Frequently Asked Questions (updated 07.21.26)

The following responses address questions received after the release of the Beyond Alliance RFP and during the formal Q&A period. For ease of reference, questions have been organized by topic. These responses constitute the final clarifications for this RFP; no further updates, guidance, or interpretations will be issued.

Reminder: Key Dates

- Letter of Intent (LOI) Deadline: Tuesday, July 28
- Full Proposal Deadline: 3:00 p.m. PT on August 26

Accounting, Baselines, & Methodology Questions

Q: For end-of-life refrigerant that is currently recovered and sold into the reclamation market, no associated emission is typically recognized in any party's Scope inventory at that transaction. Separately, ozone-depleting substances (e.g., CFCs, HCFCs) generally fall outside GHG Protocol Scope inventory boundaries entirely. Generally, emissions reductions are counted against a category that is already being accounted for. Could you please share anything the Beyond Alliance is thinking about how potential end-of-life destruction / reclamation benefits could be claimed given they have no baseline to be compared against?

***A:** Beyond Alliance recognizes this challenge: for interventions like end-of-life refrigerant recovery, reclamation, and destruction, there's often no single published methodology or universally accepted baseline to compare against. Because of this, we haven't prescribed one specific baseline methodology. Instead, in the absence of an established inventory baseline, we ask respondents to propose a scientifically and technically defensible framework for quantifying and substantiating the climate benefit of their proposed approach.*

This is consistent with standard project-level GHG accounting practice: ISO 14064-2:2019 explicitly allows baselines to be constructed from alternative scenarios, rather than requiring pre-existing inventory data. This approach is also program-neutral by design, meaning it's meant to sit underneath a program's own requirements (like Beyond Alliance's), not replace them.

For example, respondents could point to:

- *ISO 14064-2, or*
- *Sector-specific precedent, such as Isometric's HFC and ODS Recovery and Destruction Protocol (which credits reductions against a constructed counterfactual, with an additionality test, but credits only the GWP-100 benefit — not the ozone co-benefit), or*
- *A protocol with a wider eligible-substance list, such as Verra's, which includes ODS as well as HFCs, with all eligible gases evaluated in GWP-100 CO2e terms.*

Respondents may also use a mass balance approach, and cite national Article 7 reporting to the Ozone Secretariat as supporting evidentiary context for their counterfactual assumptions, as long as they are *also able to demonstrate that a proposed destruction or reclamation activity isn't already required to meet a country's Montreal Protocol/Kigali Amendment obligations (regulatory surplus), or to benchmark against the relevant national phasedown trajectory. Please note, this data doesn't substitute for the project- or facility-level baseline and quantification methodology respondents must still propose and substantiate, but it is one input among several that can inform it.*

Q: Where no existing methodology exists, does the Alliance expect respondents to propose a defensible alternative framework, consistent with the RFP's allowance for alternative accounting approaches?

A: *Yes. Where no established methodology exists for a particular intervention or accounting element, respondents are encouraged to propose a scientifically and technically defensible alternative framework. As noted above, any alternative approach should be clearly documented, supported by appropriate evidence, and demonstrate how it meets the RFP's principles for transparency, credibility, quantification, attribution, and independent verification. In particular we encourage respondents to think about:*

- *Demonstrating Rigor: does their approach demonstrate comparable rigor to the AIM Platform Standard and Guidance (V1.0, April 2026)?*
- *Justification for Claim: are you clearly documenting and supporting your baseline assumptions, including additionality so the framework can be independently evaluated?*
- *Claim Integrity: How do you demonstrate how chain of custody, verification, and safeguards against double counting will ensure any claimed climate benefits are credible, durable, and independently verifiable?*
- *Advancing the Evidence Base: How could your methodology, implementation approach, and supporting data help inform future standards and best practices?*

Q: For recovery-and-destruction interventions, what counterfactual does the Alliance consider credible for quantifying the reduction? For example, should the reference case assume that recovered material would otherwise be reclaimed and resold (with eventual leakage over time), that it would be immediately vented, or another scenario? Guidance on the expected counterfactual would support consistent and comparable quantification across proposals.

