# InfluenceMap's Climate Policy Engagement Alignment Assessments: Methodology

## Overview of the methodology for assessing the Climate Policy Engagement Alignment Assessments under the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark

September 2026

## Table of Contents


Summary of InfluenceMap's Climate Policy Engagement Alignment Assessments under the Climate Action 100+ Benchmark 2

Indicator 1: Real-World Climate Policy Engagement 4

Indicator 2: Accuracy of Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure 7

Indicator 3: Corporate Climate Policy Engagement Review & Misalignment Management 9

Indicator 7: Climate Policy Engagement 11

Appendix A: Relationship between indicators assessing climate policy engagement under the Climate Action 100+ Benchmark 14

Appendix B: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 1, Real-World Climate Policy Engagement 15

Appendix C: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 2, Accuracy of Climate Policy Engagement 17

Appendix D: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 3, Corporate Climate Policy Engagement Review & Misalignment Management 20

Appendix E: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 7, Climate Policy Engagement 24

# Summary of InfluenceMap's Climate Policy Engagement Alignment Assessments under the Climate Action 100+ Benchmark

## Indicator 1: Real-World Climate Policy Engagement (Performance Band)

A comprehensive assessment of a company's climate policy engagement, accounting for both its own engagement and that of its industry associations. Companies will receive an overall 'Performance Band' score of A+ to F.

**Sub-indicator 1.1: Direct Climate Policy Engagement (Organization Score)**

A measure of how supportive or obstructive the company's direct engagement is of science-aligned climate policy, with 0% being fully opposed and 100% being fully supportive.

**Sub-indicator 1.2: Indirect Climate Policy Engagement via Industry Associations (Relationship Score)**

A measure of how supportive or obstructive the company's industry associations are of science-aligned climate policy, with 0% being fully opposed and 100% being fully supportive.

## Indicator 2: Accuracy of Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure

An assessment of the accuracy of a company's reporting on its direct and indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement activities.

**Sub-indicator 2.1: Accuracy of Direct Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure**

Evaluates whether the company has published an accurate account of its corporate climate policy positions and engagement activities (as compared to InfluenceMap's database).

**Sub-indicator 2.2: Accuracy of Indirect Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure**

Evaluates whether the company has published an accurate account of the climate policy positions and engagement activities of the industry associations of which it is a member (as compared to InfluenceMap's database).

## Indicator 3: Corporate Climate Policy Engagement Review & Misalignment Management (Review Score)

An assessment of the quality and robustness of a company's processes to identify, report on, and address specific cases of misalignment between its climate policy engagement activities (direct and indirect via industry associations) and science-aligned policy pathways for limiting warming to 1.5°C.[1]

[1] *InfluenceMap assesses corporate reviews of climate policy engagement against seven assessment criteria, benchmarked against standards put forward by investors under the Global Standard on Responsible Climate Lobbying and additional statements by PRI, IIGCC, and Ceres. Under Indicator 3, these seven assessment criteria are aggregated into a standalone 'Review Score'.*

## Indicator 7: Climate Policy Engagement

An assessment of whether a company has high-level commitments and disclosures in place related to its climate policy engagement, both direct and indirect via industry associations. Indicator 7 assesses these aspects of corporate disclosure on a binary yes/no basis but does not assess the quality of the disclosures themselves.

**Sub-indicator 7.1: Lobbying Commitment Aligned with Paris Agreement**

Assesses whether the company has published a specific public commitment or position statement to conduct its direct and/or indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement.

**Sub-indicator 7.2: Review of Direct and Indirect Climate Policy Positions**

Assesses whether the company has published a review of its direct and/or indirect (via industry associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities.

# Indicator 1: Real-World Climate Policy Engagement

InfluenceMap's Indicator 1 evaluates the extent to which a company's real-world climate policy engagement (direct and indirect via industry associations) is aligned with policy pathways for limiting warming to 1.5°C.[2]

Companies receive an overall 'Performance Band' score against this indicator. The Performance Band (expressed as a grade from A+ to F) is a comprehensive assessment of a company's climate policy engagement, accounting for both its direct corporate engagement and that of its industry associations.

The Performance Band is integrated with the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark traffic light system in the following way:

*Yes, meets criteria: Performance Band scores **from A+ to B** indicate **broad alignment** between the company's overall climate policy engagement and science-aligned climate policy.*

*Partially meets criteria: Performance Band scores from **B- to D+** indicate **mixed engagement** with Paris-aligned climate policy, i.e., partial alignment between the company's overall climate policy engagement and science-aligned climate policy.*

*No, does not meet criteria: Performance Band scores from **D to F** indicate **misalignment** between the company's overall climate policy engagement and science-aligned climate policy.*

*Not Applicable: If **limited evidence is available** on a company's direct climate policy engagement (Organization Score) and industry association links (Relationship Score), the Performance Band does not receive a score.*

**Assessment Timeframe for InfluenceMap: Indicator 1**

- Company assessments against InfluenceMap's Indicator 1 published *on the CA100+ website* provide a snapshot of the company's real-world climate policy engagement at the end of InfluenceMap's data collection period for the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark 2026 assessments (i.e., August 1st 2026).
- However, InfluenceMap updates its assessments *on its website* on a weekly basis, as new information becomes available. Please refer to the InfluenceMap *CA100+ Investor Hub* for the most up-to-date assessments and underlying evidence.

