

# Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark Disclosure Framework

## Assessment Methodology V2.2 – 2025

October 2025

This document contains detailed Indicator-by-Indicator guidance on how company disclosures were assessed using the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark<sup>1</sup> (henceforth referred to as the ‘*Benchmark*’) **Disclosure Framework** assessed by the TPI Global Climate Transition Centre (TPI Centre) on behalf of the Climate Action 100+ initiative. The TPI Centre is part of the Global School of Sustainability at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), and the academic partner of Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI). The document also contains a summary of how company assessments are presented (via a ‘traffic light system’), as well as contingencies between Indicators. This document does **not** cover the Benchmark **Alignment** Assessments. These are assessed by different data providers that use their own separate assessment methodologies. Please see [here](#) for other Benchmark methodologies. This document should be read and used in conjunction with the other supporting materials relating to the Benchmark Version 2.2 (October 2025) available on the [Climate Action 100+ website](#). These include:

- Information on the [background and future development](#) of the Benchmark.
- Overview of the [Benchmark framework and methodologies](#) used. This includes the full framework, [TPI Centre’s Carbon Performance methodologies](#) and an investor guide on how the Benchmark and TPI Centre tool can be used together.
- [Frequently Asked Questions](#) (FAQs).
- Terms and conditions regarding [data usage](#) and the [company review and redress process](#).

Please also refer to the Climate Action 100+ disclaimer, available [here](#). The company assessments can be accessed on the Climate Action 100+ website via individual [company profiles](#). This also includes the complete set of all company assessments, which are accessible via a publicly available Excel file. Any additional questions or feedback can be directed to [benchmark@climateaction100.org](mailto:benchmark@climateaction100.org).

## CONTENTS

1. Acknowledgements (p2)
2. Terminology (p4)
3. Assessment Methodology and Indicator Guidance (p5)
4. Traffic Light System: Yes / No / Partial (p36)
5. Indicator Contingencies (p36)
6. Scope 3 Assessed Companies (p37)

<sup>1</sup>The data referenced in this document is not intended to be used as a “benchmark” as defined in Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2016 on indices used as benchmarks in financial instruments and financial contracts or to measure the performance of investment funds (the European Benchmark Regulation) and The Benchmarks (Amendment and Transitional Provision) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (the UK Benchmark Regulation). The Disclosure Framework Indicators draw on public and self-disclosed data from companies. These are collected from sources such as company annual reports, sustainability reports, press releases and CDP disclosures. Overall, the Climate Action 100+ Net Zero Company Benchmark is not a disclosure mechanism or a database itself. Rather, it is an assessment tool for investor engagement that can be used by investors, all of whom will have differing mandates and starting points together with considerations of jurisdiction, regulation and best practice, from which they make their own decisions. Investors always act independently, including with respect to investment decisions and voting.

**Disclaimer:** The information contained in this document is meant for information purposes only and is not intended to be investment, legal, tax or other advice, nor is it intended to be relied upon in making an investment or other decisions. Without limiting the foregoing, this document is not intended as a voting recommendation on any shareholder proposal. This document is provided with the understanding that the authors and publishers are not providing advice on legal, economic, investment or other professional issues and services. Climate Action 100+ and the investor networks (individually or as a whole) are not responsible for any errors or omissions, for any decision made or action taken based on information contained in this report or for any loss or damage arising from or caused by such decision or action. All information in this document is provided “as-is” with no guarantee of completeness, accuracy or timeliness, or of the results obtained from the use of this information, and without warranty of any kind, expressed or implied. Please also refer to: <https://www.climateaction100.org/disclaimer/>.

## Acknowledgements

The Benchmark was undertaken through the leadership and support of the Climate Action 100+ Steering Committee, and the collaboration of investor signatories and experts from the [investor networks](#) of AIGCC, Ceres, IIGCC, IGCC and PRI. Leading climate research and data organisations, including the TPI Global Climate Transition Centre (TPI Centre) as part of the Global School of Sustainability at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), FTSE Russell – an LSEG business, Chronos Sustainability, Carbon Tracker Initiative (CTI), Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI) and InfluenceMap (IM) have been central to supporting the overall development of the Benchmark and the Indicators used to assess focus company alignment with the initiative's goals.

The Disclosure Framework Indicators covered in this document are assessed by the TPI Centre, supported by its partners (see below). The document has been prepared by representatives from the investor networks who lead the Benchmark project for the Climate Action 100+ initiative. These include:

### Climate Action 100+ Benchmark Reference Group:

Valerie Kwan, Director, Stewardship, **AIGCC**  
Cosmo Hui, Manager, Stewardship, **AIGCC**  
Hayli Chiu, Analyst, Stewardship, **AIGCC**  
Morgan LaManna, Director, **Ceres**  
Sarah Hicks, Senior Associate, Investor Network, **Ceres**  
Dr Donna Lopata, Manager, Corporate Engagement and Policy, **IGCC**  
Adam Rose, Senior Climate Action 100+ Manager, **IIGCC**  
Jasna Šelih, Senior Specialist, Climate Action 100+, **PRI**  
Jude Otaibi, Stewardship Specialist, Climate Action 100+, **PRI**  
Aneesha Sing, Stewardship Specialist, Climate Action 100+, **PRI**  
Kerri-Anne Hemphshall, Benchmark Manager, Climate Action 100+, **PRI**

### Contributors also include:

Dr Rory Sullivan, Chief Technical Adviser, **TPI & CEO, Chronos Sustainability**  
Ella Harvey, Manager, Climate, **Chronos Sustainability**  
Chup Priovashini, Research Analyst, **Chronos Sustainability**  
Professor Simon Dietz, Professor of Environmental Policy, **London School of Economics and Political Science & Research Director, TPI Centre**  
Valentin Jahn, Deputy Director, **TPI Centre**  
Jared Sharp, Project Lead, **TPI Centre**  
Robert Ingham, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**  
Antonina Scheer, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**  
Nikolaus Hastreiter, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**

### Research Leads:

Shafaq Ashraf, Research Project Manager, **TPI Centre**  
Jessica Moo Young, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**  
Edward Clinton, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**  
Robin Goon, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**  
Ella Davies, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**  
Jon Ward, Research Analyst, **TPI Centre**  
Jaakko Kooroshy, Global Head of SI Research, **LSEG**  
Felix Fouret, SI Research Lead - Transition, **LSEG**

Kayla Gaskin, Senior Digital Associate, **Ceres**  
Rebecca Hoffman, Associate, **Ceres**  
Tracey Cameron, Senior Manager, **Ceres**  
Rob Berridge, Director, **Ceres**  
Rosanna Croom, Communications Manager (Climate Action 100+), **IIGCC**  
Ben Pincombe, Head of Stewardship, Climate Change, **PRI**  
Livia Rossi, Senior Specialist, Climate Action 100+, **PRI**  
Lily Dai, Senior SI Research Lead, **LSEG**  
Edmund Bourne, SI Research Lead, **LSEG**



The TPI Global Climate Transition Centre (TPI Centre) is an independent, authoritative source of research and data on the progress of corporate and sovereign entities in transitioning to a low-carbon economy. It is part of the Global School of Sustainability at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). The TPI Centre is the academic partner of the Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI). Parts of the CA100+ Disclosure Framework uses data provided by FTSE Russell – an LSEG business, TPI’s data partner.



The Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI) is a global initiative led by asset owners and supported by asset managers, aimed at helping investors assess companies’ preparedness for the transition to a low-carbon economy and supporting efforts to address climate change.



FTSE Russell – an LSEG business, is a global index leader that provides innovative benchmarking, analytics and data solutions for investors worldwide. FTSE Russell calculates thousands of indexes that measure and benchmark markets and asset classes in more than 70 countries, covering 98% of the investable market globally. FTSE Russell has pioneered sustainable investment index solutions for over two decades and its products based on transparent, rules-based methodologies are used by investors around world. FTSE Russell is part of the London Stock Exchange Group (LSEG).



The Global School of Sustainability at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) hosts the TPI Global Climate Transition Centre (TPI Centre). Launched in 2025, the Global School of Sustainability at LSE is the centre of social science expertise for sustainability impact at LSE. The School works in partnerships across the LSE community and beyond to advance pioneering sustainability research and global policy engagement.



Chronos Sustainability was established in 2017 with the objective of delivering transformative, systemic change in the social and environmental performance of key industry sectors through expert analysis of complex systems and effective multi-stakeholder partnerships. Chronos works extensively with global investors and global investor networks to build their understanding of the investment implications of sustainability-related issues, developing tools and strategies to enable them to build sustainability into their investment research and engagement. For more information visit [www.chronossustainability.com](http://www.chronossustainability.com) and @ChronosSustain.

## Terminology

The Benchmark was updated in 2023 following a [public consultation](#). Please see [here](#) for the Version 2.0 Disclosure Framework Indicators.

