

# Addressing the impact of ongoing emissions – beyond value chain mitigation (BVCM)

EWG virtual session III on 3rd June

“How much is enough”

*Presentation deck*

*Alice Farrelly & Scarlett Benson*

# Introduction | Our goal for today is to refine the overall approach for determining “how much is enough”, while considering tensions between responsibility to pay and feasibility

Today's questions

... and outcomes

1. How to determine a science-based approach for responsibility for addressing ongoing emissions?

Establish a shared baseline understanding of the ongoing emissions responsibility ratio (**OERR**)

2. How can we integrate a science-based approach for responsibility for addressing ongoing emissions whilst still incentivizing harder-to-measure systemic outcomes?


Refined approach for responsibility framework

3. How to balance the tension between responsibility to pay and feasibility?

Refined approach on whether, and, how to adjust for ability to pay

# Reminder of our fellow EWG members

## SBTi Team



**Alice Farrelly**  
SME BVCM



**Scarlett Benson**  
EWG Lead



*Aisha Rodriguez*



*Cindy Chiang*



*Daniel Schneiders*



*Elijah Innes-Wimsatt*



*Melissa Chavana*



*Morten Rossé*



*Nathan Truitt*



*Nicolas Kreibich*



*Omonigho Erigha*



*Seruni Salsabila*



*Sophie Louise Gladov*



*Sunita Purushottam*



*Tim Clairs*



*Giulia Carbone*



*Robert Höglund*



*Abigail Paris*



*Billie Wilcox Brooke*



*Jacqueline Persson*



*Jessica Omukuti*



*Gilles Dufrasne*

# DISCLAIMER & ANTITRUST

- **Disclaimer** - Please note, this document is for information purposes only in order to inform discussions and for no other purpose.
- The information provided by SBTi (including information supplied by third-parties) in this document is furnished on a confidential basis and must be treated as confidential.
- No such information may be divulged to any third party without the prior written approval of SBTi.
- This information shall not be used for any other purpose. SBTi reserves all rights in this document.

**Antitrust Caution** – Do not engage in any discussion, activity or conduct that may infringe on any applicable competition law.

For example, do not discuss company-specific information on:

- current or future prices, pricing strategies, or price related information;
- output, capacity, inventory levels, or costs;
- data related to market share;
- current or future business model transformation strategies.

Members are responsible for halting any activity that may violate this policy and reporting it immediately to SBTi.


# CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION

- As per the [EWG Terms of Reference](#) and the [SBTi COI policy](#), conflicts of interest must be declared
- At the start of each meeting the chair will ask members if a new COI has arisen
- A Conflict of Interest may be:
  - Actual: A true conflict exists between a Party's duties with the SBTi and their private interests.
  - Potential: Where a Party has personal or private interests that could conflict with their duties with the SBTi, or where it is foreseeable that a conflict may arise in future.
  - Perceived: Where an unbiased observer could reasonably form the view that a Party's private interests could influence their decisions or actions.

**ARE THERE ANY COI THAT THE SBTi SHOULD BE AWARE OF?**

# VIDEO-CONFERENCE GUIDELINES


## Participant guidelines




Mute during presentations



Use the chat box



Use the raise hand function



If you can, please keep your camera on

## Notes from us




Treat info as confidential



Meeting is being recorded




We will follow up with minutes...



..And we will follow up with slides!


Finally, please have your devices ready to use...




# AGENDA

SBTi team presentation: Pre-read recap	25 min
Questions and comments on pre-read	15 mins
Responsibility frameworks and feasibility	35 min
Ability to pay	40 min
Closing & next steps	5 min


# The SBTi's previous work on "how much": an "externality framing"



# SBTi's current best practice approach follows the polluter pays principle by recommending company apply a science-based carbon price to 100% of ongoing emissions



Apply a science-based carbon price to unabated scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions to determine a financial budget




Companies should use this budget to...


- Deliver ex-post BVCM outcomes equivalent to 50% of unabated scope 1-3 emissions (i.e. 50% ton-for-ton).
- Use the remaining budget to fund a chosen combination of:
  - Additional ex-post BVCM outcomes;
  - The scale up of nascent climate solutions and enabling activities;
  - Adaptation and/ or loss and damage.

# The SBTi research team has continued to explore what constitutes a science-based level of ambition for addressing ongoing emissions...