[2] *InfluenceMap uses external and authoritative benchmarks to provide a robust assessment of whether a company's climate policy engagement activities are aligned with the Paris Agreement's goals, either: (1) Government Policy Benchmarks; (2) Science-Based Benchmarks. See Appendix B for further details.*

## Sub-indicator 1.1 - Direct Climate Policy Engagement (Organization Score)

An assessment of a company's direct climate policy engagement (i.e. climate policy engagement carried out by the company) is represented by the Organization Score.

The Organization Score is a measure of how supportive or obstructive the company's direct engagement is of science-aligned climate policy. It is expressed as a percentage from 0 to 100, with 0% being fully opposed and 100% being fully supportive of science-aligned policies.

Under the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark, focus companies receive one of the following scores against this Sub-indicator:

*Yes, meets criteria: Organization Scores of **75% and above** indicate **broad alignment** between the company's direct climate policy engagement and science-aligned climate policy.*

*Partially meets criteria: Organization Scores from **50% to 74%** indicate **mixed** direct engagement with Paris-aligned climate policy, i.e., partial alignment between the company's direct climate policy engagement and science-aligned climate policy.*

*No, does not meet criteria: Organization Scores **below 50%** indicate **misalignment** between the company's direct climate policy engagement and science-aligned climate policy.*

*Not Applicable: Companies found **not to have sufficient data available with respect to their direct engagement with climate policy** are not attributed an Organization Score.*

- A company will be assessed as having low levels of direct engagement with climate policy if it has an Engagement Intensity score below 5% on InfluenceMap's database. Engagement Intensity (expressed as a percentage from 0 to 100) is a metric that InfluenceMap uses to track the amount or intensity of direct climate policy engagement by a company, irrespective of whether this is supportive or obstructive.
- Engagement Intensity scores below 5% indicate that a company is insufficiently transparent with respect to its engagement with climate policy, which means that there is not enough evidence of direct climate policy engagement collected to attribute an Organization Score to the company – these companies are signified with 'Insufficient Data'.
- Engagement Intensity scores for every company are available on InfluenceMap's *CA100+ Investor Hub*, and are a useful metric to track the level of engagement on climate policy by a company.

### Sub-indicator 1.2 – Indirect Climate Policy Engagement (Relationship Score)

An assessment of a company's indirect climate policy engagement (i.e. climate policy engagement carried out by a company's industry associations) is represented by the Relationship Score.

The Relationship Score (expressed as a percentage score from 0 to 100) is a measure of how supportive or obstructive the company's industry associations are of science-aligned climate policy on an aggregate basis, with 0% being fully opposed and 100% being fully supportive.

This score draws on InfluenceMap's assessments of over 330 key industry associations (available on InfluenceMap's *CA100+ Investor Hub*), which are assessed in exactly the same manner as companies. This database is not exhaustive and may not cover all industry associations of which a company is a member. The Relationship Score also incorporates an assessment of the strength of the relationship between a company and an industry association[3].

Under the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark, focus companies receive one of the following scores against this Sub-indicator:

*Yes, meets criteria: Relationship Scores of **75% and above** indicate broad alignment between the climate policy engagement of the company's industry associations and science-aligned climate policy.*

*Partially meets criteria: Relationship Scores from **50% to 74%** indicate mixed engagement with Paris-aligned climate policy by the company's industry associations, i.e., partial alignment between the company's indirect climate policy engagement and science-aligned climate policy.*

*No, does not meet criteria: Relationship Scores **below 50%** indicate misalignment between the climate policy engagement of the company's industry associations and science-aligned climate policy.*

*Not Applicable: Companies found **not to maintain significant links to industry associations actively influencing climate policy** (as per InfluenceMap's database) are not attributed a 'Relationship Score'.*

[3] *Industry associations with whom the company has a stronger relationship will have a greater impact on its overall Relationship Score. For example, a stronger weighting will be attributed where a company has a representative on the board of an industry association. This weighting will be reduced if a company publicly acknowledges a misalignment with an industry association on climate change policy.*

# Indicator 2: Accuracy of Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure

Indicator 2 is an assessment of the accuracy of a company's reporting on its direct and indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement activities.

For Indicator 2, InfluenceMap utilizes its proprietary database to assess how corporate disclosures on climate policy positions and engagement activities compare to InfluenceMap's independent assessment of the companies' and industry associations' real-world climate policy engagement. In short, it assesses the extent to which the company has disclosed on all its climate policy engagement identified by *InfluenceMap's database*, which independently tracks corporate climate policy engagement activities.

InfluenceMap's independent assessments of companies are based on a broad range of data sources going beyond company disclosures, including: company reporting, social media channels, CDP responses, regulatory consultation comments (including those obtained via freedom of information requests), reliable media reporting, statements from senior management, financial disclosures and investor communications.

Companies receive an overall score against this Indicator. This score is integrated with the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark traffic light system in the following way:

*Yes, meets criteria: The company has **published an accurate account** of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies, including those undertaken directly and indirectly via industry associations. The company **receives a 'Green'** for the assessments under both Sub-indicator 2.1 and Sub-indicator 2.2 (see below);*

*Partially meets criteria: The company has **published a partial account** of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies. The company **receives at least one 'Green' or 'Amber'** for the assessments under Sub-indicator 2.1 and Sub-indicator 2.2 (see below);*

*No, does not meet criteria: The company **has not published an account** of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate-related policies, or the disclosure is **limited to 'top-line' climate statements** without reference to specific climate-related policies. The company **receives a 'Red'** for the assessments under both Sub-indicator 2.1 and Sub-indicator 2.2 (see below);*

*Not Applicable: The company has **explicitly stated that it does not engage** on climate-related policies and is **not a member of any industry associations** actively engaged on climate policy, aligned with InfluenceMap's database. The company **receives a 'Grey'** for the assessments under both Sub-indicator 2.1 and Sub-indicator 2.2 (see below).*

- Under Sub-indicators 2.1 and 2.2, 'material evidence' is defined as consistent and/or strategic engagement on specific climate-related policies. This could mean several instances of engagement with specific climate-related policies, and/or one instance of meaningful engagement with specific climate-related policies (e.g., direct engagement with policymakers). If an entity has failed to disclose climate policy engagement identified by InfluenceMap's database, it will not meet the criteria.