11 DISCLOSURE FRAMEWORK INDICATORS – VERSION 2.2 (2025)
(1) NET ZERO GHG EMISSIONS BY 2050 (OR SOONER) AMBITION
(2) LONG-TERM (2036-2050) GHG REDUCTION TARGET(S)
(3) MEDIUM-TERM (2029-2035) GHG REDUCTION TARGET(S)
(4) SHORT-TERM (UP TO 2028) GHG REDUCTION TARGET(S)
(5) DECARBONISATION STRATEGY
(6) CAPITAL ALLOCATION
(7) CLIMATE POLICY ENGAGEMENT
(8) CLIMATE GOVERNANCE
(9) JUST TRANSITION
(10) CLIMATE-RELATED DISCLOSURES
(11) HISTORICAL GHG EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS

The Disclosure Framework is structured into the following units of assessments, listed below in order of granularity:

- **Indicator:** Specific area the company is being assessed on (e.g., Indicator 8 evaluates companies on climate governance).
- **Sub-indicator:** Component of an Indicator that divides it into specific areas of interest (e.g., Sub-indicator 8.2 evaluates executive remuneration).
- **Metric:** Highest resolution assessment that separates Sub-indicators into components, creating the opportunity for evaluation across the subject of attention (e.g., Metric 8.2.b focuses on incorporating progress on climate change targets as a Key Performance Indicator to determine performance-linked compensation).
- **BETA Indicator/Sub-indicator/Metric:** A Beta Indicator/Sub-indicator/Metric is an Indicator/Sub-indicator/Metric piloted in this iteration of the Disclosure Framework assessments. Company assessments against Beta Indicators/Sub-indicators/Metrics will not be made publicly available.

## Assessment Methodology and Indicator Guidance

### Indicator 1 – Net Zero GHG Emissions by 2050 (or sooner) Ambition

#### 1.1 – Net Zero Ambition

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company has set an ambition to achieve net zero GHG emissions by 2050 or sooner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The company has made a qualitative net zero GHG emissions ambition statement that explicitly includes at least 95% of its Scope 1 and 2 emissions.</li> <li>b. The company’s net zero GHG emissions ambition covers the most relevant Scope 3 GHG emissions categories for the company’s sector (where assessed).</li> </ul>
---------------------------	--

#### Detailed Guidance

<b>a.</b> The company has made a qualitative net zero GHG emissions ambition statement that explicitly includes at least 95% of its Scope 1 and 2 emissions.	<p>Net zero commitments represent a special case of GHG emissions targets in which companies pledge to achieve a 100% reduction in net carbon emissions. A company is considered to have made a net zero commitment if it has publicly disclosed ambition to reach net zero, for example by stating that the company will ‘reach’, ‘achieve’ or ‘become’ ‘net zero by’, ‘carbon neutral by’ or ‘eliminate all emissions by’ a stated year - by 2050 or earlier. Companies that have set a GHG reduction target to cut (absolute) emissions by 100% by 2050 or earlier are also positively assessed on this Metric.</p>
<b>b.</b> The company’s net zero GHG emissions ambition covers the most relevant Scope 3 GHG emissions categories for the company’s sector (where assessed).	<p>As above, a company can make net zero commitments on its Scope 3 emissions through disclosing a net zero target that explicitly includes the Scope 3 categories deemed to be the most material for the company’s sector.</p> <p>If the company has disclosed a net zero commitment on its Scope 3 emissions, the following details are captured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the Scope 3 ambition is part of or separate from any Scope 1 and/or 2 net zero ambitions.</li> <li>• The Scope 3 category (as categorised by the GHG Protocol) that the ambition covers. The assessment focuses on the following categories: purchased goods and services (Category 1 - upstream), fuel- and energy-related activities (Category 3 - upstream), processing of sold products (Category 10 - downstream) and the use of sold products (Category 11 - downstream).</li> <li>• Percentage share of the most relevant Scope 3 GHG emissions categories covered by the ambition.</li> </ul>

Metric 1.1.b is contingent on the result of Metric 1.1.a; a company cannot score ‘Yes’ on Metric 1.1.b if it does not score ‘Yes’ on Metric 1.1.a.

Companies for which Scope 3 emissions are not assessed in the Climate Action 100+ Disclosure Framework will be marked as ‘Not Assessed’ on Metric 1.1.b, regardless of whether they have set a net zero Scope 3 ambition.

## Indicator 2 to 4 – Long-, Medium- and Short-Term Emissions Targets

### Indicator 2 to 4 – Long-, Medium- and Short-Term Emissions Targets

#### Indicator Text

These Indicators are captured over three different timeframes:

- Indicator 2: Long-term (2036 to 2050)
- Indicator 3: Medium-term (2029 to 2035)
- Indicator 4: Short-term (2025 to 2028)

Emissions reduction targets that have expired before the year of assessment are not considered. However, if a company has achieved net zero emissions by the year of assessment on its most material emissions, it will be assessed on the below Metrics. For each timeframe, each Indicator is composed of three Sub-indicators:

- **‘.1’** The company has set a target to reduce its GHG emissions.
- **‘.2’** which is separated into Metric ‘.2.a’ (The company has specified that this target covers at least 95% of its total Scope 1 and 2 emissions) and Metric ‘.2.b’ (Where assessed, the company’s Scope 3 GHG emissions target covers at least the most relevant Scope 3 emissions categories for the sector, and the company has published the methodology used to establish the Scope 3 target).
- **‘.3’** The company’s last disclosed carbon intensity OR targeted carbon intensity OR the company’s expected carbon intensity derived from its GHG target is aligned with or below the relevant sector trajectory needed to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot. This trajectory is equivalent to [IPCC’s Special Report on the 1.5° Celsius pathway P1](#) or the [International Energy Agency’s \(IEA\) Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario](#).

Metrics .2.a and .2.b are contingent on the results of Sub-indicator .1. Sub-indicator .3 is assessed independently of Sub-indicator .1 and .2.

Indicator 3: Medium-term GHG Reduction Target(s) also includes a Beta Sub-indicator 3.4 (see below for more detail).

#### Detailed Guidance

- .1** The company has set a target to reduce its GHG emissions.
- For each company, the following target details are captured:
- Scope of emissions (Scope 1 and/or Scope 2 and/or Scope 3)
  - Base year
  - Percentage reduction targeted (%)
  - Target year
  - Unit of the target (tCO<sub>2</sub>e, kgCO<sub>2</sub>e/\$, ...)
  - Year in which target was set
  - Percentage of emissions covered by target
  - Source document
  - Source text

A GHG reduction commitment will be captured as a target if the disclosure clearly identifies, at a minimum, a target year and a percentage reduction (in terms of either absolute GHG emissions or GHG intensity). If a company

states that it is aiming to maintain carbon emissions at current levels (e.g., at the levels specified in its current or most recent sustainability report), this is recorded as a 0% reduction target.

The assessment focuses only on GHG reduction targets. Renewable energy targets or other sustainability targets are not considered. Individual methane and flaring targets are not considered, unless the percentage of emissions covered by the targets is clearly disclosed.

If the company discloses multiple targets, these are all captured. For the assessment, the target covering the largest share of the company's emissions is prioritised (i.e., a target covering all emissions is prioritised for the assessment over targets covering a subset of emissions). If there are multiple targets covering all emissions (or the same subset of emissions) the target that has been set most recently is assessed.

If the company has set a separate long-term Scope 3 target, or includes Scope 3 emissions in its target, the following details are captured:

- Whether the Scope 3 target is part of or separate from any Scope 1 or 2 targets.
- The Scope 3 Category (as categorised by the GHG Protocol) that the target covers. The assessment focuses on the following categories: purchased goods and services (Category 1 - upstream), fuel- and energy-related activities (Category 3 - upstream), processing of sold products (Category 10 - downstream) and the use of sold products (Category 11 - downstream).
- The percentage share of Scope 3 emissions covered by the target in the targeted categories.
- The methodology used to establish any Scope 3 target, if disclosed. If the target methodology is not available, the emissions calculation methodology used to assess Scope 3 emissions in the targeted categories is captured as far as is available.

If a company has a target that is a net zero target, this is captured both here and in Indicator 1.

If a company is assessed as having a net zero emissions target by 2035 (assessed under Sub-indicator 3.1), this target will be automatically accepted on Sub-indicator 2.1. Similarly, if a company is assessed as having a net zero emissions target by 2028 (assessed under Sub-indicator 4.1), this target will be automatically accepted on Sub-indicators 3.1 and 2.1.

---



<p><b>.2.a</b> The company has specified that this GHG reduction target covers at least 95% of its total Scope 1 and 2 emissions.</p>	<p>Metric .2.a is met if the information captured under Sub-indicator .1 identifies a target that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covers over 95% of the company's Scope 1 and 2 emissions.</li> <li>• Note that this can also be met if the company respectively only targets Scope 1 emissions or only Scope 2 emissions, but the company discloses that these account for over 95% of the company's combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions.</li> </ul> <p>If a company is assessed as having a net zero emissions target by 2035, covering at least 95% of Scope 1 and 2 emissions (assessed under Metric 3.2.a), this will be automatically accepted on Metric 2.2.a. Similarly, if a company is assessed as having a net zero emissions target by 2028 (assessed under Metric 4.2.a), this will be automatically accepted on Metrics 3.2.a and 2.2.a.</p>
<p><b>.2.b</b> The company's Scope 3 GHG reduction target covers at least the most relevant Scope 3 emissions categories for its sector, and the company has published the methodology used to establish its Scope 3 target (where assessed).</p>	<p>In applicable sectors, to score on this Metric, a company should set a target that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covers the most relevant Scope 3 emissions categories assessed for the company's sector; AND</li> <li>• The methodology used to establish the Scope 3 target or to calculate Scope 3 emissions of the targeted Scope 3 categories are available.</li> </ul> <p>If a company is assessed as having a net zero emissions target covering its assessed Scope 3 emissions by 2035 (assessed under Metric 3.2.b), this will be automatically accepted on Metric 2.2.b. Similarly, if a company is assessed as having a net zero target covering its assessed Scope 3 emissions by 2028 (assessed under Metric 4.2.b), this will be automatically accepted on Metrics 3.2.b and 2.2.b.</p> <p>Note that all companies for which Scope 3 emissions are not assessed will be marked as 'Not Assessed' on Metric .2.b, regardless of whether they have set a Scope 3 target.</p>



## 2.3 – Long-Term Alignment to 1.5°C

### Sub-indicator Text

The company's last disclosed carbon intensity OR its short-term or medium-term targeted carbon intensity OR the company's expected carbon intensity derived from its long-term GHG reduction target is aligned with or below the relevant sector trajectory needed to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot in 2050. This is equivalent to [IPCC's Special Report on the 1.5°C pathway P1](#) or the [IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario](#).

