Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform

Governing Committee Meeting Minutes | April 22, 2025

An initiative jointly developed by:

C2ES
CENTER FOR CLIMATE AND ENERGY SOLUTIONS

CENTER FOR GREEN MARKET ACTIVATION

Gold Standard®

The Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Governing Committee
April 22, 2025 | 10:00AM – 12:00 AM US Eastern Time | Meeting #22

Attendees (via Teams):

Governing Committee Members:

- Alexia Kelly (High Tide Foundation)
- Andrew Chen (RMI)
- Cynthia Cummis (Deloitte)
- Derik Broekhoff (SEI)
- Devon Lake (Meta)
- Elena Schmidt (RSB)
- Jordan Faires (EDF)
- Kelley Kizzier (Bezos Earth Fund)
- Kerry Constabile (Amazon)
- Lisa Spetz (H&M)
- Peter Skovly (Maersk)
- Silvana Paniagua (SustainCert)
- Tim Juliani (WWF)

Observers:

- Jonathon Alcock (Verra)
- Brad Schallert (Winrock)
- Nemi Vora (Amazon)
- Peter Sandkuehler (Dow)
- Elijah Innes-Wimsatt (Conservation International)

Secretariat:

- Verena Radulovic (C2ES)
- Rebecca Berg (C2ES)
- Owen Hewlett (Gold Standard)
- Kim Carnahan (GMA)
- Laura Hutchinson (GMA)
- Kristen Mertens (GMA/Engie)
- Sam Pearl-Schwartz (GMA)
- Holly Lahd (GMA)
- Stacey McCluskey (GMA)
- Dan Smith (GMA)

Discussion Topics:

Recap of last Governing Committee Meeting

1. Sam Pearl Schwartz welcomed the Governing Committee to the meeting. Sam provided an overview of the meeting agenda.
2. Sam Pearl Schwartz reviewed what was discussed at the March 25th Governing Committee meeting. Noted that the Governing Committee approved the revised Governance Documents and three new Governing Committee members at the March meeting. The AIM Platform Secretariat also previewed the Accounting and Reporting portion of the AIM Standard and Guidance.
3. Sam Pearl Schwartz welcomed the three new Governing Committee members: Silvana Paniagua, Kerry Constabile, and Andrew Chen.

AIM Timeline Update

1. Sam Pearl Schwartz provided a high-level overview of progress made during the Association Test Pilot Process. Noted that the fourth pilot meeting was held last week and now the pilot process is moving on to drafting case studies.
2. Sam Pearl Schwartz proposed that the Governing Committee members join the last pilot call on May 15th to hear directly from companies on how the Association Test worked for them.
    a. There was broad consensus from the Governing Committee that hearing directly from pilot testers would be immensely helpful for the Governing Committee.
    b. Holly Lahd asked the Governing Committee what they would like to hear from pilot testers. Governing Committee members noted that it would be helpful to hear what's working with the Association Test, as well as any challenges or gaps pilot participants have encountered.
3. Sam Pearl Schwartz outlined the current timeline for finishing the full AIM Platform Standard and Guidance. Noted that, due to the amount of technical and substantive topics that need to be fleshed out, the AIM Secretariat proposes introducing another Governing Committee meeting in addition to the May 15th meeting where Governing Committee members speak with pilot participants.
    a. There was alignment among Governing Committee members that another meeting in June made sense.

Revisiting Criterion 2

1. Holly Lahd provided an outline of the challenges to Criterion 2 as currently drafted. Holly reminded the Governing Committee that the original intent of Criterion 2 was to prevent over-procuring. However, through the pilot process, the AIM Secretariat has identified multiple situations where conformance with a strict, volume of product-based approach to Criterion 2 would be prohibitively difficult.
2. Holly Lahd noted that the Governing Committee needs to determine the future of Criterion 2 and the AIM Secretariat sees four possible paths forward. Holly outlined and described the pros and cons with each of the four paths.
    a. Path 1: maintain Criterion 2 as is with no additional flexibility
        i. One Governing Committee member asked for an approximation of how many interventions Criterion 2, as currently written, would work for. Holly Lahd guessed that it probably works for about 10% of interventions.
        ii. Multiple Governing Committee members agreed that addressing emissions is already challenging enough (cost, counterparty identification and engagement, technology availability, contractual complexity, project implementation challenges, measurement challenges). There was discussion on whether AIM should have different criteria for different sectors to address this.
    b. Path 2: maintain Criterion 2 but add a pathway to estimate conformance with Criterion 2 if you if you don't have matching units and emission factor coverage
        i. Two Governing Committee members expressed approval of this approach.
        ii. One Governing Committee member asked, as these paths get more flexible, if there was concerns over the ability to assure results. Holly Lahd noted that the AIM Platform Secretariat is working with an assurance provider to test the assurability of the Association Test.
        iii. There was a discussion among Governing Committee members on how to best balance the commercial feasibility and intervention sizing.
    c. Path 3: Maintain Criterion 2 as is if you have matching units and emission factor coverage. But, if a company doesn't have matching units and emission factor coverage, they can address up to the total emissions for a given component or subcomponent

    d. Path 4: Change Criteria 2 to say that companies can address up to the total emissions for a given component or subcomponent. Remove the tie to what is physically possible by a given technology
3. Holly Lahd asked what path(s) the Governing Committee thinks would be best to test
    a. The Governing Committee debated the benefits of Path 4 with the perception that it could be considered too loose and akin to BVCM. Members debated the AIM Platform theory of change and if the goal is to scale investment quickly by avoiding barriers when possible.
    b. There was consensus among many Governing Committee members that a hierarchy of the Paths may be an appropriate way forward. This approach was likened to GHGP's hierarchy for Scope 3 data sources, where companies work to move up the hierarchy over time and in the sectors and categories where it is possible.
        i. Sam Pearl Schwartz noted that the meeting chat seems interested in seeing what a hierarchy approach to this could look like. Proposed taking this offline as homework for the AIM Secretariat and coming back for further discussion and a vote.

<u>Revisiting Electricity in the Association Test</u>

1. Holly Lahd noted that feedback from Governing Committee members and Association Test pilot testers requested special consideration for electricity. Noted that electricity is unique for a variety of reasons, including that it can be produced by a variety of technologies, produced in every country, cannot be a “component” as defined by the Association Test (it would be in scope 2), and is not a widely traded commodity.
    a. As a result, the AIM Secretariat believes that there needs to an Electricity-specific annex to the Association Test
2. Holly Lahd outlined how electricity currently works in the Association Test as written and the issues with that.
3. Holly Lahd provided a readout of the electricity annex and how it fixes the problems electricity runs into under the current version of the Association Test.
    a. There was consensus among Governing Committee members that the direction the AIM Secretariat was taking the electricity guidance made sense.
4. Holly Lahd noted that a written version of the Electricity Annex is under development and will be shared with Governing Committee members and a broadly group of expert reviewers in the coming weeks.

Preview: Quality Criteria

1. Kim Carnahan noted that the AIM Platform Secretariat is looking at the Accounting and Reporting criteria again to consider if they should still be included in the final publication and to identify any outstanding questions.

Next Steps

1. Stacey McCluskey reminded Governing Committee members to sign their member agreement and conflict-of-interest statement if not already done.
2. Stacey McCluskey provided an overview of the next meeting agenda.

Meeting concluded at approximately 12:02PM US Eastern Time.