A: *Beyond Alliance does not prescribe a single counterfactual scenario across all proposals, nor does it evaluate proposals against an Alliance-defined baseline. The appropriate counterfactual depends on the specific intervention, the end-of-life pathway being addressed, and regional applicability. Please see the preceding question for additional guidance on counterfactual development, noting that where available, Beyond Alliance also encourages respondents to support their proposed methodology with independent third-party evaluation or validation.*

Beyond Alliance does, however, place significant emphasis on the durability and integrity of the resulting environmental claim. An "immediate venting" counterfactual represents a permanent, one-time avoided emission because the refrigerant is ultimately destroyed and cannot generate *future emissions. By contrast, a "reclaim-and-resell-with-eventual-leakage" counterfactual represents a time-distributed avoidance, with the refrigerant remaining in circulation and potentially undergoing multiple recovery, reclamation, and reuse cycles. This introduces an important claim integrity challenge: without an appropriate accounting framework, the same refrigerant—or the same avoided emissions—could be credited more than once over its useful life.*

Beyond Alliance does not prescribe a single solution to this challenge. Respondents may propose any technically defensible approach, provided it demonstrates how claim durability and uniqueness are maintained over the lifetime of the refrigerant. For example, a respondent may elect to issue a single environmental attribute representing the expected lifetime benefit of the reclaimed refrigerant, rather than multiple credits over successive recovery events. Regardless of the approach, respondents must demonstrate how the environmental claim is quantified, tracked, and ultimately retired so that the environmental benefit cannot be claimed more than once.

Accordingly, respondents should:

- *If applicable, use one of the existing methodologies*
- *Clearly define the end-of-life pathway being addressed (e.g., permanent destruction versus reclamation and continued use).*
- *Construct and justify the corresponding counterfactual using transparent, evidence-based assumptions.*
- *Describe how claim uniqueness is maintained, including how the same refrigerant—or the same avoided emissions—is prevented from generating multiple environmental claims over successive recovery, reclamation, and reuse cycles.*
- *Explain the tracking and retirement mechanism used to account for the environmental attribute, including when a claim is considered final and how future recovery events are treated.*
- *Demonstrate claim durability, explaining how the proposed accounting approach reflects the long-term environmental outcome of the refrigerant and addresses any future leakage, reuse, or eventual destruction.*

Q: How is the proposed book and claim approach better than using carbon credits directly to finance mitigation activity?

***A**: Many Beyond Alliance members are actively investing in carbon credits as part of their broader efforts to advance global net-zero goals and support climate mitigation. This initiative complements, rather than replaces, those efforts — it accelerates action specifically within the value chains that member companies rely on for their products and services, using a book and claim approach to support interventions that demonstrate a clear, credible value-chain association, consistent with the AIM Platform Standard and Guidance.*

Q: Which existing carbon credit protocols might best complement the measurement and verification requirements under this RFP?

***A**: This Request for Proposal (RFP) is not prescribing or prioritizing any single protocol. It is incumbent for the proposal to describe how current protocols can best facilitate the Measurement,* *Reporting, and Verification (MRV) requirements for a book and claim system. Its intention is to avoid restricting potential solutions by pre-defining the scope of what is considered effective.*

Q: How will the EAC's generated from the book and claim approach be carved out from existing output based scope 3 reporting to avoid double counting?

A*: Please review the AIM Standard and Guidance, as they outline the required mechanisms for preventing the double counting, reselling, or transferring of environmental attributes to other parties. These include a mandatory, clear tracking registry or system of record and an attestment of contractual obligations between the intervention host or supplier. Further, Chapter 6 of the AIM Standard and Guidance prescribes how certificates are applied to inventory disclosures.*

Q: Are there examples of existing book and claim approaches I should be aware of?

A: *Yes, please visit the Center for Green Market Activation; they have developed a number of book and claim approaches under the AIM Platform Standard. You can also review the recently updated Advanced and Indirect Mitigation (AIM) Platform Standard and Guidance V1.0 (April 2026).*

Q: What if a current approach can't be effectively claimed within existing carbon accounting standards?