Using concept of a finite, science-based global carbon budget, the team has developed the Ongoing Emissions Responsibility Ratio (OERR). It allocates to companies a fair-share responsibility for addressing their ongoing unabated emissions – those that occur during the transition to net-zero but are not yet reduced or removed.



When we apply this concept to IPCC AR6 C1 scenarios...



- For the set of filtered scenarios that stay within sustainable limits (Figure: left), the ratio between carbon removed and carbon released into the atmosphere, until the end of the century ranges from 0 to 1.8
- The **median OERR value across the scenarios is 0.4**. This estimate accounts for all ongoing emissions, including residual emissions.
- This means that for every 1 tCO<sub>2</sub>e of ongoing emissions, a company is responsible for at least 0.4 tCO<sub>2</sub>e of measurable mitigation outcomes – over and above its value chain emissions reductions.
- *Additional research is being conducted to update the OERR to reflect ongoing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, excluding residuals, and also to cover all GHG emissions.*

$$\text{Ongoing emissions responsibility ratio}(y) = \frac{\text{Cumulative removal budget}(y)}{\text{Cumulative gross emissions}(y) - \text{Residual emissions}(2050)}$$

**Note:** This slide was originally presented during meeting Option A (09:00–11:00 BST). Following discussion with EWG members during that session, the content was revised to enhance clarity ahead of Option B (15:00–17:00 BST). Please refer to the following slide for the updated version.


# The SBTi research team has continued to explore what constitutes a science-based level of ambition for addressing ongoing emissions...

## Problem 1: Even the most ambitious net-zero pathways involve overshoot

Our cross-sector pathway targets net-zero emissions by 2050, in line with the most ambitious scenarios from the IPCC. However, even these pathways involve a median peak temperature overshoot of ~0.1–0.3°C above 1.5°C around mid-century. In these scenarios, carbon removals after 2050 are critical to bring temperatures back down toward 1.5°C in the second half of the century.

## Problem 2: The carbon budget may already be exceeded

Most IPCC pathways were developed based on emissions trajectories as of 2020. They do not fully account for higher-than-expected global emissions between 2020 and 2024. Emerging evidence suggests that the remaining carbon budget for 1.5°C may already be exhausted, which implies that even these "most ambitious" scenarios may underestimate the degree of required course correction.



## Implication: Delayed removals are necessary, but not sufficient

Post-2050 removals are necessary to address overshoot, but opportunities still exist to reduce or avoid overshoot altogether. Advancing removals and/or accelerating reductions before 2050 can help reshape the temperature trajectory and reduce risks associated with overshoot duration and magnitude.

## Responsibility for Ongoing Emissions: A proactive role for companies

While companies are not directly responsible for the global overshoot, they can contribute meaningfully to addressing it by taking responsibility for ongoing emissions through delivering emissions reductions and removal beyond the value chain.


We have developed the Ongoing Emissions Responsibility Ratio to establish responsibility. The median ratio across scenarios is 0.4, meaning that **for every 1 tCO<sub>2</sub>e of ongoing emissions, a company is responsible for at least 0.4 tCO<sub>2</sub>e of measurable mitigation outcomes** – over and above its value chain emissions reductions.

# The ongoing emissions responsibility ratio has important implications for both “what counts” and “how much”....

As its design is based on carbon-budget logic, the ratio focuses on measurable outcomes and therefore limits the scope of what can “count “ toward BVCM.

In previous follow-up surveys, the EWG has indicated support for both ex-post and forward looking investments to be recognized for addressing ongoing emissions.

***A key question for the EWG is therefore, how can the SBTi framework for determining “how much” maintain integrity and the budget-based approach while also incentivising the investments and innovation needed to unlock systemic change.***



- Recognize both ex-post outcomes and forward-looking, promising investments (per the 2024 Above and Beyond Report)
- Focus exclusively on quantified, ex-post mitigation outcomes
- Other

Source: EWG Session 1 follow-up survey results



SCIENCE  
BASED  
TARGETS


DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

# Questions and comments?

# AGENDA

SBTi team presentation: Pre-read recap	25 min
Questions and comments on pre-read	15 mins
Responsibility frameworks and feasibility	35 min
Ability to pay	40 min
Closing & next steps	5 min

# How to integrate science-based responsibility and continue to incentivize harder-to-measure systemic outcomes? The pre-read proposed a tiered recognition approach...




