

# Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform

Meeting Minutes – October 30, 2024

An initiative jointly developed by:



**Gold Standard**<sup>®</sup>

The Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Governing Committee  
October 30, 2024 | 10:00AM – 12:00 PM US Eastern Time | GC Meeting #17

**Attendees (via Teams):**

Governing Committee Members:

- Alexia Kelly (High Tide Foundation)
- Tim Juliani (WWF)
- Devon Lake (Meta)
- Cynthia Cummis (Deloitte)
- Kai Nino Streicher (SustainCert)
- Kelley Kizzier (Bezos Earth Fund)
- Lisa Spetz (H&M)
- Derik Broekhoff (SEI)
- Jordan Faires (EDF)
- Peter Skovly (Maersk)

Invited Observers:

- Brad Schallert (Winrock International)
- Elijah Innes-Wimsatt (CI)
- Ingrid Irigoyen (Aspen)
- Mike Taptich (Amazon)
- Laura Hutchinson (RMI)

AIM Organizers:

- Kim Carnahan (GMA)
- Dan Magrath (GS)
- Owen Hewlett (GS)
- Verena Radulovic (C2ES)
- Sam Pearl-Schwartz (GMA)
- Holly Lahd (GMA)
- Stacey McCluskey (GMA)

## Discussion Topics:

### 1) Climate Week GC Recap

- a. Kim reminded the GC about discussions had during the last GC meeting. This included a discussion on how to communicate the logic of Criterion 1
  - i. How do we ensure our approach solves key barriers in Scope 3 decarb and manages credibility risks
  - ii. How do we talk about the logic of criterion 1 to external audiences
  - iii. Do we need to adjust any of our approaches to ensure we're covering interventions in all sectors (including electricity?)
  - iv. How do we define the term value chain?
- b. Kim also quickly re-presented the matrix that the GC discussed last meeting around how to map the various approaches to requirements (for ambition for example).
- c. Finally, Kim presented major takeaways from that discussion, including:
  - i. The continuing open questions about our supply shed definition
  - ii. Renaming criterion 1 to the Association Test
  - iii. The need for real world examples to test the functionality/viability of the Association Test
    1. AIM Organizers had asked GC members to share their real world interventions to begin this testing process – will be developed into a more formal piloting process (see below)

### 2) Updated Workplan

- a. Kim noted that stakeholder feedback has identified 3 major roadblocks
  - i. Lack of clarity on how you define/identify an inventory component
  - ii. Lack of clarity on acceptable level of inventory component-inventory matching (outside of transport sector)
  - iii. Lack of clarity on our supply shed definition and the idea of like production processes
- b. Kim shared the work items to be completed by Secretariat (Organizers) for discussion by GC
  - i. Define components and subcomponents (both in terms of level of aggregation and in terms of level of activity matching)
  - ii. Revise the Close Association supply shed approach with a clearer definition, and possibly an ambition requirement
  - iii. Create a list of possible data sources and work examples

- c. Due to this long list of work items, Secretariat proposed to cancel the next GC meeting (currently set for November 21) to have more time to create a complete draft for review by GC

### 3) Preview of Current Work Revising Step Two of Association Test

- a. Kim presented three possible paths forward for revising the Supply Shed approach of Step 2 of the Association Test (aka Further Association)
  - i. Option 1: Keep the ‘produced in a like way’ as part of the supply shed definition, but really go back to the drawing board on improving definition clarity and thinking about how companies would actually prove this
  - ii. Option 2: adopting the VCI definition of supply shed and then adding some version of causality. I.e. can you prove that you made this mitigation occur?
  - iii. Option 3: in lieu of other options, is there something else we add to this (some form of ambition/additionality?)
- b. Group discussed the idea of adding causality or ambition. There were a variety of opinions and GC members did not fully align on a position
  - i. One GC member felt that adding any form of ambition requirement was not necessary, even if we aligned with VCI supply shed definition, because of the existence of Criterion 3.
  - ii. Multiple GC members supported aligning with the VCI definition – particularly around the importance of having a geographic component to the definition, which while implied is not guaranteed in the current language
  - iii. One GC member thought that what we should really be thinking about is adding an additionality requirement, because in theory causality should apply to all three approaches (proven supplier, supply shed, and positive list).
- c. Holly concluded this section by acknowledging that the organizers have more work to do on this and will come back to the GC with a more complete proposal. We have to consider causality, maybe have to consider bringing some aspects of the positive list or additionality to supply shed. Getting examples of how companies are currently defining supply shed will help us come to a conclusion

### 4) Revising Publication and Timeline Plan

- a. Holly presented the organizer's proposal for a new approach to writing and releasing a suite of AIM publications. Rather than releasing one full standard and guidance by Nov 2025, instead split it into three separate publications: 1) Association Test, 2) Accounting and Reporting, and 3) Assurance. The reasoning behind this is there is an urgent need for companies to have something out there for them to be able to point to and consider how they might make investments ASAP.
  - i. Kim noted that this is a pretty big change from what was discussed in the past. Some concerns have been raised that criteria 2-11 are integral to fully understanding the Association Test, so it would be bad to split them (some GC member agreed with this point), but just from a bandwidth perspective we think there's value in having something out there that we can run pilot tests on for the Association Test rather than waiting for the entire Standard and Guidance to be completed.
  - ii. Timeline would be:
    1. Association Test: Completed by May 2025, with a pilot testing process running from Jan-March
    2. Accounting and Reporting: Completed by Nov 2025 (which is the same as our initial timeline)
    3. Assurance: Into 2026, if/as needed
- b. GC largely aligned to agree with the phased approach, although said that we should adjust how we refer to the releases.
  - i. Because criteria 2-11 are so important to the application of the Association Test, when we release the Association Test for Pilot Testing, don't refer to it as a completed Standard (or Version 1.0). Goal should be to have an Association Test pilot testing draft that the GC can approve for testing by EOY so we can begin pilot testing in January
  - ii. While the Association Test pilot test runs organizers and GC will continue to revise criteria 2-11. TBD if we should run a pilot test on the criteria 2 – 11 guidance document (name TBD).
- c. There was significant discussion over whether the Assurance Standard/Guidance was necessary, what form it would take, etc. Some GC members felt it was not necessary if the criteria are written in an assurable way. Others felt it could be helpful but would make more sense as a guidance than as a standard

- i. Organizers will continue to think about this and will revisit with the GC when we have a better idea of what it might look like.

5) Next Steps

a. Organizers to:

- i. Write draft of Association Test guidance in November. The goal is to send the draft to GC members by December 2 so GC members can read and review thoroughly for discussion during the December 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - 1. Organizers may reach out to small groups of GC members for quick feedback during the writing period.
- ii. To prepare more detailed pilot testing plan schedule and testing materials
- iii. Cancel the scheduled November 21 GC call to prioritize drafting work

**b. GC requests:**

- i. Continue to send intervention examples and association test results and questions
- ii. Send examples of existing markets or sourcing regions that could be examples of supply sheds
- iii. Review pilot testing announcement (coming November) and consider participating in the pilot process. Share announcement with other potential participants

**Meeting concluded at approximately 11:25AM US Eastern Time.**