A*: If no broadly accepted methodologies are available, respondents are encouraged to describe the protocols or frameworks their accounting approach aligns with (e.g., GHG Protocol LCA or Project Accounting Standard, ISO standards, etc.). In such cases, respondents should propose a reasonable, transparent pathway for verifying emissions reductions.*

Q: Should calculations be done in GWP100?

A*: Yes. Respondents should calculate and report emissions reductions using 100-year Global Warming Potentials (GWP100) and clearly identify the GWP values and sources used in their calculations.*

Partnership, Supply Chain & Roles

Q: For end-of-life recovery and destruction interventions, we would appreciate clarification on how supply is expected to be mobilized within a member's value chain. Specifically, would participating members/buyers from the Beyond Alliance help coordinate or direct facilities and contractors in their supply chain to route recovered end-of-life refrigerant to the awarded provider, or is the respondent expected to establish those value-chain supply relationships independently? Understanding how this responsibility is divided between the buyer and the respondent is important to structuring a credible, value-chain-connected intervention.

A*: Either approach may be appropriate depending on the intervention model and the participating buyer's relationship with its suppliers. However, respondents should not assume that Beyond Alliance* *members will direct or require suppliers to participate. Rather, respondents are encouraged to demonstrate a credible pathway for mobilizing supply within the relevant value chain. This may include:*

- *Leveraging existing supplier relationships, where the respondent already has direct connections to suppliers, contractors, service providers, or facilities within the value chains of Beyond Alliance members.*
- *Forming partnerships with organizations that possess those relationships (e.g., project developers, solution providers, contractors, OEMs, distributors, or project hosts) if the respondent does not independently have direct access.*
- *Utilizing a sourcing region approach, where specific suppliers cannot reasonably be identified (particularly for Tier 2 or Tier 3 supply chains). In these cases, respondents may demonstrate a credible value chain association by targeting refrigerant recovery and destruction activities within regions known to supply products or services to Beyond Alliance members.*

Q: What is Beyond Alliance's expected role in facilitating introductions and commercial discussions with participating data center operators?

A: *Beyond Alliance's role is to convene stakeholders, establish a high-integrity framework for interventions, and evaluate proposals, not to broker commercial relationships or negotiate transactions between parties.*

Where appropriate, the Alliance may facilitate introductions or help raise awareness of relevant initiatives to support ecosystem development. However, commercial discussions, partnership formation, commercial terms, and project implementation remain the responsibility of the participating organizations. Respondents should not assume that submission to the RFP includes access to, endorsement by, or commercial introductions to Alliance members or data center operators.

Q: Will Beyond Alliance identify and introduce participating data center operators, or is the project developer expected to source participants independently?

A: *Project developers should generally expect to identify and engage participating data center operators and other implementation partners independently. Beyond Alliance's role is to evaluate and support high-integrity interventions, not to recruit participants or broker commercial relationships.*

Q: Does the applicant organization have to be the project host? If so, can an organization primarily focused on market activation be the project host if it partners with solution providers and project developers?

A: *No. The applicant organization does not have to be the project host. The proposal should clearly identify the project host(s) and define the roles and responsibilities of all project partners, demonstrating how the partnership will successfully implement the proposed intervention.*

Q: Are respondents required to identify named hosts with letters of commitment at proposal submission, or can proposals describe a host recruitment strategy targeting the priority sectors?

A: *Respondents are not required to identify named intervention hosts at the time of proposal submission. Proposals may instead describe a credible strategy for identifying and recruiting intervention hosts within the priority sectors or relevant value chains.*

Where specific hosts or partners have already been identified, respondents are encouraged to include them in their proposal along with letters of commitment, where applicable.

Further, if a proposal is shortlisted, respondents should be prepared to identify and engage intervention hosts during the diligence process and demonstrate their willingness to enter into the necessary contractual arrangements to implement the intervention and convey the associated environmental outcomes.

Q: Do you have to be a technology provider to respond?

A*: No. Respondents do not need to be technology providers. Eligibility is based on the proposed intervention's ability to satisfy the requirements and evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP, rather than the respondent's organization type.*

Q: Do respondents need pre-existing relationships with Tier 2 or Tier 3 suppliers?