Tier 1 proposed as a prerequisite for tier 2 recognition..  
But could this stepped approach disincentivize harder-to-measure systemic outcomes i.e. *Is there a risk with companies would stop at tier 1 and not pursue additional, Tier 2 recognition?*

Minimum required responsibility coverage for recognition under each option. Bars on chart reflect total ongoing emissions i.e. scopes 1-3

# Other approaches that integrate science-based responsibility while still incentivizing harder-to-measure systemic outcomes...

### Option 2: Require 100% of ongoing emissions to be addressed for SBTi recognition




Target cycle

**40%** Deliver ex-post, verified mitigation inline with the Ongoing Emissions Responsibility Ratio, i.e. equivalent to 40% of ongoing emissions.

+

**60%** Apply a science-based carbon price to remaining emissions to fund a diversified portfolio of high-integrity climate contributions

### Option 3: Integrate Ongoing Emissions Responsibility Ratio into current best-practice guidance




Target cycle

**100%** Apply a science-based carbon price to 100% of ongoing emissions to set determine a financial budget.

- Use a portion of this budget to deliver for ex-post verified mitigation equivalent to 40% of ongoing emissions (per the Ongoing Emissions Responsibility Ratio);
- Allocate the rest to high-integrity climate contributions.

### Option 4: Recognize either Tft or Mft approach in line with the Ongoing Emissions Responsibility Ratio



Target cycle

**40% Tft** Deliver ex-post, verified mitigation inline with the Ongoing Emissions Responsibility Ratio, i.e. equivalent to 40% of ongoing emissions

OR

**40% Mft** Apply a science-based carbon price to 40% of ongoing emissions to fund a diversified portfolio of high-integrity climate contributions

## Pros and cons

- ✓ Both Goal 1 and Goal 2 are incentivized
- x High bar for recognition (& associated cost) would create a barrier to uptake
- x Similar but different to Above & Beyond best practice approach - could cause confusion

- ✓ Continuity with Above & Beyond best practice approach
- ✓ Both Goal 1 and Goal 2 are incentivized
- x High bar for recognition (& associated cost) would create a barrier to uptake

- ✓ Lower bar for recognition means less cost to companies
- x "Either or" approach means Goal 2 is not incentivized as companies will likely go for the least costly option (Tft)

Minimum required responsibility coverage for recognition under each option. Bars on chart reflect total ongoing emissions i.e. scopes 1-3

# Let's do a temperature check menti-poll



***Which of the responsibility framework options do you prefer?***

*Join us on Mentimeter!*

Link:  
[https://www.menti.com/  
albxnyy5jsih](https://www.menti.com/albxnyy5jsih)

QR:




# These different options could entail significantly different costs for different businesses [slide 1/2]

## Company A : Food and beverage company



- Total ongoing emissions: 16.5 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
  - Scope 1+2 emissions: 1.5 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
  - Scope 3 emissions: 15 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
- Profit in the reporting year: \$8 billion
- Profit per ton: 485 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>e

## Company B : Technology company



- Total ongoing emissions: 10.5 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
  - Scope 1+2 emissions: 500k tCO<sub>2</sub>e
  - Scope 3 emissions: 10 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
- Profit in the reporting year: \$70 billion
- Profit per ton: 6667 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>e

## Company C : Mining company



- Total ongoing emissions: 600 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
  - Scope 1+2 emissions: 30 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
  - Scope 3 emissions: 570 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e
- Profit in the reporting year: \$12 billion
- Profit per ton: 20 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>e

# These different options could entail significantly different costs for different businesses [slide 2/2]

Carbon-price assumptions: Tft \$ per ton: \$10; Science-based carbon-price: \$100