### Detailed Guidance

Sub-indicator 2.3 uses the TPI Centre's Carbon Performance methodology to measure companies' carbon intensities in 2050. There are three ways to meet the conditions of this Sub-indicator:

- 1) If at the last year of disclosure (and without a long-term GHG target), the company's carbon intensity is aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2050, it meets the conditions of this Sub-indicator.

OR

- 2) If the company's short-term or medium-term targeted carbon intensities are aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2050, it meets the conditions of the Sub-indicator.

OR

- 3) If the company discloses a long-term GHG target that extends to 2050 and the company's aimed carbon intensity at that time is aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2050, it meets the conditions of the Sub-indicator.

Therefore, even if a company has not set a long-term target (and therefore scores 'No' on 2.1, 2.2.a and 2.2.b), it can score 'Yes' on Sub-indicator 2.3 if its expected intensity at 2050 is aligned with or below the trajectory (for the company's respective sector) to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot (equivalent to IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C pathway P1 or the IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario). In the case of electric utility companies, the relevant year of long-term alignment is 2040.

In the absence of a 1.5°C-consistent scenario in the Paper sector, companies in this sector will be measured against a best-available below 2°C scenario. Company assessments will be adjusted when a credible 1.5°C scenario becomes available. All other sectors are assessed against a 1.5°C scenario. Currently, the companies within sectors that do not have a Carbon Performance methodology by the TPI Centre are marked as 'Not Assessed'<sup>2</sup>. The 1.5°C scenario considered for this iteration of the Benchmark is largely based on IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 report and therefore broadly follows an IPCC P2 pathway. This pathway is used in the absence of a suitable P1 scenario<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The sectors that do not yet have a Carbon Performance Methodology are Chemicals, Coal Mining, Household and Consumer Products, Retailers, Oil and Gas Distribution, Other Industrials and Other Transport.

<sup>3</sup> The emissions pathway of IEA's Net-Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario used in this assessment broadly follows an IPCC 1.5C scenario P2 trajectory until 2030 with emissions falling faster thereafter, reaching net zero in 2050 (IEA, 2021). Although this scenario considers a wider range of abatement technologies than the IPCC P1 pathway, both

### 3.3 – Medium-Term Alignment to 1.5°C

#### Sub-indicator Text

The company's last disclosed carbon intensity OR its short-term targeted carbon intensity target OR the company's expected carbon intensity derived from its medium-term GHG reduction target is aligned with or below the relevant sector trajectory needed to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot in 2035. This is equivalent to [IPCC's Special Report on the 1.5°C pathway P1](#) or the [IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario](#).

#### Detailed Guidance

Sub-indicator 3.3 uses the TPI Centre's Carbon Performance methodology to measure companies' carbon intensities in 2035. There are three ways to meet the conditions of this Sub-indicator:

- 1) If at the last year of disclosure (and without a medium-term GHG target), the company's carbon intensity is aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2035, it meets the conditions of the Sub-indicator.  
OR
- 2) If the company's short-term targeted carbon intensity is aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2035, it meets the conditions of the Sub-indicator.  
OR
- 3) If the company discloses a GHG target that extends to 2035 and the company's aimed carbon intensity at that time is aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2035, it meets the conditions of the Sub-indicator.

Therefore, even if a company has not set a medium-term target (and therefore scores 'No' on 3.1, 3.2.a and 3.2.b), it can score 'Yes' on Sub-indicator 3.3 if its expected intensity at 2035 is aligned with or below the trajectory (for the company's respective sector) to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot (equivalent to IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C pathway P1 or the IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario).

In the absence of a 1.5°C-consistent scenario in the Paper sector, companies in this sector will be measured against a best-available below 2°C scenario. Company assessments will be adjusted when a credible 1.5°C scenario becomes available. All other sectors are assessed against a 1.5°C scenario. Currently, the companies within sectors that do not have a Carbon Performance methodology by the TPI Centre are marked as 'Not Assessed'. For further details, please refer to footnotes 1 and 2.

The 1.5°C scenario considered for this iteration of the Benchmark is largely based on IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 report and therefore broadly follows an IPCC P2 pathway. This pathway is used in the absence of a suitable P1 scenario.

### 3.4 – Conversion of GHG Intensity Targets to Absolute GHG Emissions Reductions [BETA]

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company discloses its medium-term absolute GHG reduction targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a.</b> The company already states its medium-term GHG reduction target on an absolute basis or converts its medium-term intensity target into projected absolute GHG emissions reductions for its Scope 1 and 2 emissions.</li> <li><b>b.</b> The company already states its medium-term GHG reduction target on an absolute basis or converts its medium-term intensity target into projected absolute GHG emissions reductions for its Scope 3 emissions (where assessed).</li> </ul>
---------------------------	--

#### Detailed Guidance

<b>a</b>	<p>The company already states its medium-term GHG reduction target on an absolute basis or converts its medium-term intensity target into projected absolute GHG emissions reductions for its Scope 1 and 2 emissions.</p>	<p>Metric 3.4.a applies to a company's medium-term target for its Scope 1 and 2 emissions. A company can meet the criteria for this Metric in one of two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Disclosing its medium-term Scope 1 and 2 GHG reduction target (Metric 3.2.a) in absolute terms.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>2) Converting its medium-term Scope 1 and 2 intensity target into projected absolute GHG emissions reductions.</li> </ul> <p>Companies are only assessed on this Metric if they have set a medium-term target covering their Scope 1 and 2 emissions as per Metric 3.2.a. As such, Metric 3.4.a is contingent on Metric 3.2.a; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 3.4.a if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 3.2.a.</p>
<b>b</b>	<p>The company already states its medium-term GHG reduction target on an absolute basis or converts its medium-term intensity target into projected absolute GHG emissions reductions for its Scope 3 emissions (where assessed).</p>	<p>Metric 3.4.b applies to a company's medium-term target for its Scope 3 emissions (where assessed). As above, a company can meet the criteria for this Metric in one of two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Disclosing its medium-term Scope 3 GHG reduction target (Metric 3.2.b) in absolute terms.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>2) Converting its medium-term Scope 3 intensity target into projected absolute GHG emissions reductions.</li> </ul> <p>Companies are only assessed on this Metric if they have set a medium-term target covering their Scope 3 emissions as per Metric 3.2.b. As such, Metric 3.4.b is contingent on Metric 3.2.b; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 3.4.b if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 3.2.b.</p>

### 4.3 – Short-Term Alignment to 1.5°C

#### Sub-indicator Text

The company's last disclosed carbon intensity OR the company's expected carbon intensity derived from its short-term GHG reduction target is aligned with or below the trajectory for its respective sector to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot in 2028. This is equivalent to [IPCC's Special Report on the 1.5° Celsius pathway P1](#) or the [IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario](#).

#### Detailed Guidance

Sub-indicator 4.3 uses the TPI Centre's Carbon Performance methodology to measure companies' carbon intensities in 2028. There are two ways to meet the conditions of this Sub-indicator:

- 1) If at the last year of disclosure (and without a short-term GHG target), the company's carbon intensity is aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2028, it meets the conditions of this Sub-indicator.

OR

- 2) If the company discloses a GHG target that extends to 2028 and the company's aimed carbon intensity at that time is aligned with or below its respective sector's benchmarked carbon intensity for 2028, it meets the conditions of the Sub-indicator.

Therefore, even if a company has not set a short-term target (and therefore scores 'No' on 4.1, 4.2.a and 4.2.b), it can score 'Yes' on Sub-indicator 4.3 if its expected intensity at 2028 is aligned with or below the trajectory (for the company's respective sector) to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot (equivalent to IPCC Special Report on 1.5° Celsius pathway P1 or the IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario).

In the absence of a 1.5°C-consistent scenario in the Paper sector, companies in this sector will be measured against a best-available below 2°C scenario. Company assessments will be adjusted when a credible 1.5°C scenario becomes available. All other sectors are assessed against a 1.5°C scenario. Currently, the companies within sectors that do not have a Carbon Performance methodology by the TPI Centre are marked as 'Not Assessed'. For further details, please refer to footnotes 1 and 2.

The 1.5°C scenario considered for this iteration of the Benchmark is largely based on IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 report and therefore broadly follows an IPCC P2 pathway. This pathway is used in the absence of a suitable P1 scenario.