- InfluenceMap distinguishes between corporate disclosure on 'top-line' or general climate statements and specific climate-related policies under Indicator 2. A company will be scored higher if it discloses its actual policy engagement on specific climate policies, and lower if this is limited to a disclosure of general 'top-line' climate statements (e.g. broad support for the Paris Agreement, carbon pricing, etc).

### Sub-Indicator 2.1 – Accuracy of Direct Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure

This Sub-indicator evaluates whether the company has published an accurate account of its corporate climate policy positions and engagement activities (as compared to InfluenceMap's database).

Under the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark, focus companies receive one of the following scores against this Sub-indicator:

*Yes, meets criteria: The company has **published an accurate** account of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies, aligned with InfluenceMap's database, or has **excluded one item of material evidence** of direct climate policy engagement identified by InfluenceMap's database.*

*Partially meets criteria: The company has **published a partial account** of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies, but **excludes more than one item of material evidence** of direct climate policy engagement identified by InfluenceMap's database.*

*No, does not meet criteria: The company has **not published an account** of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate-related policies, or the company's **disclosure is limited to 'top-line' climate statements** without reference to specific climate-related policies.*

*Not Applicable: The company has **explicitly stated that it does not engage** on climate-related policies, aligned with InfluenceMap's database.*

### Sub-Indicator 2.2 – Accuracy of Indirect Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure

This Sub-indicator evaluates whether the company has published an accurate account of the climate policy positions and engagement activities of the industry associations of which it is a member (as compared to InfluenceMap's database).

Under the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark, focus companies receive one of the following scores against this Sub-indicator:

*Yes, meets criteria: The company has **published an accurate account** of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies for **each industry association actively engaged**[4] on climate policy, aligned with InfluenceMap's database, or the company has **excluded one industry association** which is actively engaged on climate policy or **excluded one item of material evidence of indirect climate policy engagement** identified by InfluenceMap's database.*

*Partially meets criteria: The company has **published a partial account** of its industry associations' positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies. However, the company **excludes more than one industry association(s) which are actively engaged** on climate policy, and/or **excludes more than one item of material evidence of indirect climate policy engagement** identified by InfluenceMap's database.*

*No, does not meet criteria: The company has **not published an account** of the positions and engagement activities of its industry associations on specific climate-related policies, or the company's **disclosure is limited to 'top-line' climate statements** without reference to specific climate-related policies*

*Not Applicable: The company is **not a member of any industry associations actively engaged** on climate policy, aligned with InfluenceMap's database.*

# Indicator 3: Corporate Climate Policy Engagement Review & Misalignment Management

An assessment of the quality and robustness of a company's processes to identify, report on, and address specific cases of misalignment between its climate policy engagement activities (direct and indirect via industry associations) and science-aligned policy pathways for limiting warming to 1.5°C.

[4] *Industry associations are considered 'actively engaged' on climate policy if they have an Engagement Intensity score of 12% or above under InfluenceMap's database. The Engagement Intensity (expressed as a percentage from 0 to 100) is a measure of the level of direct policy engagement by the industry association, whether positive or negative.*

Under InfluenceMap's Indicator 3, seven assessment criteria are aggregated into a standalone 'Review Score' (expressed as a percentage from 0 to 100), where 100% would indicate that a company has met all criteria related to the review process, and 0% would indicate it has met none. The seven assessment criteria are outlined on page 10 below.

The full breakdown of corporate performance against the seven assessment criteria, including a detailed methodology document, can be available on InfluenceMap's *CA100+ Investor Hub*.

The Review Score is integrated with the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark traffic light system in the following way:

*Yes, meets criteria: Review Scores of 75% and above indicate that the company has **broadly met the criteria** related to the review process.*

*Partially meets criteria: Review Scores from 25% to 74% indicate that the company has **partially met the criteria** related to the review process.*

*No, does not meet criteria: Companies may score a 'Red' under Indicator 3 for two distinct reasons: if they **do not meet the criteria related to the review process**, scoring below 25%; or if they **have not published a review** of their climate policy engagement (where the score will be accompanied by the note 'No review published').*

**Assessment timeframe for InfluenceMap Indicators 2 and 3**

- InfluenceMap imposes a time limit of two years for Indicators 2 and 3. This means that company disclosures published after the end of InfluenceMap's data collection period for the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark 2026 assessments (i.e., August 1st 2026) or more than two years prior to the end of the data collection period (i.e. August 1st 2024) will not be taken into account for these assessments.
- Given the speed at which the global policy landscape is developing and changing, companies should provide regular updates on their climate policy engagement activities. As a result, climate policy engagement disclosures older than two years can no longer be deemed relevant. The need for annual reviews has also been highlighted in the *Global Standard on Responsible Climate Lobbying* - the leading best-practice framework for corporate climate policy engagement initiated by investors and launched in March 2022.