**Company A**  
profit per ton:  
485 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>e

**Company B**  
profit per ton:  
6667 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>e

**Company C**  
profit per ton:  
20 \$/tCO<sub>2</sub>e

**Tier 1: \$66 million cost**  
**Tier 1: 0.8 % of profit**  
w/ Tier 2: As option 2

**Tier 1: \$42 million cost**  
**Tier 1: 0.06 % of profit**  
w/ Tier 2: As option 2

**Tier 1: \$2.4 billion cost**  
**Tier 1: 20 % of profit**  
w/ Tier 2: As option 2

**\$1.1 billion cost**  
**13.2% of profit**

**\$672 million cost**  
**0.96% of profit**

**\$38.4 billion cost**  
**320% of profit**

**\$1.65 billion cost**  
**20.6% of profit**

**\$1.05 billion cost**  
**1.5% of profit**

**\$60 billion cost**  
**500% of profit**

**Tft: \$66 million cost**  
**Tft: 0.8 % of profit**  
**Mft: \$660 million**  
**Mft: 8.3% of profit**

**Tft: \$42 million cost**  
**Tft: 0.06 % of profit**  
**Mft: \$420 million cost**  
**Mft: 0.6% of profit**

**Tft: \$2.4 billion cost**  
**Tft: 20 % of profit**  
**Mft: \$24 billion cost**  
**Mft: 200% of profit**

- 1 "Tiered recognition"
- 2 "Full responsibility for recognition"
- 3 "Integrate to current best practice"
- 4 "Either Tft or Mft"

## REMINDERS OF DEFINITIONS!

- Company A : Food and beverage company with 1.5 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e of scope 1 and 2; 15 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e scope 3; \$8 billion profit in the reporting year.
- Company B : Technology company with 500 thousand tCO<sub>2</sub>e of scope 1 and 2; 10 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e scope 3 emissions; \$70 billion profit in the reporting year.
- Company C : Mining company with 30 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e of scope 1 and 2; 570 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e scope 3 emissions; \$12 billion profit in the reporting year.
- "Tiered recognition": Deliver Tft mitigation equivalent to 40% of ongoing emissions on. For additional Tier 2 recognition, apply carbon price to remaining (60%) ongoing emissions to fund climate contributions.
- "Full responsibility for recognition": Deliver Tft mitigation equivalent to 40% of ongoing emissions AND apply carbon price to remaining (60%) ongoing emissions to fund climate contributions
- "Integrate to current best practice": Carbon price 100% ongoing emissions, fund 40% Tft equivalent and remainder for other climate contributions.
- "Either Tft or Mft": Either deliver Tft mitigation equivalent to 40% of ongoing emissions OR apply a science-based carbon price to 40% of ongoing emissions to determine contribution budget.

Note: All figures are annual

# AGENDA

SBTi team presentation: Pre-read recap	25 min
Questions and comments on pre-read	15 mins
Responsibility frameworks and feasibility	35 min
<i>Ability to pay</i>	<i>40 min</i>
Closing & next steps	5 min

# Two potential approaches to adjust for ability to pay...

## Variable-based Adjustment

Adjust the variables that define financial contribution levels at layers that reflect differing abilities to pay.

Adjustable variables:

🇺🇸 Carbon price

🔄 Emissions coverage

Possible adjustment layers:

- By sector (sectoral benchmarks)
- By emissions profile
- By company size
- By profit per tCO<sub>2</sub>e

**Example mechanisms:**

- Variable carbon price based on company profit-per-ton
- Differentiated emissions coverage and/or carbon-price requirements by sector
- Cost basis: pure science-based carbon price vs adjusted (e.g. abatement cost-based).

## Design-based Approach

Design differentiated ambition tiers or recommendations within the Standard.

Designs could be:

📈 Low bar + tiered ambition

★ Minimum floor + best practice recommendation

- Minimum threshold to drive broad adoption
- Higher tiers / recommendations reflect alignment with the ongoing emissions responsibility ratio.
- Allows market signaling for leadership while lower tiers can incentivize broad adoption.

**Example mechanisms:**

- Minimum threshold could be full transparency (no thresholds) ; X% of profit contributed, or minimum floor carbon price
- Top tier / recommendation could be full science-based alignment based on responsibility framework (i.e options 1-4).

# Two potential approaches to adjust for ability to pay...

## Variable-based Adjustment

Adjust the variables that define financial contribution levels at layers that reflect differing abilities to pay.

Adjustable variables:

🇺🇸 Carbon price

In the variable-based adjustment approach, the **standard itself is adjusting ambition of the financial contribution** for the company based on an **external judgment of their ability to pay** (e.g. via profit-per-ton brackets or sectoral assumptions).

- By profit per tCO<sub>2</sub>e

### Example mechanisms:

- Variable carbon price based on company profit-per-ton
- Differentiated emissions coverage and/or carbon-price requirements by sector
- Cost basis: pure science-based carbon price vs adjusted (e.g. abatement cost-based).

## Design-based Approach

Design differentiated ambition tiers or recommendations within the Standard.