## Indicator 5 – Decarbonisation Strategy

### 5.1 – Strategy to Meet GHG Reduction Targets

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company has a decarbonisation strategy that explains how it intends to meet its medium- and long-term GHG reduction targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The company identifies the set of actions it intends to take to achieve its GHG reduction targets over the targeted timeframes. These actions clearly refer to the main sources of the company’s GHG emissions, including Scope 3 emissions (where assessed).</li> <li>b. The company quantifies the contribution of individual decarbonisation levers to achieving its medium- and long-term GHG reduction targets, including Scope 3 GHG reduction targets where assessed (e.g., changing technology or product mix, supply chain measures).</li> <li>c. If the company chooses to employ offsetting and negative emissions technologies to meet its medium- and long-term GHG reduction targets, it discloses the quantity of offsets, type of offsets, offset certification and the negative emissions technologies it is planning to use.</li> <li>d. The company discloses the abatement measures it intends to use that are technologically feasible under current economic conditions and quantifies the contribution of these measures to achieving its medium- and long-term GHG reduction targets.</li> </ul>
---------------------------	--

#### Detailed Guidance

<p>a. The company identifies the set of actions it intends to take to achieve its GHG reduction targets over the targeted timeframes. These actions clearly refer to the main sources of the company’s GHG emissions, including Scope 3 emissions (where assessed).</p>	<p>For companies that have targets meeting Metrics 2.2.a and 3.2.a, any disclosures about concrete actions to achieve these targets are assessed. Do note, where a company has set a target on its Scope 3 emissions, the inclusion of actions to decarbonise on Scope 3 emissions is also taken into account. To be assessed as ‘Yes’ on this Metric, the company should disclose a set of actions that meet three key criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Specifically relate to the company’s GHG reduction targets.</b> The set of actions should be explicitly framed as aiming to achieve the GHG reduction targets the company has set. An account of broader emissions reductions efforts that do not clearly relate to achieving these targets is insufficient.</li> <li>2. <b>Clearly address the main sources of the company’s GHG emissions.</b> The set of actions should clearly relate to the most material sources of GHG emissions. For example, it would be insufficient if the bulk of emissions a company generates consisted of Scope 1 emissions, but the actions described were mainly related to Scope 2 emissions (e.g., ‘use 100% renewables for our headquarters’).</li> <li>3. <b>Lay out a concrete set of measures.</b> The strategy should clearly identify the set of actions the company will implement to achieve its decarbonisation targets (such as phasing out carbon-intensive products or assets, developing or deploying low carbon technologies, decarbonising supply chains or using offsets). The measures should be concrete and specific to the company’s operations. Vague descriptions such as ‘accelerate our transition to</li> </ol>
---	--

cleaner energy solutions’, ‘modernise our operations’ or ‘leverage green solutions’ without a description of how emissions reductions will be achieved are not eligible.

Decarbonisation strategies are separately captured in relation to each target timeframe (medium- or long-term).

To be assessed as ‘Yes’ on this Metric, a decarbonisation strategy meeting the above criteria should be disclosed in relation to both its long- and medium-term targets. Alternatively, a company is also assessed as ‘Yes’ on this Metric if it has a long- or medium-term net zero target (including Scope 3 emissions where assessed) and discloses a corresponding decarbonisation strategy that meets the above criteria. To avoid any assumptions regarding the current strategy adopted by the company, the company should disclose its strategy on an annual basis and in its latest disclosures. These criteria can also be met if the company refers to its past disclosure in its latest disclosure.

Metric 5.1.a is contingent on Metrics 2.2.a and 3.2.a; a company cannot score ‘Yes’ on Metric 5.1.a if it does not score ‘Yes’ on Metrics 2.2.a and 3.2.a.

<p><b>b.</b> The company quantifies the contribution of individual decarbonisation levers to achieving its medium- and long-term GHG reduction targets, including Scope 3 GHG reduction targets where assessed (e.g., changing technology or product mix, supply chain measures).</p>	<p>This Metric assesses whether key actions of the decarbonisation (i.e., target delivery) strategy have been quantified in the corporate disclosures. The contribution of each action should be quantified in terms of the approximate proportion of the overall GHG target that the action will account for.</p> <p>Metric 5.1.b is contingent on Metric 5.1.a; a company cannot score ‘Yes’ on Metric 5.1.b if it does not score ‘Yes’ on Metric 5.1.a.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> If the company chooses to employ offsetting and negative emissions technologies to meet its medium- and long-term GHG reduction targets, it discloses the quantity of offsets, type of offsets, offset certification and the negative emission technologies it is planning to use.</p>	<p>If the company explicitly states that it does not plan on using carbon offsetting and negative emissions technologies to meet its GHG reduction targets, it will not be assessed against this Metric, receiving a ‘Not Applicable’ label.</p> <p>If the company chooses to employ offsetting and negative emissions technologies, it should publicly disclose the following to score on this Metric:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approximate proportion of the overall GHG target that the offsets and negative emissions technologies will account for (i.e., quantity of offsets and negative emissions technologies employed);</li> <li>• The type of offsets and negative emission technologies it is planning to use;</li> <li>• A clear description of how the offsets it is planning to use will be certified. To meet this criterion, the company should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide an indicative list of offset certification mechanisms/ suppliers it is currently planning to purchase offsets from, OR</li> <li>○ Provide an offset quality policy ensuring that high quality offsets are used beyond the current practical time horizon and when new suppliers get online (e.g., Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (ICVCM) meta</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

certification).

- If the company is using negative emissions technologies, it should publicly disclose the quantity and the type.

Please note that if the company plans to use carbon offsetting for residual emissions, the company should still quantify/provide a range of the role these residual emissions play in the company's decarbonisation.

Companies disclosing that offsets will only be considered for residual emissions are also expected to meet these criteria to score on Metric 5.1.c.

Metric 5.1.c is contingent on Metric 5.1.b; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 5.1.c if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 5.1.b.

- 
- d.** The company discloses the abatement measures it intends to use that are technologically feasible under current economic conditions and quantifies the contribution of these measures to achieving its medium- and long-term GHG reduction targets.

To score on this Metric, the company should publicly disclose the approximate proportion of the overall GHG target that can be met through the deployment of measures that are technologically feasible and economically viable today. To this end, the company should explicitly state the share of abatement measures that are feasible under current conditions and the share that relies on future technologies or economic conditions.

The information provided should allow for the computation of the approximate share of technologically feasible and economically viable abatement measures the company is relying on to meet its targets.

Metric 5.1.d is contingent on Metric 5.1.b; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 5.1.d if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 5.1.b.

---



## 5.2 – Climate Solutions Commitment

### Sub-indicator Text

The company's decarbonisation strategy specifies the role of climate solutions (i.e., technologies and products that will enable the economy to decarbonise).

- a. The company discloses the revenue OR production it already generates from climate solutions and discloses its share in overall sales.
- b. The company has set a target to increase revenue OR production from climate solutions in its overall sales.

### Detailed Guidance

- a. The company discloses the revenue OR production it already generates from climate solutions and discloses its share in overall sales.

The purpose of this Metric is to evaluate a company's current deployment of climate solutions.

To score on this Metric, the company should:

- Publicly disclose revenues generated from (or production volumes of) climate solutions, AND
- Clearly state how it defines such climate solutions, for example, with reference to a formal taxonomy or revenue classification system.

To be eligible, revenue (or production volumes) should be disclosed in a manner that allows the computation of their share in the company's total revenues (or production). This could include disclosing the percentage of total revenues, revenues in a reported segment, the absolute revenues or the share of products in a specific product category (e.g., EVs as a share of total vehicle output).

Note that climate solutions reporting should be clearly tied to the company's broader revenue or production reporting. Solutions can either be disclosed as individual business lines (e.g., separately for 'wind' or 'solar') or aggregated in a segment which contains only climate solutions (e.g., a 'Renewable Energy' segment). Aggregated revenue or production data is not sufficient either a) where it is difficult to clearly establish what type of products or services are included in the reported revenue or production segment; or b) where it contains a mix of climate and non-climate solutions.

Revenue disclosures that clearly meet external, publicly available classifications of climate solutions (e.g., the EU Taxonomy or the FTSE Russell Green Revenue Classification system) will be accepted even if not explicitly labelled as climate solutions. Otherwise, companies should define climate solutions associated with their revenues or products clearly and in detail. Companies can do this either in reference to other official taxonomies or revenue classification systems or deviate from such frameworks, as long as the definitions of climate solutions are clearly laid out in their disclosures and are consistent with the principles laid out below.

Companies cannot score on this Metric where their definitions (internal or external) are vague or appear to include products and services with limited climate benefits. For example:

- **Products or services that offer limited or undefined reductions in lifecycle emissions.** For instance, 'green cement' or 'low carbon fuels' would be ineligible, unless they are defined in a manner that clearly explains their nature and are clearly linked to significant climate benefits (e.g., avoiding blended fuels with significant fossil

fuel content). Similarly, disclosures of revenues from natural gas, ‘grey hydrogen’ or revenues linked to ‘hybrid cars’ (unless explicitly defined as plug-in hybrids and clearly excluding ‘mild-hybrid’ technology) would not allow the company to score on this Metric.