A: *No, but it is beneficial to understand whether respondents have existing relationships with likely suppliers in the sectors of interest. The most competitive proposals will have concrete relationships established with the intervention hosts when the proposal is submitted.*

Q: Can a national government or government agency participate as a partner in a proposed intervention?

A: *Yes. Government entities may participate as project partners where their involvement supports the successful implementation of the intervention. Their participation is neither required nor viewed more or less favorably than partnerships with other organizations. As with any partner, respondents should clearly describe the government's role and how it contributes to the proposed intervention.*

For example, government partners may facilitate implementation, support monitoring and reporting, provide access to data — such as national Article 7 reporting to the Ozone Secretariat under the Montreal Protocol, which can help substantiate a country's phasedown obligations and production/consumption/destruction trends — or strengthen the integrity of a book-and-claim system through registry administration, chain-of-custody oversight, or verification.

As with all proposals, respondents must demonstrate regulatory surplus and additionality. Activities that are already required by law or would have occurred absent the proposed intervention would generally not be considered claimable emissions reductions. Data provided by a government partner, *including national reporting of this kind, may support this demonstration, but does not substitute for the project- or facility-level baseline and quantification methodology respondents must still propose and substantiate.*

Q: My organization is interested in serving as an implementation partner but does not independently satisfy the RFP's eligibility requirements as a lead respondent. Is there a way to make prospective applicants aware of our capabilities?

A*: Yes. Organizations interested in participating as implementation or supporting partners are encouraged to let the Alliance know. We are happy to help raise awareness of your organization's capabilities and interest in partnering by sharing that information through our social media channels and other public communications, where appropriate. This outreach is intended solely to increase visibility for potential collaborators and does not constitute an endorsement or recommendation by the Alliance. Partnership decisions remain at the discretion of applicants, and all proposals will be evaluated using the same published eligibility requirements and evaluation criteria. Please share your interest with sustainability@effecterra.com.*

Eligibility, Additionality & Scope

Q: The “Non-Competitive Activities”; section indicates that proposals seeking to monetize legacy refrigerant stockpiles or previously recovered or destroyed gases will not be competitive absent a demonstration that the intervention directly incentivizes new activity. Could you clarify the boundary of this exclusion? Would stockpiled refrigerant being held within a company’s value chain for potential future use be considered excluded?

A: In general, yes. Refrigerant that has already been recovered and is being stockpiled within a company's value chain for potential future use would generally not meet the additionality expectations of this RFP on its own. Simply holding existing recovered refrigerant in inventory does not, by itself, represent a new intervention that directly incentivizes or causes additional emissions reductions beyond what would have occurred otherwise.

Q: The RFP references “appropriate vintage controls” but does not specify an eligible vintage window. Could you clarify the expected requirements? For example, must a reduction occur after contract execution to be eligible, and is there a maximum vintage age beyond which a reduction would no longer qualify for a current-period claim?

A: The RFP does not prescribe a fixed date-based vintage window (e.g., a universal eligibility start date or maximum vintage age). Instead, respondents are expected to define and justify their proposed vintage controls as part of the Claim Lifecycle Management section of their proposal.

However, as noted in the answer above, the absence of a fixed vintage window should not be interpreted as allowing historical emissions reductions to be claimed. Consistent with the RFP's emphasis on additionality, Beyond Alliance is seeking to incentivize new emissions reductions resulting from new interventions, rather than recognize or monetize reductions that have already occurred or would have occurred regardless of this RFP. Accordingly, respondents should *demonstrate a clear temporal relationship between project implementation, the generation of emissions reductions, and the issuance of any resulting environmental claims. Respondents should also explain how their proposed approach ensures that claims are made available within a reasonable timeframe following the investment in the underlying intervention. To that end, as noted in the RFP, Beyond Alliance is seeking interventions that can begin generating emissions reductions as early as 2028. Proposals that rely on extended implementation periods before environmental claims become available may not be considered eligible unless they can clearly justify the delay.*

Q: What if the project is already being delivered under a refrigerant program, how do you show additionality?