InfluenceMap assesses corporate reviews of climate policy engagement against seven assessment criteria, benchmarked against standards put forward by investors under the *Global Standard on Responsible Climate Lobbying* and additional statements by *PRI*, *IIGCC*, and *Ceres*.

The seven assessment criteria that make up the Review Score are split into three categories, outlined below along with the corresponding Global Standard indicator it is benchmarked against:

| Review Process | Global Standard Indicator |
|---|---|
| (i) **Monitor & Review:** Has the company established an annual monitoring and review process to ensure that all of its direct and indirect climate policy engagement activities across all geographies are consistent with science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels? | Indicator 9 |
| (ii) **Alignment assessment method:** Has the company disclosed a clear and detailed methodology for assessing alignment, including: (1) the criteria it uses to assess whether the climate policy engagement activities of its industry associations align with science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels; and (2) a clear and detailed explanation behind the assessment of each industry association? | Indicator 8 |
| (iii) **Framework for addressing misalignment:** Has the company established a clear framework for addressing misalignments between the climate policy engagement activities of its industry associations and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, including the escalation strategies it will use and when it will use these escalation strategies? | Indicator 8 |
| **Review Assessment (Direct - Company)** | **Global Standard Indicator** |
| (i) **Identify & Assess (Direct Misalignment):** Has the company identified and reported on the existence of all misalignments between its direct climate policy engagement activities and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with InfluenceMap's database (including all of its subsidiaries, business areas, and operational jurisdictions)? | Indicator 10 |
| (ii) **Act (Direct Misalignment):** Has the company reported on what action is being (or has been) taken to address misalignments, if and where they exist, between its direct climate policy engagement activities and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with InfluenceMap's database? | Indicator 10 |
| **Review Assessment (Indirect - Industry Associations)** | **Global Standard Indicator** |
| (i) **Identify & Assess (Indirect Misalignment):** Has the company identified and reported on the existence of all misalignments between the climate policy engagement activities of its industry associations, and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with InfluenceMap's database? | Indicator 10 |
| (ii) **Act (Indirect Misalignment):** Has the company reported on what action is being (or has been) taken to address misalignments, if and where they exist, between the climate policy engagement activities of its industry associations, and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with InfluenceMap's database? | Indicator 10 |

# Indicator 7: Climate Policy Engagement

Indicator 7 of the Disclosure Framework - 'Climate Policy Engagement' – assesses whether a company has high-level commitments and disclosures in place related to climate policy engagement. Disclosure Indicator 7 assesses corporate disclosures on a binary yes/no basis but does not assess the quality of those disclosures. As part of the CA100+ Benchmark, the Transition Pathway Initiative previously assessed Sub-Indicators 7.1 and 7.2, with InfluenceMap conducting this assessment for the first time in 2026.

## Sub-Indicator 7.1: Lobbying Commitment Aligned with Paris Agreement

The company commits to conducting its direct and indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement activities in accordance with the goals of the Paris Agreement.

| 7.1 Lobbying Commitment Aligned with the Goals of the Paris Agreement | |
|---|---|
| | The company has a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct all its direct and indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. |
| | The company has a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct either its direct OR indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. |
| | The company does not have a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct its direct and indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. |

### Metric 7.1.a: Direct Lobbying Commitment Aligned with Paris Agreement

The company has a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct all its direct climate policy engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. Vague or caveated language, such as "where possible," is not sufficient to score on this metric. See Appendix E for the detailed guidance on what counts and does not count toward this metric.

| 7.1.a. Direct Lobbying Commitment Aligned with Goals of the Paris Agreement | |
|---|---|
| | The company has a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct all its direct climate policy engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. |
| | The company does not have a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct all its direct climate policy engagement activities in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement. |

### Metric 7.1.b: Indirect (via Industry Associations) Lobbying Commitment Aligned with Paris Agreement

The company commits to advocating for Paris-aligned climate policy engagement activities within the trade associations of which it is a member. Vague or caveated language, such as "where possible," is not sufficient to score on this metric. See Appendix E for the detailed guidance on what counts and does not count toward this metric.

| 7.1.b. Indirect Lobbying Commitment Aligned with the Goals of the Paris Agreement | |
|---|---|
| | The company commits to advocate for Paris-aligned climate policy engagement activities within the trade associations of which it is a member. |
| | The company does not commit to advocate for Paris-aligned climate policy engagement activities within the trade associations of which it is a member. |

## Sub-indicator 7.2: Review of Direct & Indirect Climate Policy Positions

The company publishes a review of its direct and indirect (via trade associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities.

| Review of Direct & Indirect Climate Policy Positions | |
|---|---|
| | The company has published a review of both its direct and indirect (via trade associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities. |
| | The company has published a review of its direct OR indirect (via trade associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities. |
| | The company has not published a review of its direct or indirect (via trade associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities. |

### Metric 7.2.a: Review of Direct Climate Policy Positions

The company publishes a review of its own climate policy positions and engagement activities. Meeting this metric requires an evaluation of those positions and activities against a stated benchmark; disclosing engagement activities alone, without any assessment of alignment, is not sufficient to count as a review. See Appendix E for detailed guidance.

| Review of Direct Climate Policy Positions | |
|---|---|
| | The company has published a review of its direct climate policy positions and engagement activities. |
| | The company has not published a review of its direct climate policy positions and engagement activities. |

