

Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform

Meeting Minutes – September 6, 2023

An initiative jointly developed by:



Gold Standard[®]

The Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Governing Committee

September 6, 2023 | GC Meeting #6

Attendees:

Governing Committee Members:

- Alexia Kelly (High Tide Foundation)
- Chris Davis (Amazon)
- Dan Smith (SFC)
- Devon Lake (Meta)
- Lisa Spetz (H&M Group)
- Pierre Bloch (VCI/SustainCERT)
- Tim Juliani (WWF)
- Peter Skovly (Maersk)

Invited Observers:

- Michael Macrae (GHGP)
- Brad Schallert (Winrock International)
- Jonathan Alcock (Verra)
- Laura Hutchison (RMI)

AIM Organizers:

- Kim Carnahan (GMA)
- Owen Hewlett (GS)
- Verena Radulovic (C2ES)
- Daniel Magrath (GS)
- Edmond Yi (GMA)
- Sam Pearl-Schwartz (GMA)

Logistics

Tentative schedule for GC meetings:

- Oct 11, Nov 1, Nov 21, Dec 13

Notes/Substantive Discussion:

Proposed AIM Platform Guidance Deliverables:

- Generally positive feedback from the GC on the structure of 2a and 2b (system and project based). Some questions about where the line is between systems and projects.
- One area of this delineation that needs clarification. Funding SAF refinery might be a project, but SFC is looking at the environmental attributes of that project and how it's accounted for in an inventory. Might need to address potential friction between 1) if an org funds a SAF refinery and is taking project credits for that, vs 2) double count from the output of that project, the EAC of the project itself.

Guiding Principles:

- Lots of commentary on #7 bullet 2: “address double counting within the value chain or with carbon markets.”
- Some belief on the need to clarify that we want appropriate rather than erroneous double counting given that the same emissions will be claimed by multiple parties. Maybe split the bullet point in two to talk about 1) avoiding erroneous double counting and 2) properly account for where emissions are in multiple inventories

Revised version of principles:

- Discussion around the term ‘value chain’. Value chain implies to some a physical connection between company and product, but value chain in the AIM context could be broader than that.
- Example of SAF: I’m an airline and I buy the EAC of SAF from a producer who's delivering the SAF to an airport in Helsinki. No physical contract with producer and airline doesn’t fly to Helsinki. Not part of airline's supply chain. Is the producer in airline's value chain? Some would say no. AIM Organizers argue you can take it up a level. No physical connection but jet fuel is in their value chain even if t
- Group seemed to align on there being a difference between 1) the value chain in which you operate vs 2) your value chain. Company value chain vs sectoral value chain. Might need some additional clarification in the wording

Discussion around aiming to engage direct supplier:

- General agreement that restricting to direct supplier risks a lack of feasibility of action. There are dozens of reasons why constraining to direct suppliers is going to limit. There’s a balance to be struck of starting there but then the standard allows companies to beyond direct suppliers

Bullet point #8: aligned with transition to net zero

- Some skepticism within the group of this type of virtue signaling language. Do we want to incentivize a switch from LSFO to LNG, or to a more ambitious solution? Many GC members worried that we don't have to overly restrict efficiency or marginal improvements given the need to reduce emissions rapidly