Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform

Governing Committee Meeting Minutes | July 23, 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
July 23, 2025 | 10:00AM – 12:00 AM US Eastern Time | Meeting #25

Attendees (via Teams):

Governing Committee Members:

- Cynthia Cummis (Deloitte)
- Devon Lake (Meta)
- Jordan Faires (EDF)
- Kerry Constabile (Amazon)
- Peter Skovly (Maersk)
- Silvana Paniagua (Sustaincert)

Observers:

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

Secretariat:

- Owen Hewlett (Gold Standard)
- Andrew Alcorta (GMA)
- Dan Smith (GMA)
- Kim Carnahan (GMA)
- Kristen Mertens (GMA/Engie)
- Laura Hutchinson (GMA)
- Michelle Kołacz (GMA)
- Sam Pearl-Schwartz (GMA)
- Stacey McCluskey (GMA)

Discussion Topics:

Recap of last Governing Committee Meeting

- Sam Pearl Schwartz welcomed the Governing Committee to the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda.
- Sam Pearl Schwartz provided a recap that covered last meeting's review and discussion of the following: 1) updated proposals for Criterion 2 and Aggregation 2) themes from the stakeholder feedback received on the Association Test 3) remaining QAR requirements
- The Secretariat expressed continued commitment to meeting the end-of-year goal for finalizing the standard and guidance.

Reminders

- Sam Pearl Schwartz remined Governing Committee members of the new meeting that was added for July 31 to support progress toward the pilot testing phase. Members were reminded that this is already on their calendars, and today's meeting was intended to help ensure alignment ahead of the vote to advance the QAR to pilot testing.
- The previously scheduled in-person Governing Committee meeting during New York Climate week has been rescheduled to October 2 as a virtual meeting. More details on an event during Climate Week will be shared in the coming weeks.

Association Test Updates

- The AIM Team has initiated an assurance process for the Association Test, with the goal of identifying recommendations to strengthen its auditability. This reflects the priorities expressed by members and is expected to inform a revised draft. The assurance review will extend the timeline for approval of the Association Test into the fall.

Quality, Accounting, and Reporting (QAR) Discussion)

- Kristen Mertens thanked the Committee Members for reviewing Chapters 1–7 and providing feedback. She noted that the document has now been organized into two major sections:
    - **Intervention Quality** (Chapters 1–7)
    - **Accounting & Reporting** (Chapters 8–16)

- Members were encouraged to raise any questions that could influence their final vote.
- Kristen Mertens clarified that requirements were written for the actor most responsible, but ultimately the company making the claim is responsible for meeting the requirements. Additionally, it was specified that the term *intervention outcome* was defined as the quantified emissions benefit of the intervention. She noted that examples are being developed to accompany each requirement of the draft.
- Laura Hutchinson walked members through each chapter, introducing the structure of the requirements, the key subsections, and the intended focus areas for pilot testing. **Discussion Highlights include:**
    - GC members emphasized the need for clarity in setting assurance expectations. Laura highlighted that we do not want to be overly prescriptive from the start. (regarding Ch. 1)
    - An observer flagged that cradle-to-gate may not fit all interventions, particularly for electricity. Another observer suggested more emphasis on when to use primary vs. secondary data. (regarding Ch. 2)
    - Kim Carnahan reiterated that the focus is on demonstrating real outcomes, not just accounting alignment. (regarding Ch. 2)
    - Gold Standard proposed adding animal welfare to Chapter 3, as this constitutes a reputational risk. (regarding Ch. 3)
    - A member expressed support for using the decision tree approach to cover the regulatory surplus requirement, suggesting that a few terms may need to be explained further for clarity. (regarding Ch. 4)
    - An observer raised concerns around requiring public disclosure of sourcing data. Kim Carnahan clarified that only certification documents would be public; auditors would access underlying records confidentially, and no price data would be requested. It was noted to further clarify what is meant by "publicly available." (regarding Ch. 5)
    - A GC member emphasized the need to clearly articulate and distinguish between traceability and chain of custody. (regarding Ch. 5)
    - An observer suggested adding product type as an intervention record transparency requirement. (regarding Ch. 6)
    - A GC member asked for reversals to be discussed further in the next meeting. (regarding Ch. 7)

QAR Pilot

- Stacey McCluskey provided an update on the project timeline and outlined the tentative pilot test meeting dates.
- Stacey McCluskey informed the group that efforts are underway to recruit additional pilot participants. She also shared that feedback questions and supporting documents are being developed. These materials will be used by pilot participants as they engage in the process.
    - The feedback process will mirror a similar approach to the Association Test, where we will first outline the required tasks. Participants will then review the requirements, answer related questions, and provide feedback during the following meeting.
    - ***Additionally: If any Governing Committee members or observers know of companies that would be a good fit, please contact us or connect those companies with us as soon as possible.***

Next Steps

- Kim Carnahan announced an optional 30-minute meeting that will be going out soon to discuss mass balance free attribution and distribution in more detail.
- Kim Carnahan noted that we are finalizing the second half of the QAR draft, which we plan to send out by the end of the week.
- Regarding the collection of additional feedback, Kim Carnahan informed everyone that any written comments and thoughts are welcome and valuable. She also reminded everyone that we will have a meeting next week where we can go through those chapters in real time.
    - ***Send comments in by Tuesday 7/29 EOD at the latest for integration before the vote goes out.***
- The goal is still to have the GC vote on whether to publish the draft for pilot testing and public comment next week. It was noted that there will likely be a 2-3 week period between voting and publishing for the start of pilot testing.
    - The plan is still to launch the pilot test next month.

The meeting concluded at approximately 12:00PM US Eastern Time.