- **Products or services that serve as inputs into a wide range of supply chains, as opposed to being primarily used for decarbonising the economy.** For instance, while bulk materials such as copper and aluminium are critical inputs into many low carbon technologies, these account for a limited share of their overall consumption, and as such should not be designated as climate solutions. Such products can however be accepted where they are being produced with a materially lower environmental footprint (e.g., through recycling) and/or where the company quantifies the extent to which its bulk products are used in the production or use of accepted climate solutions.
- **Conventional products or services which are marketed in conjunction with offsets** (i.e., where emissions are compensated for rather than reduced).

Note that disclosures of EU Taxonomy-*aligned* turnover are valid against this Metric. EU Taxonomy-*eligible* turnover disclosures are not specific enough to identify investment in climate solutions and are not eligible for scoring against this Metric.

Where a company clearly states in its disclosures that it is not intending to produce or derive revenue from climate solutions, this Metric will be assessed as ‘Not Applicable’.

<b>b.</b> The company has set a target to increase revenue OR production from climate solutions in its overall sales.	<p>To score on this Metric, a company should publicly disclose a target for revenue or production volumes from climate solutions with a clear timeline for when the company intends to achieve this target (e.g., 2028 or 2030).</p> <p>Note that while the target should be clearly quantified and time-bound, it can be expressed either in terms of revenue (e.g., ‘increasing EV sales to 20% of total car sales by 2028’), production (e.g., ‘In 2030, Renewable Energy will reach 50% of power generation’) or output (e.g., ‘one in five cars produced will be electric by 2028’).</p> <p>The same requirements laid out in 5.2.a in terms of the definition of climate solutions and capital expenditures apply.</p> <p>Where a company clearly states in its disclosures that it is not intending to produce or derive revenue from climate solutions, this Metric will be assessed as ‘Not Applicable’.</p>
---	---

## Indicator 6 – Capital Allocation

### 6.1 – Capex Allocation

#### Sub-indicator Text

The company is working to decarbonise its capital expenditures.

- a. The company explicitly states that it has phased out or is planning to phase out capital expenditure in new unabated carbon-intensive assets or products by a specified year.
- b. The company discloses the stated value of its capital expenditure that is going towards unabated carbon-intensive assets or products.

#### Detailed Guidance

- a. The company explicitly states that it has phased out or is planning to phase out capital expenditure in new unabated carbon-intensive assets or products by a specified year.

To score on this Metric, the company's public disclosures should explicitly state that it has phased out or is committed to phasing out capital expenditure in new unabated carbon-intensive assets or products by a specified year. 'Unabated carbon-intensive assets' here refer to assets or products with a high carbon footprint relative to their output that do not use any carbon removal technologies. The company should clearly describe how it defines carbon-intensive assets or products in its own particular case.

Note that statements on phasing out unabated carbon-intensive assets or products are not, on their own, sufficient to score on this Metric; the company's commitment should apply to all of its capital expenditures.

Note further that a company's commitments to 'align' capital expenditure decisions and plans with its long-term GHG reduction target or a 1.5°C pathway is not sufficient to meet this Metric.

Finally, simply listing or detailing green or low-carbon capital expenditure plans or projects (including large-scale plans or projects) is not sufficient to meet this Metric, even in cases where it can be reasonably presumed that much or all of the company's capital expenditures are already aligned with the low carbon transition.

- b. The company discloses the stated value of its capital expenditure that is going towards unabated carbon-intensive assets or products.

To score on this Metric, the company should publicly disclose the amount of capital expenditures that is going towards carbon-intensive assets or products. 'Unabated carbon-intensive assets' here refer to assets or products with a high carbon footprint relative to their output that do not use any carbon removal technologies. The company should clearly describe how it defines carbon-intensive assets or products in its own particular case.

The company should disclose this information in a manner that allows for the calculation of the absolute value of capital expenditure allocated to unabated carbon-intensive assets or products. This could include disclosing the absolute amount (dollar value) or the percentage share of total capital expenditures, as long as the latter is disclosed in absolute terms.

Where a company clearly states in its public disclosures that it has not allocated any capital expenditures towards unabated carbon-intensive assets or products, this Metric will be assessed as a 'Yes'.

Where companies disclose against the EU Taxonomy, they should clearly break out capital expenditures that are non-aligned as part of capital expenditures into eligible activities.

## 6.2 – Climate Solutions Allocation

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company explains how it intends to invest in climate solutions (i.e., technologies and products that will enable the economy to decarbonise).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The company discloses the stated value of its capital expenditure allocated towards climate solutions in the last reporting year.</li> <li>The company discloses the stated value of its capital expenditure that it intends to allocate towards climate solutions in the future.</li> </ol>
---------------------------	--

### Detailed Guidance

- The company discloses the value of its capital expenditure allocated towards climate solutions in the last reporting year.

To score on this Metric, the company should:

- Publicly disclose capital expenditures towards producing or developing climate solutions; AND
- Clearly state how it defines such climate solutions, for example, with reference to a formal taxonomy or classification system.

To be eligible, the disclosure should allow for the calculation of the absolute value of capital expenditures towards producing or developing climate solutions in the last fiscal year. This could include disclosing the percentage share of total capital expenditures disclosed in absolute terms; the absolute amount; or the share of climate-focused capital expenditures in a specific product category (e.g., EVs as a share of total vehicle investment), disclosed as an absolute amount.

Note that climate solutions reporting should be clearly tied to the company's capital expenditure reporting. Solutions can either be disclosed as individual business lines (e.g., separately for 'wind' or 'solar') or aggregated in a segment which contains only investment in climate solutions (e.g., a 'Renewable Energy' segment). Aggregated capital expenditure data is not sufficient either a) where it is difficult to clearly establish what type of products or services are included in the reported capital expenditure; or b) where it contains a mix of climate and non-climate solutions.

Similar to the approach on revenues under 5.2, companies should define climate solutions associated with their capital expenditure clearly and in detail. Companies can do this either in reference to official taxonomies or revenue classification systems or deviate from such frameworks, as long as the definitions of climate solutions are clearly laid out in their disclosures.

Companies cannot score on this Metric where their definitions are vague or appear to include products and services with limited climate benefits, following the approach outlined in 5.2.

Note that disclosures of EU Taxonomy-aligned capital expenditure are valid against this Metric. Taxonomy-eligible capital expenditure disclosures are not specific enough to identify investment in climate solutions, and so they will not count against this Metric.

Where a company clearly states in its public disclosures that it is not intending to allocate capital towards climate solutions, this Metric will be assessed as 'Not Applicable'.

---

<p><b>b.</b> The company discloses the stated value of its capital expenditure that it intends to allocate towards climate solutions in the future.</p>	<p>To score on this Metric, a company should publicly disclose the capital expenditure that it intends to allocate towards climate solutions within a clear timeframe (e.g., ‘in 2024-2027’ or ‘by 2030’). Note that while the target should be clearly quantified and time-bound, it can be expressed either as an absolute value (e.g., ‘\$3B by 2030’) or as a share of total capital expenditure (e.g., ‘50% of our total \$10B investments’), as long as the latter is disclosed in absolute terms.</p> <p>The same conditions laid out in 6.2.a in terms of the definition of climate solutions and capital expenditures apply.</p> <p>Where a company clearly states in its public disclosures that it is not intending to focus capital expenditure on climate solutions, this Metric will be assessed as ‘Not Applicable’.</p>
---	---

---

## Indicator 7 – Climate Policy Engagement

### 7.1 – Lobbying Position Aligned with Paris Agreement

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company commits to conducting its policy engagement activities in accordance with the goals of the Paris Agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a.</b> The company has a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct all of its lobbying in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement.</li> <li><b>b.</b> The company commits to advocate for Paris-aligned lobbying within the trade associations of which it is a member.</li> <li><b>c.</b> 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.</li> </ul>
---------------------------	---

#### Detailed Guidance

<b>a.</b> The company has a specific public commitment/position statement to conduct all of its lobbying in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement.	<p>To score on this Metric, a company should make a clear statement that it will ensure all of its direct lobbying activities 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>b.</b> The company commits to advocate for Paris-aligned lobbying within the trade associations of which it is a member.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>c.</b> 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.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

## Indicator 8 – Climate Governance

### 8.1 – Board Oversight

#### Sub-indicator Text

The company's Board has clear oversight of climate change.

- a. The company discloses evidence of Board or Board committee oversight of the management of climate change risks.
- b. The company has named a position at the Board level with responsibility for climate change.

#### Detailed Guidance

- a. The company discloses evidence of Board or Board committee oversight of the management of climate change risks.

For the purposes of this Metric, 'Board oversight' can take multiple forms:

- The company states that responsibility for climate change lies with the Board or a specific Board committee.
- There is an executive, such as a head of sustainability, with explicit responsibility for climate change (i.e., not just 'sustainability performance') AND there is evidence that the individual reports on climate change directly to the Board or to a Board-level committee.
- The CEO is responsible for climate change AND there is evidence that the CEO reports to the Board or a Board-level committee on climate change issues specifically in the latest reporting year.
- There is a committee (which is not necessarily Board-level) that is responsible for climate change (i.e., not just 'sustainability performance') AND that committee reports directly to the Board or a Board-level committee.

Furthermore, reference to Board responsibility for 'sustainability' or 'environment' more broadly is not sufficient; companies should clearly mention 'climate change'.

- b. The company has named a position at the Board level with responsibility for climate change.

