Leading Corporates, Investors and Researchers Back Higher-Integrity Clean Energy Accounting — While Many Anonymous Companies Endorse a Flawed Status Quo

Consultation on carbon accounting rules draws support from Google, Constellation, NGOs, independent researchers, and technology developers — while many corporates resist more granular disclosure requirements

LONDON / WASHINGTON — 31st July

The world's leading authority on carbon accounting, the Greenhouse Gas Protocol, has this week released long-awaited public consultation responses on proposed reforms to improve the integrity and accuracy of corporate electricity carbon accounting. Across 1,072 responses, a majority of corporate respondents opposed the changes, which would require them to report a more honest assessment of their electricity carbon footprints. A supermajority of companies responded anonymously, and 53.5% of responses were anonymous overall.

However, the release also revealed a broad coalition of independent scientists, NGOs, technology providers, and leading corporate buyers supporting higher-integrity carbon accounting. Respondents supporting the proposed updates included Google, Constellation Energy, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, Regulatory Assistance Project, Climate Group, Iron Mountain, Clean Air Task Force, and others. Well over 100 respondents supported the core updates.

The proposed updates target "Scope 2" emissions, which measure indirect emissions from purchased and consumed electricity. Today's standard allows companies to offset fossil-fuel use with clean energy credits from distant, disconnected grids at any time of year. As a result, large AI data center companies are currently building new fossil fuel power plants while claiming to be 100% clean, exposing the flaws in the current system. While Google responded in support of the changes, no other Big Tech companies could be found amongst the identifiable responses - despite the well-reported influence campaign the sector has waged on GHGP updates.

The proposed changes, which would require that clean energy claims align with where and when companies consume electricity, were also backed by developers of technologies that are not valued under today's annual accounting system, such as geothermal and energy storage technologies.

"A credible coalition of independent experts and progressive leaders is driving this change," said **Killian Daly, Executive Director of EnergyTag**. "While the well-resourced status quo defenders want carbon accounting stuck in the past, the world is moving on - and real progress demands real transparency."

While the public consultation provides an input into the standards development process, it does not determine the outcome. Work now reverts back to the Scope 2 Technical Working Group and Independent Standards Board, who already strongly endorsed the proposed changes last year.

In a release on their website, the GHGP reiterated that “any further proposals will follow GHG Protocol's standard development process including development by the Technical Working Group and review and approval by the Independent Standards Board." The decision-making criteria of scientific integrity, impact, and feasibility remain front and center. The public consultation was not a “voting exercise” of raw numbers - it was a request for feedback to be evaluated on the merits of evidence.

Granular accounting isn't theoretical. Over 1,500 companies are already doing hourly accounting and matching worldwide, which is more companies than responded to the GHGP consultation. Hourly matching tariffs are available in countries representing 73% of global electricity demand. Whilst this process continues, progressive companies are already implementing hourly matching, and investors increasingly demand it to assess real climate risk.