

Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform

Governing Committee Meeting Minutes | February 25, 2026

An initiative jointly developed by:



Gold Standard[®]

The Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Governing Committee
February 25, 2026 | 10:00AM – 12:00 AM US Eastern Time | Meeting #30

Attendees (via Teams):

Governing Committee Members:

- Alexia Kelly (High Tide Foundation)
- Marvin Henry (WBCSD)
- Gill Alker (RSB) – non-voting alternate for Arianna Baldo
- Derik Broekhoff (SEI)
- Devon Lake (Meta)
- Jordan Faires (EDF)
- Peter Skovly (Maersk)
- Kelly Kizzier (BEF)

Observers:

- Brad Schallert (Winrock)

Secretariat:

- Laura Draucker (GMA)
- Laura Hutchinson (GMA)
- Sam Pearl Schwartz (GMA)
- Stacey McCluskey (GMA)
- Kristen Mertens (GMA)
- Owen Hewlett (Gold Standard)
- Rebecca Berg (C2ES)

Discussion Topics:

Introduction

- Stacey McCluskey welcomed the Governing Committee and observers to the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda.
- Stacey McCluskey provided a recap of the last Governing Committee meeting.

AIM Platform Updates

- Stacey McCluskey reviewed the AIM Platform timeline, noting that there is one month left before the intended publication date for the Standard and Guidance. Due to the volume of feedback and to accommodate late feedback received, some of the milestone goals in the leadup to the publication have changed. Stacey shared the updated timeline, confirming that the intent is to receive approval to publish by the end of March.
- Stacey McCluskey provided an overview of the agenda for the March 11th and March 25th meetings.
- Stacey McCluskey previewed the AIM Platform comms plan in the lead up to publication. She confirmed that a social media toolkit will be provided to Governing Committee members and Observers ahead of the publication of the Standard.
- Stacey McCluskey provided an overview of the feedback received on the first draft of the Standard.

Review of Changes

- Sam Pearl Schwartz reiterated that the review of changes will be focused on common themes that were brought up by multiple individuals and/or substantive issues that require Governing Committee review.
- Further Association changes:
 - Sam Pearl Schwartz reminded the group what the draft Sourcing or Use Region requirements and recommendations stated. Sam noted that the Secretariat received a lot of pushback on requiring the use of sector-specific guidance for all sectors. The Secretariat has changed this to only require sector-specific guidance for the Forest, Land, and Agriculture (FLAG) sector. Companies may use sector-specific guidance in other sectors.
 - No issues or questions were raised.
 - Sam Pearl Schwartz reminded the group that the draft Sourcing Region boundary was defined as the country of origin. The Secretariat received feedback that restricting the sourcing region to country of origin was too strict, but also received

- feedback received during the Association Test pilot that the 5 top producing countries pathway was too broad. Sam presented two options: 1) Sourcing region is defined as the country of origin, or if not possible the next most granular boundary as available data allows (with justification) (with language to prohibit global), and 2) a hierarchy in the order of sub-national region, country of origin, product-specific common market.
- One Observer pointed out that AIM's definition of Sourcing Region does not align with the Land Sector and Removals Standard (LSRS).
 - Sam Pearl Schwartz reminded the observer that these two options would be for non-FLAG sectors where the LSRS does not apply.
 - One Governing Committee member asked why the hierarchy (option 2) might not be preferred. Noted that companies might prefer that as it gives something clear to point to.
 - Sam Pearl Schwartz corrected that the concern is that the broadest level of the proposed hierarchy might be too broad and could open AIM up to criticism.
 - The Governing Committee member responded that they don't have a strong view on either option.
 - One Governing Committee member said they are supportive of a hierarchy but also agreed there is uncertainty on if the broadest level is too broad.
 - Another Governing Committee member agreed, saying they support a hierarchy that promotes country of origin but offers flexibility.
 - One Governing Committee member noted it is difficult for companies to determine what the actual country of origin is, as there can be differences between what is shown on the import record, versus where the product is actually made, versus where the supplier company is headquartered.
 - Not hearing a definitive preference among the group, Sam Pearl Schwartz asked the group if there would be any pushback if the Secretariat went with Option 1.
 - One Governing Committee member asked if there is a significant difference between option 1 and option 2, or if option 1 is just a looser version of option 2.
 - Sam Pearl Schwartz confirmed that option 1 puts more onus on the reporting company to determine the broadest level, whereas option 2 explicitly states that the common market is the broadest level.
 - Sam Pearl Schwartz reminded the group that the Critical Sectors method was originally limited to 7 sectors based on the Mission Possible Partnership list. Based on feedback, the Secretariat proposes opening the method up to all sectors when using the Qualitative or Quantitative Metrics pathway. The Critical Technologies List and the Decarbonization Potential will remain for the original seven sectors.
 - No issues or questions were raised.