There are multiple scenarios/models that qualify as a 'named position' for the purposes of this Metric:

- There is a Board position (e.g., Board Director) with explicit responsibility for climate change.
- There is a named individual (rather than a position) on the Board who is responsible for climate change.
- The CEO is responsible for climate change AND the CEO sits on the Board.
- In a two-tier board structure, a named management Board member/position has explicit responsibility for climate change AND reports to the Supervisory Board on climate.

A company will not score on this Metric by proxy of having a committee responsible for climate change. Unless specifically identified as being individually responsible, the chair of such a committee does not score on this Metric. A named position or individual responsible for 'sustainability' or 'environment' at the Board level does not score on this Metric.

Note that for German, Polish and Norwegian companies only, where it is unlikely for the CEO to sit on the Supervisory Board, companies whose CEO is individually responsible for climate change and sits on the Executive Board will be assessed 'Yes' on this Metric.



## 8.2 – Remuneration Arrangements

### Sub-indicator Text

The company's executive remuneration scheme incorporates climate change performance elements.

- a. The company's CEO and/or at least one other senior executive's remuneration arrangements specifically incorporate climate change performance as a Key Performance Indicator determining performance-linked compensation (references to 'ESG' or 'sustainability performance' are insufficient).
- b. The company's CEO and/or at least one other senior executive's remuneration arrangements incorporate progress towards achieving the company's GHG reduction targets as a Key Performance Indicator determining performance-linked compensation.

### Detailed Guidance

- a. The company's CEO and/or at least one other senior executive's remuneration arrangements specifically incorporate climate change performance as a Key Performance Indicator determining performance-linked compensation (references to 'ESG' or 'sustainability performance' are insufficient).
 

A company will be assessed as scoring on this Metric if the CEO and/or at least one other senior executive's remuneration arrangements are determined by the company's performance against a climate change-related Key Performance Indicator (KPI).

This KPI should be concrete and measurable and should specifically focus on the company's climate change-related performance (e.g., meeting GHG emissions reduction targets). KPIs that measure broader 'ESG' or 'sustainability' targets or objectives, energy efficiency targets, CDP scores or the like do not meet this Metric.

Any CEO/Executive Committee (ExCo) objectives that are not directly incentivised by monetary reward do not score on this Metric. Furthermore, an incentivised position at a lower level than ExCo (e.g., a head of sustainability that is not a member of ExCo) does not score on this Metric.
- b. The company's CEO and/or at least one other senior executive's remuneration arrangements incorporate progress towards achieving the company's GHG reduction targets as a Key Performance Indicator determining performance-linked compensation.
 

To score on this Metric, the CEO and/or at least one other senior executive's remuneration arrangements should be determined by the company's performance against its disclosed company-wide emissions targets. This could be any of the targets captured as part of Sub-indicators 2.1, 3.1 or 4.1.

Similar to Metric 8.2.a, any CEO/ExCo objectives that are not incentivised by monetary reward do not meet the Metric. Further, an incentivised position at a lower level than ExCo (e.g., a head of sustainability that is not a member of ExCo) does not meet this Metric.

Metric 8.2.b is contingent on Metric 8.2.a and at least one of the Sub-indicators 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 8.2.a if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 8.2.a and at least one of Sub-indicators 2.1, 3.1 or 4.1.

### 8.3 – Board Climate-Related Capabilities/Competencies

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The Board has sufficient capabilities/competencies to assess and manage climate-related risks and opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The company has assessed its Board’s competencies with respect to managing climate risks and opportunities and has disclosed the results of this assessment.</li> <li>b. The company provides details on the criteria it uses to assess its Board’s competencies with respect to managing climate risks and opportunities, and the measures it is taking to enhance these competencies.</li> </ul>
---------------------------	--

#### Detailed Guidance

<b>a.</b> The company has assessed its Board’s competencies with respect to managing climate risks and opportunities and has disclosed the results of this assessment.	<p>To score on this Metric, a company should clearly disclose that the company has assessed to what extent its Board is competent specifically with respect to managing climate change risks AND disclose the results of this assessment.</p> <p>This could include disclosure of a Board skills assessment that has included consideration of climate change knowledge or expertise. Inclusion of climate change in a skills matrix would score on this Metric where the results/mapping have been disclosed. Companies should provide an indication of which members or what proportion of the Board provides competencies related to climate risks.</p> <p>A company will not score on this Metric if only ‘sustainability’ or ‘environment’ or ‘ESG’ is covered in relation to Board competency assessments. Further, the existence of a climate expert on the Board cannot be used as a proxy for having conducted a Board climate competency assessment.</p>
<b>b.</b> The company provides details on the criteria it uses to assess its Board’s competencies with respect to managing climate risks and opportunities, and the measures it is taking to enhance these competencies.	<p>To score on this Metric, the company should disclose details on what specific criteria have been used to assess the Board’s climate-related competencies.</p> <p>Furthermore, the company should explicitly disclose measures it has implemented to enhance the climate competencies of the Board. This could include Board trainings on climate issues, either external or internal, or the appointment of a ‘climate expert’ to the Board.</p> <p>It should be noted that measures aimed at enhancing ‘sustainability’, ‘environment’, or ‘ESG’ competencies do not score on this Metric.</p> <p>Metric 8.3.b is contingent on Metric 8.3.a; a company cannot score ‘Yes’ on Metric 8.3.b if it does not score ‘Yes’ on Metric 8.3.a.</p>

## Indicator 9 – Just Transition

### 9.1 – Commitment to Just Transition Principles

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company has committed to the principles of a Just Transition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The company has committed to decarbonise in line with defined Just Transition principles, recognising the social impacts of its decarbonisation efforts.</li> <li>b. The company has committed to retain, retrain, redeploy and/or compensate workers affected by its decarbonisation efforts.</li> <li>c. The company has committed that new projects associated with its decarbonisation efforts are developed in consultation with affected communities and, where relevant, with their Free, Prior and Informed Consent.</li> </ul>
---------------------------	--

#### Detailed Guidance

a. The company has committed to decarbonise in line with defined Just Transition principles, recognising the social impacts of its decarbonisation efforts.	<p>This Metric evaluates whether the company has committed to decarbonise its operations in line with Just Transition principles (i.e., in a way that respects the rights and needs of workers, communities and other key stakeholders who may be affected by this transition).</p> <p>To score ‘Yes’ on this Metric, the company should explicitly commit to decarbonise in line with Just Transition principles, and clearly define these principles. A company can do this either in reference to official taxonomies or by clearly laying out in its disclosures its own comprehensive definition of Just Transition. At a minimum, these principles should cover the company’s workers and affected communities.</p> <p>Simply acknowledging external frameworks or a general social need for a Just Transition is not sufficient to score ‘Yes’ on this Metric. The company’s understanding of Just Transition should demonstrate a holistic approach, covering a range of stakeholders and issues relevant to its business.</p>
b. The company has committed to retain, retrain, redeploy and/or compensate workers affected by its decarbonisation efforts.	<p>This Metric assesses whether companies provide active support to workers negatively affected by the transition away from high-carbon activities. To score ‘Yes’ on this Metric, companies should explicitly commit to specific forms of support (i.e., job retention, training, reskilling and upskilling, redeployment, compensation, retirement packages, access to job search and/or similar); or commit to external frameworks with similar commitments (i.e., the Council for Inclusive Capitalism’s Just Energy Transition framework). The commitment should be company-wide, link explicitly to decarbonisation and apply to the current employees of the company.</p> <p>If a company merely acknowledges the impact of decarbonisation on workers, it will not score ‘Yes’ on this Metric. References to asset-specific cases, interactions with labour unions or job creation for the future or the wider community are not on their own sufficient to score ‘Yes’ on this Metric.</p>
c. The company has committed that new projects associated with its decarbonisation efforts are developed in consultation with affected communities and, where relevant, with their Free, Prior and Informed Consent.	<p>This Metric evaluates whether companies have a company-wide commitment to engage with and, where relevant, seek consent from the communities that are affected by their decarbonisation activities.</p> <p>To score ‘Yes’ on this Metric, the company should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Make an explicit commitment to engage, consult or work with affected communities; AND</li> <li>2. Make an explicit commitment to seek their Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as part of this consultation process.</li> </ul>

To be assessed as 'Yes' on (1), the company should provide details on how they have implemented this commitment, such as who they are consulting with, what issues they are addressing and what outcomes they seek to achieve.

If a company only acknowledges the impact of decarbonisation on communities, only informs communities of its decarbonisation plans or does not specify affected communities amongst its stakeholders, it cannot score 'Yes' on this Metric.

Companies that do not operate in countries in which Indigenous peoples are present will not be assessed on criterion (2) to commit to seek FPIC.