### Metric 7.2.b: Review of Indirect Climate Policy Positions

The company publishes a review of its industry associations' climate policy positions and engagement activities. Meeting this metric requires evaluating those positions and activities against a stated benchmark. Listing memberships or disclosing engagement activities alone, without assessing alignment, is not sufficient to count as a review. See Appendix E for detailed guidance

| Review of Indirect Climate Policy Positions | |
|---|---|
| | The company has published a review of its indirect (via industry associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities. |
| | The company has not published a review of its indirect (via industry associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities. |

# Appendix A: Relationship between indicators assessing climate policy engagement under the Climate Action 100+ Benchmark

There are two indicators assessing climate policy engagement in the Climate Action 100+ Benchmark:

- **Disclosure Framework (assessed by Transition Pathway Initiative):** Indicator 7 of the Disclosure Framework - 'Climate Policy Engagement' – assesses whether a company has high-level commitments and disclosures in place related to climate policy engagement. Disclosure Indicator 7 assesses aspects of corporate disclosures on a binary yes/no basis, but does not assess the quality of those disclosures.

- **Alignment Assessment (assessed by InfluenceMap):** The 'Climate Policy Engagement Alignment' indicator assesses the science-alignment of a company's real-world climate policy engagement as well as the quality and accuracy of corporate disclosures on climate policy engagement. InfluenceMap indicators provide a more granular assessment of company performance, which goes beyond a binary yes/no basis.

The alignment assessments complement the Disclosure Framework by providing independent evaluations or verification of corporate commitments and disclosures. InfluenceMap data can be used to assess the extent to which companies are following through on their high-level commitments in their real-world climate policy engagement (direct and via industry associations), as well as the accuracy and robustness of their disclosures.

| | Disclosure Framework, Indicator 7: Climate Policy Engagement | Alignment Assessment: Climate Policy Engagement Alignment |
|---|---|---|
| *Who is it assessed by?* | **InfluenceMap** | **InfluenceMap** |
| *What do the assessments consider?* | A company's **commitments & disclosure** related to climate policy engagement, including related to industry associations | A company's **real-world climate policy engagement activities** & the quality of related disclosures |
| *What data sources are used?* | **Corporate disclosures only** | Company disclosures, social media, CDP responses, regulatory consultation comments (including FOIs), media reporting, statements from senior management, financial disclosures and investor communications |
| *How are outcomes measured?* | **Yes/no assessments** based on whether or not a company has made a commitment or disclosure | Assessments on a 0-100 scale, assessed against **independent and authoritative benchmarks** (e.g. derived from IPCC, policymakers, Global Standard on Responsible Climate Change Lobbying) |
| *What is the assessment useful for?* | Ascertaining the **level of disclosure** that the company provides to investors | Measuring the **accuracy and quality of disclosures** as well as the extent to which a company's **real-world climate policy engagement is science-aligned** |
| *How regularly is it updated?* | Assessed **periodically** with each Benchmark launch | Company profiles and scores updated on a **weekly basis,** disclosures assessed **periodically as new reports released** |

# Appendix B: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 1, Real-World Climate Policy Engagement

The *Global Standard on Responsible Climate Lobbying* - instigated by investors and launched in March 2022 - states that companies should adopt climate policy positions in line with the Paris Agreement and engage accordingly. As a research partner to Climate Action 100+, InfluenceMap's system for tracking, assessing, and scoring companies and their key industry associations on their ongoing climate change policy engagement activities is a key resource for investors. Full details of the methodology are *accessible here.*

- **How does InfluenceMap define policy engagement?** InfluenceMap's definition of "policy engagement" is based on the UN *Guide for Responsible Corporate Engagement in Climate Policy* (2013), which defines a range of corporate activities as engagement, such as advertising, social media, public relations, and direct contact with regulators and elected officials.

- **How does InfluenceMap define climate policy?** InfluenceMap's system considers existing, evolving, and likely future climate-related policy measures proposed by mandated bodies. "Mandated bodies" are defined here as various levels of government or government-authorized bodies responsible for or supporting efforts to implement Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) in their regions.

InfluenceMap's system also captures high-level corporate communications that influence the broader public narrative on policies (e.g., concerning the role of different low-carbon technologies).

- **What policy areas does InfluenceMap track?** InfluenceMap assesses corporate positions on distinct climate-related topics, which are organized into "queries". These queries include top-line statements (e.g. 'Support of UN Climate Process'), engagement on specific climate-related regulations (e.g. 'Carbon Tax', 'GHG Emission Regulation'), and comments related to the 'Energy Transition & Zero Carbon Technologies'. In 2022, InfluenceMap also expanded its methodology to include analysis of corporate engagement with land-use-related climate policy, and in 2024 included analysis of corporate engagement with circular economy-related climate policy. InfluenceMap does not assess communications related to a company's operational commitments and business model.

- **How does InfluenceMap collect evidence?** Each company's engagement activities on climate-related policy are assessed using publicly accessible data sources to gather reliable and representative evidence. InfluenceMap uses seven data sources: (1) organizational website disclosures; (2) social media channels; (3) CDP responses; (4) direct consultation with governments, including those obtained via freedom of information requests; (5) reliable media reporting; (6) CEO and top management statements; (7) financial disclosures and investor communications.

- **How does InfluenceMap assess evidence?** Each individual item of evidence is assessed on a five-point scale between +2 and -2, where +2 indicates full support for Paris and IPCC-aligned policy, and -2 indicates active opposition. Using a five-point scale enables a more nuanced analysis of the grey areas within corporate positioning on climate policy, compared to a binary yes/no assessment.