- Sam Pearl Schwartz reminded the group that the original text contained quantity (sizing) considerations in Further Association. Feedback from the last meeting and on the first draft indicated that 1) the concept needed to be made more clear, and 2) quantity should not be tied to the Association Test. The Secretariat proposes removing the requirement and recommendations pertaining to quantity from Further Association and having it be exclusive to Chapter 6.1. Sam noted there will be a footnote and guidance in Further Association that companies may want to consider the relevance.
 - Many Governing Committee members expressed support for this change.
- QAR changes:
 - Laura Hutchinson reminded the group what the requirements for Chapter 5.4 said on accurate emissions outcomes. The Secretariat received feedback that both lifecycle emissions and accurate attribution should be requirements, not recommendations. As such, the Secretariat proposes to elevate the definition of a system boundary as a requirement, which will dictate the appropriate lifecycle scope and appropriate GHG emission sources. The Secretariat also proposes elevating the accurate attribution issue to a requirement, as this is foundational for the accounting and reporting steps covered in Chapters 6 and 7.
 - One Governing Committee member asked if “correctly” has been defined anywhere in the draft.
 - Laura Hutchinson said that a draft definition has been added to the draft.
 - One Observer noted that the word “appropriate” may also need to be defined as it is mentioned quite a bit in the draft.
 - Laura Hutchinson noted that “appropriate” is defined in chapter 5.2. Noted that the connection between chapters can be made more clear.
 - Laura Hutchinson reminded the group of the requirement for chapter 5.5 on stakeholder engagement and social and environmental impacts. The Secretariat received feedback that more examples/guidance was needed and that the requirement for an independent audit to a standard or methodology for these other impacts criteria should be softened. As such, the Secretariat has included more details and examples in the guidance to better describe the minimum level of rigor required and expanded the section to clarify how the stakeholder engagement and safeguard requirements apply across different intervention contexts.
 - One Governing Committee member commented that these safeguards are often very value chain/sector/product specific and this poses a challenge that needs to be kept in mind. Suggested that sector-specific solutions and frameworks be mentioned and the AIM Standard cannot provide that level of depth given its cross-cutting nature
 - Laura Hutchinson agreed that this is the intent in scaling it back.

- Laura Hutchinson noted that Chapter 5.7 on unique right to report now has two images to better describe co-claiming. The first is a numeric example showcasing how co-claims can be distributed. The second is an example showcasing how co-claims can be distributed across co-product value chains.
 - No issues or questions were raised.
- Laura Hutchinson noted that the first draft did not include examples and guidance for the accounting methods in Chapter 6.2. This has since been changed, with more examples and notes to help clarify when companies should use a specific accounting method.
 - No issues or questions were raised.

Open Discussion

- Laura Hutchinson opened the meeting for remaining issues or feedback to be raised.
 - No issues or questions were raised.

Next Steps

- Laura Hutchinson reiterated the timeline to publication and reminded the Governing Committee that the next meeting will be held on March 11th. Laura repeated that this meeting will be office hour style.

Meeting concluded at approximately 11:02 PM US Eastern Time.