---

## 9.2 – Just Transition Planning and Monitoring

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company has disclosed how it is planning for and monitoring progress towards a Just Transition.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The company has developed a Just Transition plan for how it aims to support workers and communities negatively affected by its decarbonisation efforts.</li> <li>The company's Just Transition plan was developed in consultation with workers, communities and other key stakeholders affected by its decarbonisation efforts.</li> <li>The company discloses the quantified Key Performance Indicators it uses to track its progress towards the objectives of its Just Transition plan.</li> </ol>
---------------------------	---

### Detailed Guidance

<b>a.</b> The company has developed a Just Transition plan for how it aims to support workers and communities negatively affected by its decarbonisation efforts.	<p>This Metric assesses whether the company has developed a concrete plan to implement the commitments evaluated in Sub-indicator 9.1. To score 'Yes' on this Metric, the company, within its Just Transition plan, should clearly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set forth a set of actions it will implement to achieve its Just Transition commitments; AND</li> <li>At minimum, link the set of actions to workers and communities.</li> </ol> <p>The plan should be company-wide and clearly relate to the company's decarbonisation efforts.</p> <p>If the company has conducted a case study or developed an asset level plan in the past, it can score 'Yes' if it explicitly mentions that it will develop similar plans for all other relevant assets.</p>
<b>b.</b> The company's Just Transition plan was developed in consultation with workers, communities and other key stakeholders affected by its decarbonisation efforts.	<p>This Metric evaluates whether a company has engaged with and incorporated feedback from affected stakeholders, such as workers and communities, in the development of its Just Transition plan. To be assessed as 'Yes' on this Metric, the company should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State which stakeholders were consulted (e.g., relevant union representatives or other employee representatives, general community members); AND</li> <li>How the consultation process was conducted (e.g., one in-person meeting, ongoing consultations).</li> </ol> <p>Metric 9.2.b is contingent on Metric 9.2.a; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 9.2.b if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 9.2.a.</p>
<b>c.</b> The company discloses the quantified key performance indicators it uses to track its progress towards the objectives of its Just Transition plan.	<p>This Metric assesses whether the company has developed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to track its progress towards achieving the objectives of its Just Transition Plan. To score 'Yes' on this Metric, the company should have a measurable quantitative KPI explicitly relating to the company's Just Transition plan. Disclosure of data points on jobs lost, jobs created or wage metrics are ineligible to score 'Yes' on this Metric. The KPI should be disclosed each year as a measurement of ongoing performance.</p> <p>Metric 9.2.c is contingent on Metric 9.2.a; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 9.2.c if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 9.2.a.</p>

## Indicator 10 – Climate-Related Disclosures

### 10.1 – Support for TCFD/ISSB Recommendations

#### Sub-indicator Text

The company has publicly committed to implement the recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) or the International Sustainability Standards Board's IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures.

- a. The company explicitly commits to align its disclosures with the TCFD recommendations OR IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures.
- b. The company explicitly sign-posts TCFD-aligned or IFRS S2-aligned disclosures in its annual reporting OR publishes them in a TCFD or IFRS S2 report.

#### Detailed Guidance

- a. The company explicitly commits to align its disclosures with the TCFD recommendations OR IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures.

To meet this Metric, a company should:

- Explicitly commit to align its disclosures with the TCFD recommendations or IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures in its public disclosures; OR
- Explicitly and clearly indicate that it has aligned its disclosures with the TCFD recommendations or IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures.

A company would not meet this Metric if its commitment is ambiguous. For example, 'recognising' or 'acknowledging' either TCFD recommendations or the IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures is insufficient to score, as this is not equivalent to making a formal commitment.

- b. The company explicitly sign-posts TCFD-aligned or IFRS S2-aligned disclosures in its annual reporting OR publishes them in a TCFD or IFRS S2 report.

The aim of this Metric is to understand if the company is reporting against the TCFD recommendations or IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures. To meet this Metric, a company should:

- Explicitly include or sign-post TCFD-aligned or IFRS S2-aligned disclosures in its annual reporting (i.e., in Annual Reports, in sustainability-related reports or on the company's website); OR
- Publish TCFD-aligned or IFRS S2-aligned disclosures in a TCFD report or IFRS S2 report, respectively.

This Metric assesses whether the company in its disclosures clearly directs investors to its TCFD or IFRS S2 disclosures, either through clear sign-posting throughout its existing disclosures or by summarising them in a standalone report. It does not assess whether the company discloses against all of the TCFD or IFRS S2 requirements, nor the content or the quality of the disclosures being provided.

A company would not meet this Metric if the company states that it has disclosed in line with the TCFD or IFRS S2 requirements but does not sign-post where these disclosures are to be found. Furthermore, disclosures should be provided on the company's own website; pointing to a third-party website, e.g., CDP, does not meet the intent of this Metric. Finally, a commitment to report against the TCFD recommendations or IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures in the future is not sufficient to score.

## 10.2 – Scenario Analysis

### Sub-indicator Text

The company employs climate-scenario planning to test its strategic and operational resilience.

- a. The company has conducted a climate-related scenario analysis including quantitative elements and disclosed its results.
- b. The quantitative scenario analysis explicitly includes a 1.5°C scenario, covers the entire company, discloses key assumptions and variables used, and reports on the key risks and opportunities identified.

### Detailed Guidance

- a. The company has conducted a climate-related scenario analysis including quantitative elements and disclosed its results.

The aim of this Metric is to understand the company's approach to climate-related scenario analysis. To score on this Metric, a company should:

- Conduct climate-related scenario analysis including quantitative elements (i.e., using numerical data), which may be in the form of tables or figures, or explicit reference to external scenarios or models (e.g., IEA Sustainable Development Scenario, RCP 2.6) to describe possible futures; AND
- Disclose the results of its quantitative scenario analysis. This can include a qualitative description of the results or findings, or the presentation of quantitative results or findings.

A company would not score on this Metric if it only uses narrative text to describe the scenarios used. A company would not score on this Metric if it does not publicly disclose the results of its analysis (e.g., statements that an analysis has been conducted but that the results are under review by company management would be insufficient to score on this Metric).

- b. The quantitative scenario analysis explicitly includes a 1.5°C scenario, covers the entire company, discloses key assumptions and variables used, and reports on the key risks and opportunities identified.

The aim of this Metric is to assess the completeness of the information that the company provides about its quantitative scenario analysis. To score on this Metric, the following criteria should be met:

- The company should explicitly include a 1.5°C scenario in its scenario analysis; AND
- The company's quantitative scenario analysis should explicitly cover the entire company (rather than a specific product, business line or geography); AND
- The company should disclose key assumptions and variables used in its scenario analysis; AND
- The company should report on key risks and opportunities that have been identified in the scenario analysis.

A company would not score on this Metric if the analysis only covers selected operations, commodities, countries, etc., or if the company states that 'most but not all' operations are covered.

A company would also not score on this Metric if its disclosure of risks and opportunities are not related to the scenario analysis that has been conducted. For example, generic discussions of climate-related risks and opportunities do not meet the intent of this Metric.

Metric 10.2.b is contingent on Metric 10.2.a; a company cannot score 'Yes' on Metric 10.2.b if it does not score 'Yes' on Metric 10.2.a.



## Indicator 11 – Historical GHG Emissions Reductions

### 11.1 – Decrease in Historical GHG Emissions Intensity

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company's historical emissions intensity is decreasing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The company's GHG emissions intensity has decreased in the past year relative to the previous year.</li> <li>The company's GHG emissions intensity has decreased over the past three years.</li> <li>The company's GHG emissions intensity is currently aligned or converging with a credible 1.5°C pathway for its sector, based on its rate of reduction across the past three years.</li> </ol>
---------------------------	--

#### Detailed Guidance

<p><b>a.</b> The company's GHG emissions intensity has decreased in the past year relative to the previous year.</p>	<p>This Metric uses the TPI Centre's Carbon Performance methodology to measure companies' historical carbon intensity. Metric 11.1.a is met if the company's emission intensity has decreased in the most recent year of company reporting relative to the previous year.</p> <p>The company would score 'No' on this Metric if this is not the case; or if it is assessed by the TPI Centre to have insufficient emissions data; or if the last usable data was published more than two years ago.</p> <p>Companies that are part of a sector where the TPI Centre's methodology is yet to be published will be scored as 'Not Assessed'.</p>
<p><b>b.</b> The company's GHG emissions intensity has decreased over the past three years.</p>	<p>This Metric uses the TPI Centre's Carbon Performance methodology to measure companies' carbon intensities in the past three years. This includes the current year of data, or the most recent year of data available, and three historic values to obtain the variation over a three-year period. The Metric is met if the company's emission intensity has decreased over the last three years of company reporting.</p> <p>The company would score 'No' on this Metric if this is not the case; or if it is assessed by the TPI Centre to have insufficient emissions data; or if the last usable data was published more than two years ago.</p> <p>Companies that are part of a sector where the TPI Centre's methodology is yet to be published will be scored as 'Not Assessed'.</p>
<p><b>c.</b> The company's GHG emissions intensity is currently aligned or converging with a credible 1.5°C pathway for its sector, based on its rate of reduction across the past three years.</p>	<p>This Metric uses the TPI Centre's Carbon Performance methodology to measure companies' carbon intensities in the past three years. This includes the current year of data, or the most recent year of data available, and three historic values to obtain the variation over a three-year period. Carbon intensities are measured against a relevant sector trajectory needed to achieve the Paris Agreement goal of limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C with low or no overshoot in 2050. This is equivalent to the <a href="#">IPCC's Special Report on the 1.5°C pathway P1</a> or the <a href="#">IEA's Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario</a>. Historic sector benchmarks are used for this comparison, which reflect the estimated decrease in carbon intensities needed for the given sector at the beginning of the three-year period being assessed. There are two possibilities for how a company can meet the conditions of this Metric:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the company's carbon intensity has been declining faster than the</li> </ol>

respective sector's benchmark carbon intensity for the same three-year period.

