Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform

Governing Committee Meeting Minutes | May 28, 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
May 28, 2025 | 10:00AM – 12:00 AM US Eastern Time | Meeting #23

Attendees (via Teams):

Governing Committee Members:

- Alexia Kelly (High Tide Foundation)
- Andrew Chen (RMI)
- Cynthia Cummis (Deloitte)
- Derik Broekhoff (SEI)
- Devon Lake (Meta)
- Jordan Faires (EDF)
- Kerry Constabile (Amazon)
- Peter Skovly (Maersk)
- Silvana Paniagua (SustainCert)
- Tim Juliani (WWF)

Observers:

- Jonathon Alcock (Verra)
- Brad Schallert (Winrock)
- Nemi Vora (Amazon)
- Kai Nino Streicher (Consultant)

Secretariat:

- Verena Radulovic (C2ES)
- Rebecca Berg (C2ES)
- Kim Carnahan (GMA)
- Kristen Mertens (GMA/Engie)
- Sam Pearl-Schwartz (GMA)
- Stacey McCluskey (GMA)
- Andrew Alcorta (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. Kim Carnahan announced that Holly Lahd is transitioning to a part-time contractor role with the AIM Platform. She also introduced Kristen Mertens and Andrew Alcorta, who have joined the team to help finalize publications.
3. Sam Pearl Schwartz updated the group on the AIM Platform timeline and the tentative dates votes will take place on the Association Test and Quality, Accounting, and Reporting (QAR) Criteria.
    a. One Observer asked if the Electricity Annex will be included in the upcoming Association Test vote
        i. Sam Pearl Schwartz confirmed that the Electricity Annex will be included and noted that a draft will be available for review in the coming weeks.

Quality, Accounting, and Reporting (QAR) Criteria

1. Kim Carnahan introduced the Quality, Accounting, and Reporting (QAR) Criteria. Kim explained that the QAR development is taking longer due to its sector-agnostic design and broad scope.
2. Kristen Mertens outlined the current structure of the QAR document. Noted that the structure mirrors the layout of the Association Test for consistency.
3. Kristen Mertens noted the original Criteria 3 - 11 have been reorganized for improved clarity and auditability in the QAR. Noted that no new criteria have been added. Kristen noted that a few of the newly re-organized criteria would be discussed today.
    a. Validation and Verification
        i. One Governing Committee member raised concerns over using the term “Validation and Verification”, suggesting “Assurability” may be more accurate.
            1. Kristen Mertens noted “Validation and Verification” is a shorthand term for this requirement for readability and ease of discussion, with a separate "Assurability" requirement already included separately.
            2. Kim Carnahan explained that Validation is part of the initial check before anything is done further and that the terms could be revisited based on Governing Committee feedback.

ii. One Governing Committee member recommended adding a glossary and emphasized the need to explain how the concepts discussed here relate to the accounting approach(es) chosen.
iii. One Observer noted the hierarchy was helpful and recommended also clarifying levels of detail between standards (e.g., GHGp vs. VCS)
iv. One Governing Committee member suggested referencing external documents (if they exist) that detail the specifics on what standards/ methodologies cover, instead of AIM building the full structure.
    1. Kristen Mertens noted that this is a roadblock the Secretariat has run into for multiple criteria with balancing finding external lists versus the AIM Secretariat building something out itself
v. One Governing Committee member questioned that the audience of the draft seemed to be the intervention host and suggested that it should be written with the buyer/reporting company as the audience instead.
    1. Two Governing Committee members emphasized the need to focus on intervention-level impact when considering the audience, not stakeholder role
vi. One Governing Committee member asked if Validation needed to be included, or if Verification was the more important piece.
    1. One Observer and one Governing Committee member disagreed, noting that including Validation is important for some interventions
vii. There was discussion among the group over whether some of the requirements laid out under Verification and Validation should be recommended best practice for some sectors and intervention types rather than a requirement

b. *Stakeholder Engagement and Safeguards*
    i. Kristen Mertens noted that in the drafting of the original stakeholder engagement criteria there was concerns over auditability. Kristen noted that the revised requirement outlines a) a minimum group of categories that need to be assessed and b) provides examples of standards and frameworks that may meet the categories. AIM will not approve external standards, but auditors will verify alignment.
    ii. One Observer warned that vague terms like "sound stakeholder engagement" are hard to audit; specific language is needed.
    iii. Kim Carnahan and Verena Radulovic proposed differentiating requirements based on sector/intervention type relevance

c. *Accurate Emissions Outcome*
    i. One Governing Committee member supported the requirement, but noted many standards may not meet this requirement
    ii. Two Governing Committee members urged clarification on attributional versus consequential and how that impacts this requirement
        1. One Observer suggested hybrid accounting

d. Regulatory Surplus
    i. One Observer asked for the reasoning for including regulatory surplus
    ii. There was discussion among the group over the flow chart the AIM Secretariat proposed for regulatory surplus and whether the requirement should be assumed to be met if the reporting company purchased the physical good/service

e. *Unique Right to Report*
    i. There was discussion among the group on the difference between right to report and ownership. Noted that the AIM Platform needs to clearly differentiate between the two.

<u>Revisiting Criterion 2 and Aggregation Levels</u>

1. Sam Pearl Schwartz noted this topic will be revisited during the June 11 meeting due to a lack of time at this meeting.

<u>Association Test Positive List</u>

1. Sam Pearl Schwartz noted that the pilot test used in the Association Test was a draft and that the Secretariat had committed to developing a method for developing and maintaining and updated list. Sam noted that the Secretariat has engaged in conversations with Mission Possible Partnership and Sightline Climate. However, those organization either don't have the bandwidth or expertise to own the Positive List in its entirety
2. Sam Pearl Schwartz outlined the 5 possible paths the AIM Secretariat sees for the Positive List: 1) continue trying to find an external partner to own the list, 2) find an external list to point to, 3) develop the list internally with stakeholder consultation, 4) develop and maintain the list internally with an expert evaluation committee and stakeholder consultation, 5) simplifying the hard-to-abate method.

a. Four Governing Committee members agreed with simplifying the hard-to-abate sector method
b. One Observer asked if the Secretariat has looked at global emission factor dataset and setting that as the baseline for the decarbonization threshold
    i. One Governing Committee member argued for maintaining the decarbonization threshold with more clarification as to how the threshold was established. Noted that it could outline best practice for each sector
c. Three Governing Committee members noted that the AIM Platform should keep the Positive List in some form

Next Steps

1. Sam Pearl Schwartz noted two upcoming ways to engage with the AIM Secretariat: London Climate Week and Gold Standard's biennial Climate Action for People and Nature in Paris

Meeting concluded at approximately 11:55AM US Eastern Time.