A*: A project that is already planned, funded, or underway is not automatically ineligible. However, respondents must clearly demonstrate that the emissions reductions being claimed are new, incremental, and dependent on the proposed intervention, rather than representing business-as-usual activities, pre-existing commitments, or historical project outcomes.*

Respondents should clearly articulate the "but-for" case for the proposed intervention. Specifically, they should explain what the project would achieve without support from this RFP (the business-as-usual baseline), what additional activities or outcomes will occur because of the proposed investment, and why those additional emissions reductions would not otherwise occur. The claimable emissions reductions should reflect only this incremental (delta) impact—not the emissions reductions associated with the existing program.

For example, respondents may demonstrate that the investment:

- *Expands an existing refrigerant management program to additional facilities or geographies that would not otherwise be served;*
- *Accelerates implementation beyond the organization's current deployment schedule;*
- *Enables higher-integrity recovery, reclamation, or destruction activities that would otherwise be financially or operationally infeasible; or*
- *Supports mitigation activities that exceed existing business-as-usual practice or regulatory requirements.*

Q: Are data centers owned by Beyond Alliance members or parent companies of Beyond Alliance members eligible to participate?

A*: Yes. Data centers owned or operated by Beyond Alliance members, or their parent or affiliated companies, are eligible to participate, provided the proposed intervention satisfies the RFP's eligibility and integrity requirements. While the focus of the RFP is on Beyond Alliance members' Scope 3 interventions, we recognize owned data centers may fit into that category (as they may supply other Beyond Alliance members and/or be under the operational control of a company not owned by a Beyond Alliance member).*

Beyond Alliance does not provide preferential treatment based on membership or ownership. Rather, the RFP prioritizes high-impact emissions sources and interventions that align with the Alliance's *objectives. All proposals will be evaluated against the same published eligibility and evaluation criteria, regardless of whether the participating data center is affiliated with a Beyond Alliance member.*

Q: Is there a place responders can see the scope 3 footprints of the Beyond members?

***A**: No. Beyond Alliance does not maintain or publish a centralized repository of member-specific, disaggregated Scope 3 emissions data relevant to this RFP. While many Beyond Alliance members publicly report their overall Scope 3 emissions through their annual ESG or sustainability reports, these inventories are generally not available at the level of detail needed to target individual interventions.*

Instead, respondents are encouraged to develop proposals around the sectors identified in the RFP as having significant refrigerant-related emissions opportunities (e.g., data centers, commercial real estate, and cold chain) and to use publicly available sector-level resources, such as the U.S. EIO GHG data disaggregation (Decarb Nexus) tool, where helpful to characterize market size and emissions potential.

Q: When estimating the tCO2e potential, should that be limited exclusively to the 3 priority sectors?

***A**: Yes. For the purposes of this RFP, respondents should estimate the tCO_2e potential within the priority sectors (data centers, commercial real estate and cold chain) identified in the RFP unless they are proposing an intervention that clearly justifies a broader scope.*

Q: On page 1 of the RFP, what does the following mean "Particular interest will be given to approaches that can mobilize investment toward activities…"? If the RFP is to match buyers with suppliers, why do proposals need approaches to mobilize investments?

***A**: The intent is to prioritize interventions that direct investment into the supply chains and emissions sources associated with Beyond Alliance members. In other words, the objective is not just to match buyers with suppliers, but to mobilize capital in a way that drives additional, scalable, and measurable emissions reductions where Alliance members have a value-chain connection and interest.*

Q: Should the emission reductions occur within the value chain of the Beyond Alliance members? For e.g. should the data centers included in the proposal be the ones currently used by the BA members? Will the list of data centers currently used by BA members be provided?

***A:** Proposals submitted with known suppliers to the Beyond Alliance will be more strongly positioned. However, where such an association is not known or is unclear, respondents may establish value-chain association through one of two pathways outlined in the AIM Platform Standard:*

- *Supplier and customer method — requires demonstration of direct links to known suppliers.*
- *Sourcing or use region method — allows interventions where traceability challenges make it difficult to identify known suppliers.*

This RFP accepts interventions that establish value-chain association through either method, alongside direct relationship. Please see answers to questions above about supply chain introductions.