- **What benchmarks does InfluenceMap use to assess evidence?** InfluenceMap does not take an internal position on climate policies. Each item of evidence is analyzed against external and authoritative benchmarks to provide a robust assessment of whether a company's climate policy engagement activities are aligned with the Paris Agreement's goals. There are two types of benchmarks used:

    1. *Governmental Policy Benchmarks:* corporate positions on specific climate-related policies are assessed against the original ambition of the policy as proposed by government or government-authorized bodies mandated to deliver on the Paris Agreement (e.g. state and federal governments, regional governing bodies such as the EU Commission, statutory agencies such as Australia's Climate Change Authority);

    2. *Science-Based Benchmarks*: corporate positions on technology and energy pathways (e.g. fossil fuels, electric vehicles) are assessed against the latest findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on achieving 1.5°C-aligned emissions reductions. InfluenceMap applies its 'Developing Country' benchmarks to countries outside the top 100 based on GDP per capita,

which account for the comparative lack of resources and higher systemic barriers for rapidly implementing climate policy.

- **How does InfluenceMap assess industry associations?** InfluenceMap's system also considers a company's 'indirect' climate policy engagement via industry associations. InfluenceMap's database contains over 330 key industry groups globally, similarly scored on their climate policy engagement. The relationships between the companies and these industry associations are also tracked, enabling an aggregate analysis of each company's 'indirect' climate policy engagement via its industry associations.

- **How is the overall assessment calculated?** Metrics describing each company's overall climate policy engagement - direct and indirect via associations - are produced by InfluenceMap's proprietary platform, with weightings to adjust for factors such as sector (e.g., specific queries are more heavily weighted in certain sectors) and time (e.g., more recent evidence is heavily weighted in the final score).

- **How often are InfluenceMap assessments updated?** InfluenceMap updates its assessments of real-world climate policy engagement weekly as new information becomes available. Evidence is collected and archived from the previous five years, with recent evidence collected in the last 1-2 years heavily weighted in the system, evidence older than 3 years largely weighted out of the calculation, and evidence older than 5 years weighted out entirely.

InfluenceMap's assessments are freely available and in the public domain on InfluenceMap's *CA100+ Investor Hub*, along with access to all underlying evidence.

# Appendix C: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 2, Accuracy of Climate Policy Engagement

This is an assessment of the accuracy of a company's reporting on its direct and indirect (via industry associations) climate policy engagement activities.

InfluenceMap utilizes its proprietary database to assess how corporate disclosures on climate policy positions and engagement activities compare to InfluenceMap's independent assessment of the companies' and industry associations' real-world climate policy engagement. In short, it assesses the extent to which the company has disclosed on all climate policy engagement identified by InfluenceMap's database.

InfluenceMap's independent assessments of companies are based on a broad range of data sources, including company reporting, social media channels, CDP responses, regulatory consultation comments, reliable media reporting, statements from senior management, financial disclosures and investor communications.

This methodology assesses corporate performance against two indicators, using the traffic-light framework summarized below:

| Key | Score Explanation |
|---|---|
| | Has broadly met the assessment criteria. |
| | Has partially met the assessment criteria. |
| | Has not met the assessment criteria. |

*Note: All CA100+ companies will be assessed under this methodology, irrespective of whether the company has published a formal disclosure and/or review of its climate policy engagement.*

**Accuracy of Direct Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure:** Has the company published an accurate account of its corporate climate policy positions and engagement activities (as compared to InfluenceMap's database)?

| Accuracy of Direct Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure | |
|---|---|
| | The company has published an accurate account of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies*, or has excluded one item of material evidence** of direct climate policy engagement. |
| | The company has published a partial account of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies*, but excludes more than one item of material evidence** of direct climate policy engagement. |
| | The company has not published an account of its positions and engagement activities on specific climate-related policies, or the company's disclosure is limited to 'top-line' climate statements without reference to specific climate-related policies. |
| *As assessed against InfluenceMap's *database* on the company's climate policy engagement. | |
| **Material evidence in this context means consistent and/or strategic engagement on specific climate-related policies. | |

**Accuracy of Indirect Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure:** Has the company published an accurate account of its corporate climate policy positions and engagement activities (as compared to InfluenceMap's database)?

| Accuracy of Indirect Climate Policy Engagement Disclosure | |
|---|---|
| | The company has published an accurate account of their positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies for each industry association actively engaged on climate policy*, or has excluded one industry association which is actively engaged** on climate policy or one item of material evidence*** of indirect climate policy engagement. |
| | The company has published a partial account of its industry associations' positions and engagement activities on specific climate policies*. However, the company excludes more than one industry association(s) which is actively engaged on climate policy**, and/or excludes more than one material evidence of indirect climate policy engagement***. |
| | The company has not published an account of the positions and engagement activities of its industry associations on specific climate-related policies*, or the company's **disclosure is limited to 'top-line' climate statements** without reference to specific climate-related policies. |
| *As assessed against InfluenceMap's *database* of over 330 industry associations' climate policy engagement. | |
| ** Industry associations are considered 'actively engaged' on climate policy if they have an Engagement Intensity score above 12% under InfluenceMap's database. The Engagement Intensity (expressed as a percentage from 0 to 100) is a measure of the level of direct policy engagement by the industry association, whether positive or negative. | |
| ***Material evidence in this context means consistent and/or strategic engagement on specific climate-related policies. | |

# Appendix D: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 3, Corporate Climate Policy Engagement Review & Misalignment Management

The final 'Review Score' assesses corporate performance against seven indicators, using the traffic-light framework summarized below. A 'Green' scores 2 points, a 'Yellow' scores 1 point, and a 'Red' scores 0 points. This total is converted into a percentage from 0 to 100, calculated using the total number of points available (14).