OR

2. If at the last year of disclosure, the company's carbon intensity is aligned with or below its respective sectoral benchmarked carbon intensity for the current year.

The company cannot score on this Metric if it is assessed by the TPI Centre to have insufficient emissions data or if the last usable data was published more than two years ago.

Companies that are part of a sector where the TPI Centre's methodology is yet to be published will be scored as 'Not Assessed'.

---

## 11.2 – Decrease in Absolute Historical GHG Emissions [BETA]

<b>Sub-indicator Text</b>	<p>The company's absolute historical emissions are decreasing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The company's absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions have decreased in the past year relative to the previous year.</li> <li>The company's absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions have decreased over the past three years.</li> <li>The company's absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions have decreased in the past year relative to the previous year.</li> <li>The company's absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions have decreased over the past three years.</li> </ol>
---------------------------	---

### Detailed Guidance

<b>a.</b> The company's absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions have decreased in the past year relative to the previous year.	<p>This Metric measures if the company's absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions have decreased in the most recent year of company reporting relative to the previous year.</p> <p>The company would score 'No' on this Metric if its absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions have not reduced in the previous year; or if it is assessed to have insufficient emissions data; or if the last usable data was published more than two years ago.</p>
<b>b.</b> The company's absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions have decreased over the past three years.	<p>The Metric measures if the company's absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions have reduced in the past three years. This includes the current year of data, or the most recent year of data available, and three historic values to obtain the variation over a three-year period.</p> <p>The company would score 'Yes' on this Metric if its absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions have decreased over the last three years of company reporting.</p> <p>The company would score 'No' on this Metric if its absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions have not decreased over the last three years; or if it is assessed to have insufficient emissions data; or if the last usable data was published more than two years ago.</p>
<b>c.</b> The company's absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions have decreased in the past year relative to the previous year.	<p>This Metric measures if the company's absolute Scope 3 emissions in the relevant category for its sector have reduced in the most recent year of company reporting relative to the previous year.</p> <p>The company would score 'No' on this Metric if its absolute Scope 3 emissions have not decreased in the previous year; or if it is assessed to have insufficient emissions data; or if the last usable data was published more than two years ago.</p> <p>Companies for which Scope 3 emissions are not assessed in the Climate Action 100+ Disclosure Framework will be marked as 'Not Assessed' on 11.2.c, regardless of whether they report Scope 3 emissions.</p>
<b>d.</b> The company's absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions have decreased over the past three years.	<p>This Metric measures if the company's absolute Scope 3 emissions in the relevant category for its sector have reduced in the past three years. This includes the current year of data, or the most recent year of data available, and three historic values to obtain the variation over a three-year period.</p> <p>The company would score 'Yes' on this Metric if its absolute Scope 3</p>

emissions have decreased over the last three years of company reporting.

The company would score 'No' on this Metric if its absolute Scope 3 emissions have not decreased over the last three years; or if it is assessed to have insufficient emissions data; or if the last usable data was published more than two years ago.

Companies for which Scope 3 emissions are not assessed in the Climate Action 100+ Disclosure Framework will be marked as 'Not Assessed' on 11.2.d, regardless of whether they report Scope 3 emissions.

---

### 11.3 – Factors Underlying GHG Emissions Reductions

#### Sub-indicator Text

The company discloses the factors that have led to changes in its historical emissions trajectory.

- a. The company has quantified the main actions that have driven any Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions changes, specifying the impact of any large “one-off” items (e.g., divestments, acquisitions and mergers).
- b. The company has quantified the main actions that have driven any Scope 3 GHG emissions changes, specifying the impact of any large “one-off” items (e.g., divestments, acquisitions and mergers).
- c. The company discloses details on the carbon credits it retired in the previous year.

#### Detailed Guidance

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>a. The company has quantified the main actions that have driven any Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions changes, specifying the impact of any large “one-off” items (e.g., divestments, acquisitions and mergers).</p> | <p>To demonstrate their progress in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, companies should report their Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the last two years and explain the main factors that influenced their performance. They should also break down the change in emissions by category and provide specific examples of actions that affected their emissions. These actions should be consistent with other parts of the companies’ annual reporting. Companies that only report on a partial scope of their emissions will not be eligible to score on this Metric.</p> |
|---|--|

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>b. The company has quantified the main actions that have driven any Scope 3 GHG emissions changes, specifying the impact of any large “one-off” items (e.g., divestments, acquisitions and mergers).</p> | <p>To score on this Metric, a company should disclose the main factors that influenced the changes in its Scope 3 emissions for the relevant category assigned to its sector. The company should provide figures and explanations for each factor (e.g., company structure changes, product mix changes, etc.) that affected its overall Scope 3 emissions change in the last year of reporting. The explanations should be specific and consistent with other parts of the company’s annual reporting (e.g., ‘divestment from site X’, rather than just ‘divestment’). Companies that only report on a subset of their emissions will not be eligible to score on this Metric. Companies that are not assessed on Scope 3 will be marked as ‘Not Assessed’.</p> |
|---|--|

Companies for which Scope 3 emissions are not assessed in the Climate Action 100+ Disclosure Framework will be marked as ‘Not Assessed’ on 11.3.b, regardless of whether they quantify reasons that have led to Scope 3 emissions changes.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>c. The company discloses details on the carbon credits it retired in the previous year.</p> | <p>To score on this Metric, a company should disclose the following information and details about the carbon credits it retired in the last fiscal year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantity</li> <li>• Type</li> <li>• Verification system</li> <li>• Vintage (i.e., year of carbon credit origination)</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

Offset quantities stated on both an absolute and intensity basis, and for any scope of emissions, are acceptable. While a specific offset type is

not necessary to score, offsets should be retired voluntarily. Carbon offsets disclosed due to legal compliance are insufficient to score on this Metric.

Companies that explicitly state that they do not use offsets and have not done so in the last fiscal year will be scored as 'Not Applicable'.

---

## Traffic light system: Yes / No / Partial

Each Metric is assessed with a binary Yes / No (or Not Assessed or Not Applicable; see next paragraph), based on information and evidence published by the company. Aggregation at the Sub-indicator and Indicator levels then use the following system:

- **Yes** = When all Metrics for a Sub-indicator or Indicator are ‘Yes’.
- **No** = When all Metrics for a Sub-indicator or Indicator are ‘No’.
- **Partial** = When at least **one** Metric for a Sub-indicator or Indicator is ‘Yes’.

Any Sub-indicator has between one and four Metrics (a, b, c and d). Indicators can have multiple Sub-indicators and Metrics (e.g., Indicator 7 has two Sub-indicators and five Metrics). Metrics can also be ‘Not Assessed’ or ‘Not Applicable’. When this is the case, the Metric is not included as part of the threshold for Yes / No / Partial. See Indicator combinations for more specifics.

### Sub-indicator combinations

Any Sub-indicator has between one and four metrics (a, b, c and d). Below is a summary of the possible combinations on any one Sub-indicator.

Metric score combinations		Sub-indicator assessment
x.x.a	x.x.b	Sub-indicator x.x
Y	Y	Y
Y	Not Assessed	Y
Y	N	Partial
N	Not Assessed	N
N	N	N

## Indicator Contingencies

Some Metrics require positive ‘Yes’ scores on one or more other Metrics in order to be considered for scoring. The table below lists these Metrics and the Metrics they are contingent on.

Metric(s)	Contingent on
1.1.b	1.1.a
2.2.a, 2.2.b	2.1
3.2.a, 3.2.b	3.1
3.4.a	3.2.a
3.4.b	3.2.b
4.2.a, 4.2.b	4.1
5.1.a	2.2.a AND 3.2.a
5.1.b	5.1.a

Metric(s)	Contingent on
5.1.c	5.1.b
5.1.d	5.1.b
7.1.c	7.1.a
8.2.b	2.1 OR 3.1 OR 4.1, AND 8.2.a
8.3.b	8.3.a
9.2.b	9.2.a
9.2.c	9.2.a
10.2.b	10.2.a



## Scope 3 Assessed Companies

Cluster	Sector	Scope 3 emissions assessed
Energy	Oil & Gas	Yes (use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
	Oil & Gas Distribution	Yes (use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
	Electric Utilities	Yes – for electric utilities with oil and gas distribution businesses (use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
	Coal Mining	Yes (use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
Transport	Autos	Yes (use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
	Airlines	Yes (fuel- and energy-related activities – Category 3 of the GHG Protocol).
	Shipping	No.
	Other Transport	Yes (use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
Industrials	Aluminium	No.
	Cement	No.
	Steel	No.
	Chemicals	Yes (purchased goods and services – Category 1 of the GHG Protocol and use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
	Paper	No.
	Diversified Mining	Yes (processing of sold products – Category 10 of the GHG Protocol; for coal manufacturers, also use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
	Other Industrials	On a case-by-case basis. Either purchased goods and services – Category 1 of the GHG Protocol, use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol or non-electricity use of sold products.
Consumer Goods and Services	Food Producers	Yes (purchased goods and services – Category 1 of the GHG Protocol).
	Household & Consumer Products	Yes (use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol).
	Retailers	Yes – on a case-by-case basis, depending on the types of goods sold. Either purchased goods and services – Category 1 of the GHG Protocol, or use of sold products – Category 11 of the GHG Protocol.