the open question, and recorded a pulse check in which 10 of 10 ISB members indicated support. The Secretariat emphasized that a pulse check gives direction and is not a decision.
- The Secretariat reported the open questions referred to the TWG.
- Members asked how Method 1 applies to voluntary procurement relative to standard supply service, and how older resources under time-matched and deliverable contracts would be allocated. The Secretariat responded that these are among the questions referred to the TWG.
- Members asked whether a load threshold above which hourly matching would be required remains under discussion. The Secretariat responded that thresholds sit outside the Method 1 framework the ISB supported, and that whether the market-based method is required at all is itself an open question for the TWG.
- A member raised concerns that relying on "should" places the decision with the reporter, and that conditioning the requirement on data availability reproduces the differentiation that removing thresholds was intended to avoid. Members suggested that the strength of the requirement could depend on company size, that data availability should be assessed at market rather than company level, and that the standard should minimize points of interpretation. The Secretariat suggested that the TWG work the question through at the workshop.
- Members asked for clarification of the provision that, after the transition date, companies shall report using the new MBM (Method 1) if data meeting the quality criteria is available. The Secretariat responded that in this example, if a company is reporting market-based emissions they would be

required to use the new MBM, maintaining continuity with the 2015 Scope 2 Guidance under which the market-based method is not required in markets where qualifying data is unavailable.

- Members raised concerns about the inclusion of incrementality in Method 1, suggesting that earlier TWG polling had not supported it, that it is relevant to assessing impact but not necessary for allocating emissions attributes to consumption, and that it should sit outside the inventory. Members also asked why it applies only to Method 1. The Secretariat responded that incrementality was raised in the consultation as an element enabling a theory of change under which demand finances new clean capacity where and when it is consumed, that the ISB supported its inclusion on integrity and impact grounds, that it is open for development by the TWG, and that a memo setting out the options proposed by TWG members in the August survey will be shared.
- Members raised concerns that the direction departs from the TWG's earlier work and from the balance of consultation feedback, and asked whether the TWG can revisit the high-level design and whether members may engage directly with ISB members. The Secretariat responded that the ISB has given clear direction on the Method 1 parameters, that proposals improving implementation are welcome, that the consultation is not a voting exercise and that feedback is assessed against the decision-making criteria, and that it will consult the ISB Chair on member engagement and revert to the TWG.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- N/A

5. In-person/hybrid TWG workshop (October 20-22, Washington DC) - draft agenda

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat set out the workshop objectives, being to develop the details of both methods within the ISB's direction; to ground discussion in evidence on the earliest feasible date for the new MBM, identify regional data gaps and impacts to market investment; to explain how each recommendation from the TWG balances integrity, impact and feasibility; and to reach alignment on recommendations for the ISB on December 15, 2026, outlining options and reasoning where views differ.
- The Secretariat reviewed the draft workshop topics, covering reporting and disclosure requirements, transition dates, implementation details for the new MBM, the location-based emission factor hierarchy and definitions, and additional topics including residual mix, load profile shaping and key indicators. Materials will be circulated as drafts for members to build on in discussions.
- Members asked what work is expected of the TWG after the workshop. The Secretariat responded that some matters are likely to remain outstanding, that member input may be sought through ad hoc meetings or a written process.
- The Secretariat advised that the workshop will run through close of business on October 22, that participants will join both in person and online, and that ISO representatives will attend in person.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- N/A

6. ISO feedback on public consultation proposal

Summary of discussion

- An ISO representative explained that ISO and the GHG Protocol are developing a joint draft, with the GHG Protocol leading the drafting and ISO providing expert feedback followed by a vote of ISO national bodies.
 - On dual reporting, two options are retained as no new consensus was reached: Statement 1 mandatory with Statement 2 optional; or both mandatory where an EAC market exists within the market boundary.
 - On the location-based method, a source is considered credible if it is publicly accessible, free of use and from a recognized authority.
 - Working Group 4 raised concerns with the Working Draft 2 requirement to default to fossil fuel emission factors where residual mix data is unavailable, and proposed to use the grid average mix as the fallback, subject to boundary alignment and disclosure requirements.

- Working Group 4 reached full consensus to remove the Standard Supply Service criterion, on the grounds that it would require regulatory determinations that fall to national energy regulators and that the underlying anti-double-counting intent is already addressed through the residual mix mechanism.
- On temporal granularity, a three-level hierarchy was adopted, with monthly matching as the mandatory minimum, annual matching as a fallback subject to an anti-banking provision, and hourly matching optional. Mandatory hourly matching was rejected on feasibility and global applicability grounds.
- On market boundaries, a simplified principle-based framework was adopted and deliverability was removed as not practical.
- Members raised concerns that the ISO direction differs materially from the ISB direction and asked how the differences are to be reconciled, and asked about ISO governance, working group composition, and the evidence underlying the ISO position. The Secretariat responded that ISO feedback comes to the TWG to consider before recommendations go to the ISB.

Outcomes (e.g. recommendations, options)

- N/A

6. Wrap-up and next steps

Summary of discussion

- The Secretariat acknowledged the concerns raised during the meeting, and said that the direction proposed for discussion in the workshop differs from the proposal taken to public consultation because the process must respond to the consultation feedback, the ISO feedback and the Actions and Market Instruments multi-statement framework.

Outcomes (e.g., recommendations, options)

- The Secretariat will consult the ISB Chair on direct member engagement with the ISB and revert to the TWG.
- The Secretariat will circulate starting materials for the workshop in advance of October 20, 2026.