| Key | Score Explanation |
|---|---|
| | Has broadly met the assessment criteria. |
| | Has partially met the assessment criteria, but with some deficiencies. |
| | Has not met the assessment criteria. |

The detailed assessment criteria for the seven indicators is outlined below:

## 1. Review Process

**(i)** **Monitor & Review:** Has the company established an annual monitoring and review process to ensure that all of its direct and indirect climate policy engagement activities across all geographies are consistent with the science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels?

| Monitor & Review | |
|---|---|
| | The company has published a review of its climate policy engagement on an annual basis or has committed to do so at least once a year. Alternatively, the company is/has committed to disclose regular updates on its review process including detailed updates on relevant misalignments (e.g. engagement with industry associations on climate policy engagement, specific actions taken, changes in positions, and next steps). |
| | The company has committed to publish an update to its climate policy engagement review process, but not explicitly on an annual basis. |
| | The company has not committed to any follow-up processes as part of its climate policy engagement review process. |

(ii) **Alignment assessment method:** Has the company disclosed a clear and detailed methodology for assessing alignment, including: (1) the criteria it uses to assess whether its climate policy engagement activities (direct or indirect) align with science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels; and (2) a clear and detailed explanation behind each evaluation?

| Alignment Assessment Method | |
|---|---|
| | The company has: (1) disclosed a clear and detailed methodology for assessing alignment, including the criteria for a finding of alignment and misalignment; (2) aligned this assessment methodology with delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement; and (3) provided a clear and detailed explanation behind each evaluation. |
| | The company has disclosed a methodology for assessing alignment, but the disclosure does not satisfy *one or two* of the above criteria (1-3). |
| | The company has not disclosed a methodology for assessing alignment, or it has disclosed a methodology but the disclosure does not satisfy any of the above criteria (1-3). |

(iii) **Framework for addressing misalignment:** Has the company established a clear framework to address misalignments between its climate policy engagement activities (direct or indirect) and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, including the escalation strategies it will use and when it will use these escalation strategies?

| Framework for Addressing Misalignment | |
|---|---|
| | The company has disclosed a clear framework to address misalignments, including details on: (1) the escalation strategies it will use; and (2) when it will use them. Escalation strategies may include, but are not limited to: making public statements challenging industry associations, withdrawing funding for the industry association, and suspending or ending membership of the industry association. |
| | The company has disclosed a clear framework to address misalignments, but the disclosure does not satisfy *one* of the above criteria (1-2). |
| | The company has not disclosed a framework for addressing misalignments with its industry associations, or the company has disclosed a framework but the disclosure does not satisfy *both* of the above criteria (1-2). |

## 2. Review Assessment (Direct – Company)

(i) **Identify & Assess (Direct Misalignment):** Has the company identified and reported on the existence of all misalignments between its direct climate policy engagement activities and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with

InfluenceMap's database (including all of its subsidiaries, business areas, and operational jurisdictions)?

| Identify & Assess (Direct Misalignment) | |
|---|---|
| | The company has reviewed and identified all cases of misalignment between its direct climate policy engagement and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*, or the company has no material evidence** of negative climate policy engagement identified by InfluenceMap's database.<br><br>OR the company has an Organization Score metric of 75% or above (indicating alignment with science-aligned pathways for limiting warming to 1.5°C), has reviewed its own direct climate policy engagements, and missed up to *one* instance of material evidence** of negative climate policy engagement identified by InfluenceMap's database. |
| | The company has conducted a review of its direct climate policy engagements, but has not identified key cases of misalignment between its direct climate policy engagement and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*. Companies are scored in this category if they have not identified *up to three* instances of material evidence** of negative climate policy engagement that is misaligned with delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement. |
| | The company has not conducted a review of its direct climate policy engagements, OR the company has conducted a review, but has not identified key cases of misalignment between its direct climate policy engagement and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*. Companies are scored in this category if they have not identified *more than three* instances of material evidence** of negative climate policy engagement that is misaligned with delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement. |
| *As assessed against InfluenceMap's ***database*** on the company's climate policy engagement. | |
| **Material evidence in this context means consistent and/or strategic engagement on specific climate-related policies. | |

(ii) **Act (Direct Misalignment):** Has the company reported on what action is being (or has been) taken to address misalignments, if and where they exist, between its direct climate policy engagement activities and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with InfluenceMap's database?

| Act (Direct Misalignment) | |
|---|---|
| | The company has shown evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment between its direct climate policy engagement and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*, or the company has no material evidence** of negative climate policy engagement identified by InfluenceMap's database. |
| | The company has shown some evidence of action to address cases of misalignment between its direct climate policy engagement and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*, but has not addressed key cases of misalignment identified by InfluenceMap's database. |
| | The company has shown no evidence of action to address cases of misalignment between its direct climate policy engagement and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*. |
| *As assessed against InfluenceMap's ***database*** of the company's climate policy engagement. | |
| **Material evidence in this context means consistent and/or strategic engagement on specific climate-related policies. | |

## 3. Review Assessment (Indirect – Industry Associations)

**(i)** **Identify & Assess (Indirect Misalignment):** Has the company identified and reported on the existence of all misalignments between the climate policy engagement activities of its industry associations and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with InfluenceMap's database?

