



SCIENCE  
BASED  
TARGETS

DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

# SBTi Corporate Net-Zero Standard Expert Working Group (EWG) Meeting Minutes

## **EWG Scope 2 - 3rd session**

Option A

26/06/2025, 9:00 - 11:00 BST

Option B

26/06/2025, 15:30 - 17:30 BST

Virtual

PUBLIC

## DISCLAIMER

The meeting notes provided herein are intended to capture the discussions, decisions, and actions taken during the meeting to the best of the note-taker's ability. While efforts have been made to accurately represent the proceedings, it is essential to acknowledge that these minutes are a summary and may not capture every detail or nuance of the discussions held.

While every effort has been made to respect the confidentiality of sensitive information, please be aware that the meeting minutes may contain references to discussions or materials considered confidential or privileged. The unauthorized disclosure, distribution, or use of such information is strictly prohibited. If you believe any sensitive information has been improperly disclosed, please contact the SBTi.

Meeting minutes are subject to revision and amendment. The content may be updated or modified based on corrections, additions, or clarifications deemed necessary by the SBTi.

Session decisions which are deemed interim, unresolved items or confidential will not be shared publicly to protect the confidentiality of the Standard before publication and to prevent sending premature signals to the market.

As per clause 6 in the EWG Terms of Reference, members serve on the EWG in their individual capacity as technical experts.

“Science Based Targets initiative” and “SBTi” refer to the Science Based Targets initiative, a private company registered in England number 14960097 and registered as a UK Charity number 1205768.

© SBTi 2025

## Meeting participants

### Expert Working Group Members present:

#### *Option A*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Roble Velasco-Rosenheim, The I-TRACK Standard Foundation | 7. Mohand Salah, Sidi Kerier For Petrochemicals Company (SIDPEC) |
| 2. Matthew Brander, University of Edinburgh                 | 8. Emma Saraff, Asia Clean Energy Coalition                      |
| 3. Nick Fedson, CDP   | 9. Kae Takase, Renewable Energy Institute                        |
| 4. Matt Konieczny, Watershed                                | 10. Lucile Bourguet, Fortescue                                   |
| 5. Aindrias Lefèvre-Laoide, EDF Group                       | 11. Rachel Swiatek, Climate Group                                |
| 6. Doug Miller, Energy Peace Partners                       |  |

#### *Option B*

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Drew Beyer, RMI   | 5. Alex Piper, EnergyTag |
| 2. Elliott Engelmann, World Resources Institute / GHG Protocol | 6. Molly Walton, WMBC    |
| 3. Erik Landry, GRESB  | 7. Skye Lei, ServiceNow  |
| 4. Peggy Kellen, Center for Resource Solutions (CRS)           |                          |

#### *Observers*

1. Brad Schallert, Winrock International

### SBTi

#### *Option A*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Scarlett Benson, Scope 2 EWG Lead                   | 4. Abhilash Desu, Senior Target Analyst     |
| 2. Ayla Dincay, Sector Lead Built Environment          | 5. Emma Watson, Head of Corporate Standards |
| 3. Olga Swiatek (Observer), Technical Team Coordinator |   |

#### *Option B*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Scarlett Benson, Scope 2 EWG Lead        | 4. Abhilash Desu, Senior Target Analyst                |
| 2. Emma Watson, Head of Corporate Standards | 5. Olga Swiatek (Observer), Technical Team Coordinator |
| 3. Ayla Dincay, Sector Lead                 |  |

## Meeting agenda

Welcome & focus of the session	5 min
Recap on what we've heard so far	15 min
Interactive session: Part 1	25 min
Break/solo thinking time	10 min
Interactive session: Part 2	45 min
Wrap-up & next steps	5 min

### 1. Welcome & Introductions

Each session began with a welcome from the facilitators and a brief overview of meeting logistics. Participants were reminded of the confidential nature of the Expert Working Group discussions and asked to declare any potential conflicts of interest. Practical guidelines were provided, including keeping microphones muted during presentations, using the chat function for comments, and the raise hand feature for questions. It was confirmed that a recording, slides, and minutes would be shared after the meeting.

### 2. Meeting Objectives

This meeting of the Scope 2 Expert Working Group (EWG) focused on gathering feedback on draft criteria C15.1 (dual targets), C15.3 (substantiation of zero-carbon electricity procurement), and C15.4 (time- and geo-matching). Both sessions included an overview of what we have heard so far from the EWG, some initial insights from the public consultation, and interactive discussion. In the first session we also had a breakout exercise using a Miro board.

