April 29, 2026

Lauren Sanchez, Chair
California Air Resources Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: SB 253 Public Workshop: California Corporate Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program – Request for Feedback

Dear Chair Sanchez,

ACORE respectfully submits these comments to the California Air Resources Board ("CARB") in response to CARB's March 23, 2026, climate disclosure workshop covering the implementation of Senate Bill 253 ("SB 253," or the "Climate Corporate Data Accountability Act").

ACORE is a 501(c)(3) national nonprofit organization that works to accelerate the transition to a clean energy economy. ACORE's membership spans the energy value chain, including project developers, institutional investors, corporate buyers of clean energy, manufacturers, electric power generators, retail energy providers, and other stakeholders.[1] Given the many ACORE member companies that are likely covered under SB 253, ACORE respectfully submits these comments to inform CARB's efforts to finalize effective and workable rules.

***

ACORE Response to Request for Feedback: GHG Accounting

Question. What additional information for Scope 1 and 2 reporting should CARB consider in developing final reporting templates?

Question. Should CARB consider allowing other accounting methods? If so, which ones and why?

As CARB considers what accounting methods should be allowed in 2027 and beyond and seeks information as it develops reporting templates, ACORE submits the following information regarding the ongoing revision process at the GHG Protocol. Furthermore, ACORE recommends that CARB provide guidance on which versions of the GHG Protocol guidance will be acceptable during the first years of the program before CARB re-assesses the landscape of GHG reporting standards.

Specifically, ACORE encourages CARB to clarify that companies can continue reporting under the current GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, which was in place when SB 253 was enacted,[2] at least until 2033. In addition, CARB should specify that any updated GHG Protocol standards would not be automatically required of reporting entities. Further, any potential mandatory adoption of updated standards after 2033 should be subject to notice-and-comment rulemaking to promote transparency and

[1] The views expressed here are those of ACORE and do not necessarily reflect the views of any individual ACORE member company.
[2] *See generally* WORLD RES. INST. & WORLD BUS. COUNCIL FOR SUSTAINABLE DEV., THE GREENHOUSE GAS PROTOCOL: SCOPE 2 GUIDANCE (2015) ("GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance"), https://ghgprotocol.org/sites/default/files/2023-03/Scope%202%20Guidance.pdf.

consistency. The GHG Protocol is in the midst of updating its Scope 2 Guidance, with final publication of updated Scope 2 Guidance expected in 2027.[3] As a result, there is present uncertainty as to whether and when SB 253 reporting entities will need to adapt their reporting to align with the forthcoming revised Scope 2 Guidance.

There are two primary reasons that CARB should clarify that reporting entities can continue to rely on the current GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance at least through 2033. First, the existing Scope 2 Guidance is widely in use today; continuing to allow it will minimize reporting entities' compliance burdens and provide reporting entities with needed flexibility in the early years of California's new regulatory scheme. Second, the existing Scope 2 Guidance has a demonstrated track record of promoting investment in clean energy, whereas some of the updates under consideration could undermine existing incentives to invest in clean energy sources.

ACORE raised this recommendation in its comment letter to CARB on February 9, 2026. For ease of reference, the two key points are copied from that letter below:

I. CARB Should Clarify that Entities May Continue to Report Under the Current GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance in Order to Promote Flexibility and Ease Compliance Burdens.

CARB should make clear in its regulations that companies can follow the GHG Protocol framework that was in place in January 2024 when SB 253 went into effect at least through 2033, or any successor GHG Protocol framework. This would advance the goal of allowing for flexibility and easing the compliance burden, while still providing California with high quality GHG emissions information.

Allowing entities to report under the current GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance for the foreseeable future would promote flexibility and ease the compliance burden on reporting entities. Companies are already comfortable and familiar with the effective Scope 2 Guidance that exists today.[4] In fact, 97 percent of S&P 500 companies that voluntarily reported their emissions to CDP followed the GHG Protocol framework in 2023.[5] The current version of the GHG Protocol was in place when legislators enacted SB 253 and pointed to the GHG Protocol as the framework to follow. In addition, some ACORE members have expressed concern about increased reporting costs associated with certain proposed requirements under proposed updates to the GHG Protocol, underscoring the benefits of regulatory flexibility to continue using the existing framework.[6]

Moreover, the statute specifically affords a mechanism for CARB beginning in 2033 and every five years thereafter to "survey and assess currently available greenhouse gas accounting and reporting standards" and determine whether an "alternative accounting and reporting standard. . . would more effectively further the goals of this section."[7] At least until that time, CARB should clarify through its regulations that companies can use the GHG Protocol framework that was in place when the law was passed or any successor GHG Protocol framework if a company so chooses.

---

[3] Sarah Huckins, GHG Protocol Public Consultations Now Open: Scope 2 and Electricity Sector Consequential Accounting, WRI Blog (Oct. 20, 2025), https://ghgprotocol.org/blog/ghg-protocol-public-consultations-now-open-scope-2-and-electricity-sector-consequential.

[4] That is, the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance published in 2015. *See* note 2.