| Identify & Assess (Indirect Misalignment) | |
|---|---|
| | The company has identified all cases of misalignment between its industry associations and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*, or the company does not have any memberships to industry associations with misaligned or partially misaligned climate policy engagement practices in InfluenceMap's database (Organization Scores of 0-74). |
| | The company has not identified key cases of misalignment between its industry associations and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*. Companies are scored in this category if they miss up to three cases of partial misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 50-74 in InfluenceMap's database). |
| | The company has not identified key cases of misalignment between its industry associations and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement*. Companies are scored in this category if they miss one case of misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores below 50 in InfluenceMap's database) or more than three cases of partial misalignment (industry associations with Organization Scores 50-74 in InfluenceMap's database). |
| *As assessed against InfluenceMap's *database* of over 330 industry associations' climate policy engagement. | |

**(ii)** **Act (Indirect Misalignment):** Has the company reported on what action is being (or has been) taken to address misalignments, if and where they exist, between the climate policy engagement activities of its industry associations, and science-aligned policy pathways for restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels, in line with InfluenceMap's database?

| Act (Indirect Misalignment) | |
|---|---|
| | The company has shown evidence of action to address all cases of misalignment between its industry associations and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement, or the company does not have any memberships to misaligned or partially misaligned industry associations (i.e. Organization Scores of 0-74 in InfluenceMap's database)*. |
| | The company has shown some evidence of action to address cases of misalignment between its industry associations and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement, but has not addressed key cases of misalignment or partial misalignment with its industry associations (i.e. Organization Scores of 0-74 in InfluenceMap's database)*. |
| | The company has shown no or limited evidence of action to address misalignment between its industry associations and delivering the 1.5°C goal of the Paris Agreement, missing key cases of misalignment or partial misalignment with its industry associations (i.e. Organization Scores of 0-74 in InfluenceMap's database)*. |
| *As assessed against InfluenceMap's *database* of over 330 industry associations' climate policy engagement. | |
| The *Global Standard on Responsible Climate Lobbying* discloses actions companies can take to address misalignment: making public statements challenging industry associations, withdrawal of funding, and suspending or terminating membership. Investor statements by *PRI, IIGCC* and *Ceres* outline additional actions including: constructive engagement, requiring the industry association to stop engaging on issues where there is not alignment amongst all members, and forming proactive coalitions to counter negative advocacy. | |

# Appendix E: Detailed Methodology for Assessing InfluenceMap Indicator 7, Climate Policy Engagement

**7.1 – Lobbying Position Aligned with Paris Agreement**

**Sub-indicator Text:** The company commits to conducting its policy engagement activities in accordance with the goals of the Paris Agreement.

a) **The company has a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct all of its lobbying in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement.**
   - To score on this metric, a company should make a clear statement that it will ensure all of its direct lobbying and advocacy activities are aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement. This commitment should refer to direct lobbying activities rather than those of trade associations and should refer to the Paris Agreement specifically rather than to the company's climate policy or the like.
   - Statements including vague language or caveats on aligning direct lobbying activities (e.g., "where possible" or "aim to ensure direct lobbying positions are aligned with Paris Agreement") are not sufficient to score on this Metric.

b) **The company commits to advocate for Paris-aligned lobbying within the trade associations of which it is a member.**

- To score on this metric, the company should make a clear and unequivocal statement that the company will advocate, within the trade associations of which it is a member, in a manner that is aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement. This commitment should refer directly to the lobbying activities of the company within its trade associations, and should mention the Paris Agreement specifically, rather than, for example, the trade associations' published policy positions or the company's climate policy.
- Statements including vague language or caveats on aligning indirect lobbying activities (e.g., "where possible" or "aim to ensure trade association's lobbying positions are aligned with Paris Agreement") are not sufficient to score on this Metric. Conducting a review of trade associations' climate positions and alignment to the goals of the Paris Agreement is insufficient to score on this Metric.

c) **The company's public commitment/position statement to conduct all of its lobbying in line with the objectives of the Paris Agreement specifies the goal of restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.**

- To score on this metric, a company should make a clear statement that the company will ensure its direct lobbying activities and advocacy activities are aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement, as well as specify that the company conducts advocacy activities in line with restricting global temperature rise to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.
- Statements in support of the Paris Agreement's 1.5°C goal or including a description of the exact wording of the Paris Agreement are not sufficient to score on this Metric. Statements should be explicitly linked to the company's direct lobbying and advocacy activities.
- Metric 7.1.c is contingent on Metric 7.1.a; a company cannot score "Yes" on Metric 7.1.c if it does not score "Yes" on Metric 7.1.a.

**7.2 – Review of Direct & Indirect Climate Policy Positions**

**Sub-indicator Text:** The company publishes a review of its direct and indirect (via trade associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities.

a) **The company has published a review of its direct climate policy positions and engagement activities.**

- To score on this metric, a company should have published a review, either a stand-alone document, a clearly identifiable section within a broader report, or a clearly labeled webpage, that specifically evaluates its own direct climate policy positions and engagement activities. This review should refer to the company's direct lobbying activities rather than those of trade

associations and should assess actual advocacy activities against a stated benchmark, rather than simply disclosing the company's climate policy.

- A general commitment to "monitor" or "regularly review" direct lobbying, without any published review output, is not sufficient to score on this metric.

b) **The company has published a review of its indirect (via industry associations) climate policy positions and engagement activities.**

- To score on this metric, a company should have published a review, either a stand-alone document, a clearly identifiable section within a broader report, or a clearly labeled webpage, that specifically evaluates the climate policy positions and engagement activities of the trade associations of which it is a member. This review should refer directly to the associations' positions and activities, rather than, for example, simply listing memberships or restating the company's own climate policy.
- A general commitment to monitor trade associations, without any published review output, is not sufficient to score on this metric.