### 3. Agenda Overview

The agenda covered:

- Recap of draft criteria: C15.1 (dual targets), C15.3 (substantiation of zero carbon electricity), and C15.4 (time and geo-matching)

- Presentation of initial public consultation feedback
- Plenary discussion on feasibility, clarity, and alignment
- Interactive input Option A: Breakout groups using Miro board
- Interactive input Option B: Open plenary discussion
- Summary of next steps and upcoming sessions

## 4. Review of Draft Criteria

### Dual Target Requirement

Participants discussed the proposal requiring both a location-based target and a procurement based target (with the option to set either a market-based emission reduction or zero-carbon electricity alignment target). Many EWG members supported the aim of ensuring accountability at both system and corporate levels, and the alignment with the GHG Protocol. However, feasibility concerns were raised, particularly regarding corporates' influence over location-based emissions and risks of over-complication in general. Suggestions included simplifying terminology, allowing emissions intensity metrics for location-based targets, or applying differentiated expectations over time.

### Substantiation of Zero-Carbon Electricity

There was widespread support for enhancing credibility through traceable sourcing and robust quality criteria. Participants noted the importance of clarifying what constitutes physical deliverability and how it differs from geographic matching. Ideas included tiered criteria based on market access or company size, shifting some verification responsibilities to suppliers or intermediaries, and aligning terminology and principles with existing protocols and initiatives.

### Time and Geographic Matching

There was some support for time and geo-matching clean energy procurement, while some EWG members raised concerns, including relating to feasibility and data availability. Further concerns were raised about vague language (e.g., “where possible”), practical limitations, and risks of discouraging ambition if requirements are too rigid. Participants proposed phased implementation pathways (e.g., shifting from annual → hourly over time), clear definitions, and potentially splitting time and geographic matching into separate criteria to reflect differing feasibility.

### Alignment with the GHG Protocol

Across both sessions, participants emphasized the importance of aligning with the GHG Protocol to avoid market fragmentation, improve usability, and maintain credibility in claims and disclosures.

## 5. Public Consultation Preliminary Insights

### Preliminary Public Consultation Feedback

- **Dual Targets (C15.1):** Over 50% of respondents opposed the two-target requirement due to complexity and burden; 36% were in favor.
- **Definition Shift:** 60%+ supported the move from “renewable” to “zero-carbon electricity” targets. However, inclusion of technologies like nuclear and biomass drew mixed feedback.
- Common concerns included feasibility, reporting burdens, and alignment with other frameworks.

## 6. Additional Themes

**Claims and Communication:** Participants emphasized the need for simple, consistent, and transparent language – especially to align with the GHG Protocol and avoid confusion in public-facing claims.

**Policy Engagement and Grid Influence:** Location-based targets were viewed as a potential lever for driving policy engagement and supporting grid decarbonization, though many acknowledged limited corporate influence over these outcomes.

**Simplicity vs. Ambition:** Several participants cautioned that overly complex requirements could deter participation, particularly among smaller companies. Balancing ambition with practicality was viewed as critical.

**SBTi's Role:** The initiative was widely recognized as a benchmark-setting body, with many urging it to maintain both credibility and leadership by setting feasible yet rigorous expectations.

## 7. Breakout Group Highlights (Option A Only)

Participants were divided into three breakout groups to provide structured feedback on the draft criteria:

- **Group 1:** Recommended clearer language for dual targets, raised concerns about inconsistent frameworks under C15.3, and supported supplier-led traceability improvements.
- **Group 2:** Supported the intent of location-based targets but noted implementation challenges and unclear timelines. They called for clearer definitions of target types and the distinction between geographic matching and deliverability.
- **Group 3:** Noted that location-based targets could influence company decisions and highlighted the need for guidance on policy advocacy and use claims. They supported a phased approach to matching and called for clarity on whether its aim is inventory reporting, impact, or risk management.

## 8. Actions & Next Steps

The facilitation team will review all inputs and provide an updated version of the criteria for feedback by mid-July. Additional meetings are planned for July, with further discussion to continue in September.

A team update was shared regarding upcoming staffing changes and open recruitment for a new Scope 2 Lead (see [job description](#)).