[5] GHG Protocol, About Us, https://ghgprotocol.org/about-us (accessed Jan. 20, 2026).

[6] Reporting entities have raised concerns about hourly matching and deliverability requirements significantly raising reporting costs.

[7] *See* Cal. Health & Safety Code § 38532(c)(2)(A)(iv)(I).

ACORE also requests that CARB not *require* reporting entities to adhere to any forthcoming GHG Protocol updates, particularly not until CARB has a chance to hear from reporting entities in a dedicated notice-and-comment rulemaking. To provide certainty and flexibility, ACORE encourages CARB to confirm that the existing GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (or any successor GHG Protocol framework) is an acceptable framework at least through 2033, when CARB will assess whether an alternate accounting and reporting standard would more effectively further the goals of the law.[8]

II. Allowing Continued Use of the Current GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance Will Encourage Clean-Energy Development.

Clarifying in CARB's forthcoming regulations that reporting companies can continue to use the existing GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance at least through 2033 would also promote clean energy investment and development. ACORE cautions against requiring strict adherence to the GHG Protocol updates currently under consideration which could discourage certain clean energy investments and have a chilling effect on the clean energy market.

Voluntary agreements to procure clean energy play a vital role in driving greater levels of clean energy deployment because such agreements de-risk projects and enable financing. However, the proposed hourly matching and deliverability requirements under consideration in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 update process threaten to undermine these incentives, which could result in less clean-energy capacity additions in the real world. Companies would have a more difficult time promoting renewable energy via purchases of Renewable Energy Certificates ("RECs") and Virtual Power Purchase Agreements ("VPPAs"). Indeed, a poll released in 2025 found that 78 percent of respondents involved in sourcing clean electricity and related instruments were not confident that they could continue such sourcing under an hourly matched and deliverable framework.[9] Today, many companies need to aggregate their load across regions to have enough demand for a long-term power purchase agreement. The new requirements proposed would therefore weaken a pivotal lever for companies to drive clean energy development.

By affording companies the flexibility to continue using the longstanding GHG Protocol framework in place when SB 253 was signed into law, CARB's forthcoming regulations can avoid any potential complications related to the GHG Protocol revision process.

III. The GHG Protocol's Existing Flexibility Provisions Should Inform CARB's De Minimis Definition for Scope 3 Reporting

As ACORE has recommended above with respect to Scope 2, CARB should provide clarity on how the GHG Protocol's provisions apply under SB 253. For Scope 3, this means clarifying that the Protocol's existing approach is reflected in CARB's *de minimis* definition.

GHG Protocol's existing Scope 3 Standard permits entities to focus Scope 3 emissions disclosure on relevant, significant emissions, where the data quality and methodological maturity support credible reporting. This gives companies the flexibility to focus on the emissions that are most significant to their business activities, resulting in disclosure that focuses on the emissions that are most of interest to investors and stakeholders.

---

[8] *See* Cal. Health & Safety Code § 38532(c)(2)(A)(iv)(I).

[9] Green Strategies, Inc., Report: How Scope 2 Revisions May Change Clean Electricity Procurement Strategies at 15, Figure 9. Respondent's Confidence Level on Sourcing Clean Electricity Under Scenario at 2 (May 6, 2025) https://www.greenstrategies.com/report-release-scope-2-accounting-revisions-practitioners-perspectives/.

The GHG Protocol allows companies to exclude reporting emissions on activities where emissions are insignificant in size or where the entity is unable to estimate emissions due to a lack of data or other limiting factors – as long as the entity explains its justification for the exclusion. From a cost-benefit perspective, this allows companies to focus reporting resources on the most significant emissions rather than needing to report emissions from every single activity. It also allows for the evolution of data quality and methodologies over time, where companies can increase reporting as data quality and methodologies are developed to support credible reporting.

These GHG Protocol provisions are not exceptions to the standard; they are core design features that appropriately prioritize reporting resources on the emissions that are most impactful and of most interest to the users of GHG reporting. These provisions also reflect the reality that methodologies for many Scope 3 categories and activities remain immature, and reliable data sources are unavailable for significant portions of the value chain.

Mandatory emission reporting frameworks that have moved to implementation globally have built in similar flexibility provisions, through de minimis exclusions, significance-based filtering, phased implementation, and recognition that not all categories are at the same stage of methodological development. Without an affirmative de minimis definition in the regulation that reflects these provisions, reporting entities face a binary choice: report numbers they know to be unreliable, or face enforcement risk for not reporting.

***

In short, ACORE encourages CARB to draft regulations that clarify that the existing version of the GHG Protocol framework will be an acceptable framework of the Scope 2 emissions reporting at least until 2033, when the statute provides for reassessment, and that define de minimis in a way that incorporates the GHG Protocol's own flexibility provisions into the scope 3 reporting requirements. ACORE greatly appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to assist in effective implementation of California's climate disclosure laws.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lesley Hunter
Senior Vice President, Policy and Engagement
ACORE
1150 Connecticut Ave NW #401
Washington, DC 20036
hunter@acore.org

/s/ Jeffrey Gorham
Director, Policy & Engagement
ACORE
gorham@acore.org