

June 10, 2026

David Kennedy
CEO
Science Based Targets Initiative

Dear Mr. Kennedy and SBTi Technical Council Members,

The Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) represents a powerful opportunity to continue driving corporate clean energy targets and purchases towards greater impact and true decarbonization, but the undersigned organizations express deep concern that SBTi is about to take a permanent step into irrelevancy.

Corporations, especially in light of today's hyperscale data center demand growth, have a critical role to play in aligning electricity grids around the world toward net-zero. However, the undersigned organizations are extremely concerned [that SBTi plans to walk back proposed high-integrity standard changes](#) in the face of corporate pressure, as recently reported in Financial Times, allowing companies to more easily obfuscate their real emissions impacts.

The SBTi Corporate Net Zero Standard (CNZS) is currently being updated; the [public consultation draft](#) in November 2025 outlined progress towards real clean energy procurement requirements to meet high integrity net-zero standards. The Scope 2 clean energy procurement requirements proposed new conditions, including an hourly matching phase-in, deliverable market boundaries, and new clean power. The rules in this draft also largely align with the proposed direction of travel from the Greenhouse Gas Protocol (GHGP) Scope 2 guidance updates, the preeminent voluntary accounting standard for corporate emissions.

Updates to these standards, for both voluntary reporting and climate target setting, are critical to better hold to account some of the world's largest energy users, including the hyperscale technology companies whose data centers are putting generational strain on the power grid and, in many cases, driving costs up for ratepayers. Under the reported SBTi walkback, the world's largest companies could claim their gas-powered data centers are fully covered by other clean energy investments. The proposed rules being watered down behind closed doors would have made it harder for these companies to claim that their dirty power usage was met with clean energy.

In January, NGOs from around the world signed onto a [letter calling on the GHGP to maintain integrity and scientific alignment in their standard](#). Today, we ask the same of the Science Based Targets Initiative.

To that end, the undersigned organisations:

- **Reject any corporate-driven requests to weaken the proposed SBTi standard changes without scientific backing.** The SBTi must remain science-based, otherwise the validity and importance of this target setting body is completely lost. Corporates can provide valuable input on how to ensure that science-aligned standards can be feasible, implementable, and impactful, but they must be led by the science.
- **Strongly support new, hourly, and local matching requirements.** These requirements will drive real decarbonization by aligning corporate emissions reduction claims with investments in renewable energy that credibly displace fossil fuels. The science is unequivocal — these three pillars will advance truly impactful grid decarbonization and clean energy investment. Any reliance on status quo annual matching will result in non-impactful investments counting towards unscientific climate targets.
- **Urge alignment with and support for the GHGP Scope 2 direction of travel** where it makes sense. In some cases, the SBTi CNZS should pursue more rigorous standards because it is a leadership-based, climate target setting body. But for consistency, administrative ease, and public clarity, much of the accounting quality criteria — including hourly and locational matching — should align with the GHGP process.
- **Clarify any changes between the public consultation version and the final draft with scientific justification.** We must keep the *science* in the Science Based Targets Initiative. The draft proposal for public consultation from last year was a strong start with many open questions. Any changes made since that consultation *must* be justified with peer-reviewed research to demonstrate how and why those changes will support high integrity and deep decarbonization actions.
- **If agreement cannot be met on high integrity, science-backed changes to the standard, reopen public comment on proposed paths forward.** It is highly concerning that such significant, unscientific, and corporate friendly changes have taken place without any public awareness or opportunity to provide feedback. If there is not agreement to develop the final standard along the lines of the scientifically-aligned proposed draft from November 2025, then SBTi must reopen public comment.

Under today's SBTi rules, a company can rely on a fossil-heavy electricity grid for their true power demand and buy clean certificates from solar plants a continent away to meet SBTi net-zero alignment requirements. This is unacceptable and will not be appropriate for companies moving towards net-zero electricity targets in the coming decades. **The SBTi can only maintain a position of relevance for policymakers, investors, and the public if it evolves with scientific alignment — and that direction is clear.** If it stays on this current disappointing path, it will be a self-admission that the SBTi has become an unscientific target setting body without

real credibility in the climate and clean energy space. It will be an irreparable self-inflicted wound to its integrity, utility and relevance going forward.

The undersigned organisations strongly urge SBTi to follow the science on this issue, rather than corporate pressure, and ensure its updated rules include new, hourly, and locationally matched clean power requirements to enable decision-useful evaluation, clarity for investors around real risk, transparency for policymakers and the public, and more direct decarbonization impact via corporate clean energy investment.

Sincerely,

350 Seattle

350Kishwaukee

Action Speaks Louder

Amazon Employees for Climate Justice

Beyond Fossil Fuels

Climate Risk Horizons

Energy Unlocked

EnergyTag

Environmental Coalition on Standards (ECOS)

Global Action Plan

Green Web Foundation

Greenpeace USA

Just Shift

Natural Resources Defense Council

NewClimate Institute

Oil and Gas Action Network

Oil Change International

Public Citizen

Reclaim Finance

ShareAction

Sierra Club

Stand.earth

Sustainable AI Futures

Troublemakers

Union of Concerned Scientists