

# Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform

Meeting Minutes – September 5, 2024

An initiative jointly developed by:



**Gold Standard**<sup>®</sup>

# The Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Governing Committee

September 5, 2024 | 10:00AM – 12:00 PM US Eastern Time | GC Meeting #15

## **Attendees:**

### Governing Committee Members:

- Alexia Kelly (High Tide Foundation)
- Kelley Kizzier (BEF)
- Tim Juliani (WWF)
- Devon Lake (Meta)
- Peter Skovly (Maersk)
- Derik Broekhoff (SEI)
- Cynthia Cummis (Deloitte)

### Invited Observers:

- Brad Schallert (Winrock International)
- Candace Vinke (Verra)
- Laura Hutchinson (RMI)
- Ibrahim Eryazici (Dow)
- Andrew Prag (WMB)
- Thomas Koch Blank (RMI)

### AIM Organizers:

- Kim Carnahan (GMA)
- Owen Hewlett (GS)
- Verena Radulovic (C2ES)
- Dan Smith (GMA)
- Clayton Gerber (GMA)
- Sam Pearl-Schwartz (GMA)

## **Notes/Substantive Discussion:**

### **AIM Organizers presented the feedback on AIM Criteria 7-11**

#### **Criterion 7:**

- Discussion around the use of should vs shall with regards to the vintage requirement. General agreement that shall works as long as AIM also presents something like a reporting template along with the criterion to describe how you quantify, allocation, and register/report the impacts of an intervention.
- Discussion also around being able to accept some lack of certainty when we publish this. Acknowledge the pilot nature of some of this – highlight the last sentence about if deadlines cant be met as an area that we want to see further evidence on before coming to a final conclusion.
- Agreement from GC with organizers suggestion to leave vintage at 24 months and after a review period consider adjusting for specific sectors
- Agreement from GC that arbitrary deadlines for the vintage would drive perverse behavior

#### **Criterion 8**

- GC agreement with organizers suggestion to adjust language to more clearly describe our definition of when mitigation occurs.

#### **Criterion 9:**

- GC agreement with leaning heavily on 3<sup>rd</sup> party guidance – GS, ICVCM, etc for social safeguard requirements.
- Adjust language to highlight “appropriate and established best practice” rather than just “sound practice”
- Discussion around benefit sharing – GC acknowledged that some benefit sharing language makes sense but probably not too prescriptive as in some cases with these super expensive technologies there aren’t benefits to shrae

#### **Criterion 10:**

- Lots of discussion on the idea of a ‘reasonable link’
  - o Some GC organizers pointed out that requiring too much evidence for causality becomes difficult, or even handwavy. Probably best to avoid causality.

- Instead, focus on defining reasonable link – describe what you did and what changed (likely in a qualitative way rather than quantitative)
- Regarding aligning with GHGP LSRG:
  - General agreement from GC to reference LSRG for permanence, say the plan is to fully align when its complete, etc

**Criterion 11:**

- Lots of discussion about 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification. No clear conclusion, instead likely will need a subgroup discussion on what we are verifying to.

**Criterion 1:**

- Ran out of time to discuss. To come back to at the in-person GC call at climate week.
-