Q: Will the RFP consider other fluorinated gases (e.g., SF6)?

A: *If it's within a Scope 3 intervention, yes.*

Q: Will the RFP consider additionality of other emission reductions (e.g., natural gas or electrical savings)?

A: *Yes. Respondents are encouraged to explain whether and how such additional emission reductions would be accounted for alongside the refrigerant intervention.*

Q: Will the RFP consider alternative cooling technology (ACT)?

A: *Yes, however, the technology must be readily available within the next 12 to 18 months.*

Q: Are you limiting your RFP to technology transition solely involving less than 10 GWP? Would decarbonization solutions that may lead towards slightly higher GWP refrigerants be considered?

A: No, this RFP does not set a specific GWP threshold. However, any proposed intervention must comply with the regulatory surplus and additionality requirements for any applicable countries or regions, which may include GWP prohibitions. Also, keep in mind that solutions offering the largest net reduction in refrigerant emissions will naturally be those with the lowest GWP

Commercial, Funding & Contractual Models

Q: Will the Alliance provide example templates (e.g., contract language, environmental attribute assignment agreements, or system-of-record documentation) to help respondents satisfy the AIM requirements for ownership, transfer, and prevention of double selling, double issuance, and double claiming?

A: *The Alliance does not currently provide a standard contract, assignment agreement, as appropriate legal terms, systems of record, and governance mechanisms will vary depending on the intervention model, counterparties, jurisdiction, and registry or tracking system being used.*

As such while the Alliance recognizes that there is interest in additional template resources (and may consider developing these in the future), under the current RFP, respondents should demonstrate how *their contractual arrangements and/or systems of record satisfy the requirements of Section 5.7 of the AIM Standard, including ownership, transfer, and protections against double selling, double issuance, and double claiming. For example, this may be achieved through contractual provisions, registry functionality, certification processes, or a combination of these approaches that help to clearly explain how the reductions will be tracked and attributed, and how exclusive rights to the resulting claims will be maintained.*

As a reference, the final pages of the SAFc Connect Database Manual include example commercial and contracting provisions that may be useful. While these were developed prior to finalization of the AIM Standard and should not be considered an AIM-compliant template, they illustrate the types of contractual considerations that may be appropriate under this RFP.

Similarly, there is no prescribed Environmental Attribute Certificate (EAC) template, or format for this RFP. Depending on the intervention, an existing registry-issued instrument (e.g., a Verra-issued carbon credit) could support an AIM-compliant implementation if it satisfies the AIM Standard's requirements for traceability, ownership, issuance, transfer, retirement, and claim integrity. Recognizing this is an innovative pilot, we also anticipate transactions may be made using a system of record (e.g. a secure Excel-based database shared between the intervention host and buyer) meeting the requirements of page 32 of the AIM Standard and Guidance. The distinguishing factor is not the certificate format itself, but whether the underlying governance and system of record meet the AIM requirements.

Q: If only 50% of the data center capacity is utilized by a downstream Beyond Alliance company, only 50% of the EACs generated by the data center's switch to lower GWP refrigerant or data center's use of reclaimed refrigerants will be purchased by the downstream Beyond Alliance company. What will happen to the remaining 50% of the EACs? How will the project developer recover the cost of creating these EACs? Can the same or other Beyond Alliance companies purchase the remaining EACs unbundled?

A: *One purpose of book-and-claim systems is to overcome the "free rider" challenge, where companies making a decarbonization investment would otherwise only be able to claim the emissions reductions associated with their own physical use of a facility. Similar to [Patagonia's value-chain intervention]() in Taiwan, this pilot allows a company to purchase more– or even all-– of the Environmental Attribute Certificates (EACs) generated by an intervention, rather than being constrained by its physical utilization of the data center.*

While the AIM Standard and Guidance does not require EAC purchases to be proportional to a company's utilization of the data center, at the same time the Beyond Alliance does not guarantee the purchase of all Environmental Attribute Certificates (EACs) generated by a project. The quantity of EACs ultimately contracted and purchased will depend on commercial agreements between the project developer and participating buyers.