Designs could be:

📈 Low bar + tiered ambition

In **design-based approach**, the company is **self-selecting** the **ambition level** (tier). Their choice will naturally be influenced by their ability to pay but the standard isn't dictating that for them.

### Example mechanisms:

- Minimum threshold could be full transparency (no thresholds) ; 1% of profit contributed, or minimum floor carbon price
- Top tier / recommendation could be full science-based alignment based on responsibility framework (i.e options 1-4).

# What might a variable-based adjustment look like in practice....

## Variable-based Adjustment: Illustrative example

- **Framework:** option 3 - Carbon price 100% ongoing emissions, fund 40% TfT equivalent and remainder for other climate contributions.
- **Adjustable variables:** Carbon-price and emissions coverage adjustments based on profit per tCO<sub>2</sub>e layering.

Based on their profit-per-ton value in the reporting year, companies shall apply the applicable internal carbon price to the scope of emissions coverage as specified in *Table 1* below.

Companies shall allocate a portion of this budget to deliver ex-post, quantified mitigation equivalent to 40% of its ongoing emissions. The remaining budget shall be used to fund other high integrity climate contributions.

Table 1

Profit per ton (USD/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	Internal carbon price (USD/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	Emissions coverage required
< \$10	\$5	Scope 1 + 2
\$10 - \$100	\$10	Scope 1 + 2
\$100 - \$1,000	\$30	Scope 1 + 2
\$1,000 - \$10,000	\$80	Scope 1 + 2 + 3
> \$10,000	\$100	Scope 1 + 2 + 3

### Technology Company B

500,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e of scope 1 and 2

10 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e scope 3

\$70 billion profit

\$6.6k profit per tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

- \$1.05B total contribution (Scopes 1-3 @ \$100/t)
- 1.5% of annual profit
  - ◆ ~\$42M for ex-post outcomes (40% of emissions, \$10/t)
  - ◆ ~\$1.008B remaining for other contributions

### Mining Company C

30 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e of scope 1 and 2

570 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e scope 3 emissions

\$12 billion profit;

\$20 profit per tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

- **\$150M** total contribution (scopes 1-2 at \$5 per tCO<sub>2</sub>e)
- 1.25% of annual profit
  - ◆ ~\$120M for ex-post outcomes (40% of emissions, \$10/t)
  - ◆ ~\$30M remaining for other contributions



SCIENCE  
BASED  
TARGETS

DRIVING AMBITIOUS CORPORATE CLIMATE ACTION

# Group discussion

# Let's do a temperature check menti-poll



***Should the SBTi differentiate responsibility for addressing ongoing emissions based on ability to pay?***

***If we do adjust, which approach do you prefer for adjusting for ability to pay?***

***If we follow a variable-based adjustment, what variables and layers should we adjust by?***

***If we follow a design-based approach, what should the minimum bar be?***

*Join us on Mentimeter!*

Link:  
<https://www.menti.com/albxnyy5jsih>


QR:



# AGENDA

SBTi team presentation: Pre-read recap	25 min
Q&A on pre-read	15 mins
Responsibility frameworks and feasibility	35 min
Ability to pay	40 min
Closing & next steps	5 min

# Revised BVCM EWG meeting schedule



# What to expect between now and our next meeting on 25th June...




Today's **slides and minutes** will be uploaded to our shared folder



**Pre-reads** for our next meeting will be shared 5 days in advance

Any questions? You can reach us at [alicefarrelly@sciencebasedtargets.org](mailto:alicefarrelly@sciencebasedtargets.org) and [scarlettbenson@sciencebasedtargets.org](mailto:scarlettbenson@sciencebasedtargets.org)



Science Based Targets Initiative is a registered charity in England and Wales (1205768) and a limited company registered in England and Wales (14960097). Registered address: First Floor, 10 Queen Street Place, London, England, EC4R 1BE.


SBTI Services Limited is a limited company registered in England and Wales (15181058). Registered address: First Floor, 10 Queen Street Place, London, England, EC4R 1BE.

SBTI Services Limited is a wholly owned subsidiary of Science Based Targets Initiative.

 [sciencebasedtargets.org](https://sciencebasedtargets.org)

 [@ScienceTargets](https://twitter.com/ScienceTargets)

 [Science Based Targets](https://www.youtube.com/ScienceBasedTargets)

 [/science-based-targets](https://www.linkedin.com/company/science-based-targets)

 [info@sciencebasedtargets.org](mailto:info@sciencebasedtargets.org)