Q: Are the EACs transferred from the project developers (previous owner of the environmental attributes) directly to the downstream Beyond Alliance company that pays

for the EACs OR to the data center that switches to lower GWP refrigerants or uses reclaimed refrigerants?

A: *The environmental attributes associated with an eligible intervention are conveyed from the intervention host (e.g., the data center owner or operator) to the Beyond Alliance company investing in the project through a legally binding agreement that clearly defines ownership, transfer, attribution, and permitted claims.*

Under the AIM Standard, a limited co-claim structure is permitted, provided it is supported by a legally binding agreement and managed in a manner that prevents double selling, double issuance, and inappropriate double claiming.

Specifically:

- *The investing Beyond Alliance company receives the exclusive right to claim the environmental outcomes associated with its investment toward its Scope 3 value chain objectives.*
- *The intervention host retains the ability to recognize the same intervention within its own Scope 1 emissions reporting, consistent with the AIM Standard and applicable GHG accounting requirements.*
- *The intervention host may not transfer, sell, or allocate those same environmental attributes to any other customer, client, or third party, nor may the environmental outcomes be used to support additional Scope 3 claims beyond those established in the legally binding agreement.*

Respondents should clearly describe the chain of custody, ownership, and attribution of the environmental attributes, and demonstrate how the contractual framework prevents any leakage of claims beyond the two parties to the agreement while remaining fully consistent with the AIM Standard.

Q: Under direct investment intervention, how will the investments translate into EACs? Will the price of EACs be determined by total investment amount divided by the amount of emissions reduced attributable to the investment over a specific period plus project developer's costs associated with creating the EACs?

A: *The RFP does not prescribe a specific pricing formula or methodology for translating an investment into Environmental Attribute Certificates (EACs). Instead, respondents are expected to propose a commercially viable pricing model that reflects the economics of their intervention.*

The requested $/mt$CO_2$e represents the respondent's proposed purchase price for the verified emissions reductions embodied in the resulting EACs. Respondents should determine this price based on the expected emissions reductions, project costs, commercial risks, and the overall value proposition of the intervention.

Importantly, the Beyond Alliance recognizes that not all emissions reductions—and not all EACs—are of equal value. Buyers may be willing to pay a premium for interventions that provide higher-integrity, lower-risk, and more durable claims supported by robust measurement, verification, *traceability, and governance. Conversely, lower-cost interventions may be appropriate where they offer a different balance of cost, scalability, and integrity. One objective of this RFP is to better understand these market dynamics and the willingness of buyers to invest in high-quality, high-integrity emissions reductions.*

EACs are not generated based on the amount invested. Rather, they are issued only for real, quantified, and verified emissions reductions that satisfy the AIM Standard and are documented through an agreed-upon registry or other system of record. EACs cannot be issued against forecasted or contracted emissions reductions.

Respondents should therefore clearly explain both how their proposed \$/mtCO_2e was determined and why the quality, integrity, and expected impact of their intervention justify that price.

Q: In the Proposal Format document, Section 7 asks us to describe our funding strategy. Can Beyond Alliance clarify whether this is related to how we will have funds in place to scale the technology, or if this is broader in terms of whether we anticipate supplementary funds for the proposed intervention overall?

A: *The intent is the latter. Beyond Alliance is seeking to understand the overall funding strategy for the proposed intervention, including how the project will be financed, implemented, and, where appropriate, scaled over time. As such, respondents should describe the role the Beyond Alliance investment is expected to play within the broader funding strategy, including whether additional sources of capital—such as customer investment, private financing, grants, utility incentives, public funding, or other commercial revenues—are expected to support implementation.*

Beyond Alliance is generally not seeking to serve as the sole source of project funding. Rather, the Alliance is interested in investments that can help catalyze or accelerate commercially viable interventions by complementing other sources of capital and sharing project risk. Understanding the broader funding strategy helps the evaluation team assess the financial viability, scalability, and long-term sustainability of the proposed intervention, as well as the extent to which Beyond Alliance's investment can leverage additional resources and maximize overall climate impact.

Respondents are not required to have all funding secured at the time of proposal submission, but they should clearly describe their anticipated funding approach, key assumptions, and any material dependencies.

Generally proposals should anticipate that contracts will be based on a guaranteed pay-for-delivery model, and that up-front implementation costs will not be covered by Beyond Alliance members.

Q: Example 3 describes refrigerant destruction programs, which already exist today and produce registry-issued carbon credits through established methodologies. Can you help me understand what this initiative is seeking beyond what the current voluntary carbon market already offers for verified destruction? Specifically, is the goal to enable members to treat these claims as reductions / insets rather than conventional offsets?

***A:** Beyond Alliance recognizes the role that existing registry-issued carbon credits play in the broader voluntary carbon market. A fundamental objective of this initiative, however, is to evaluate whether high-integrity refrigerant interventions can be driven through Scope 3 value-chain claims under the AIM Standard, rather than functioning solely as conventional VCM offsets. In this way, the approach doesn't compete with existing carbon markets, it tests a potentially alternative pathway for corporate investment in refrigerant emissions reductions, grounded in a company's own value chain rather than an external offset project.*

Q: Does Beyond Alliance intend to fund a mix of Direct Investment and Market Activation proposals, or will all proposals be evaluated solely on their merits according to the evaluation rubric?

***A:** Beyond Alliance has not established a predetermined allocation or funding target for Direct Investment versus Market Activation proposals. All proposals will be evaluated on their individual merits using the published evaluation criteria. The final portfolio of selected interventions will be driven by the quality, integrity, commercial viability, and potential impact of the proposals received, rather than a predetermined balance between intervention types.*

Q: In Appendix B: Clarifying Questions, you state that "Buyers and suppliers will be connected bilaterally once an award has been determined and the general contract terms have been aligned." Bilateral funding seems to be an appropriate model for 'direct investment' projects, whereas a pooled funding model would seem more appropriate for 'market activation' projects that have broader impacts. Will there be a mechanism for pooled and/or a mix of bilateral and pooled funding available for projects that include both direct investment and market activation?

***A:** Yes. Beyond Alliance recognizes that different intervention types may require different funding structures., and the appropriate funding mechanism will be determined during negotiations with selected respondents and formalized in the final contractual agreements.5. RFP Process & Administration*

Q: Does submitting a Letter of Intent (LOI) mean I am committed to submitting a full proposal?

***A:** No. The Letter of Intent is non-binding and does not commit you to submitting a full proposal. Its primary purpose is to help the Alliance anticipate the level of interest, plan the evaluation process, and allocate appropriate review resources. If your plans change after submitting an LOI, you are under no obligation to proceed with a full proposal.*

Q: If I submit a Letter of Intent (LOI), am I required to submit a full proposal?

***A:** No. The Letter of Intent is non-binding and does not obligate you to submit a full proposal. It is intended solely to help the Alliance understand the expected level of interest and plan the review* *process accordingly. If your plans change after submitting an LOI, you are under no obligation to proceed with a full proposal.*

Q: May a single respondent submit multiple proposals under this RFP where the proposals represent materially different responses (e.g., distinct target sectors, geographies, interventions)?

A: Yes. Respondents may submit multiple proposals, provided each represents a materially distinct intervention or implementation approach (e.g., different sectors, geographies, technologies, or business models). Each proposal will be evaluated independently against the criteria outlined in the RFP and should stand on its own technical and commercial merits.

Q: Can you confirm that there is no page limit or other formatting requirements for the proposal? Can you clarify the difference between Section 6. Supporting Documentation Checklist and Section 8: Supplemental Evidence in the Proposal Format document? The description of Supporting Documentation in the RFP on Page 13 suggests these two sections may share similar documents.

A: Beyond Alliance has not established a page limit or prescribed formatting requirements for proposals. Respondents should provide sufficient detail to allow the proposal to be thoroughly evaluated while keeping submissions clear and concise.

The two sections noted serve different purposes:

- *Section 6: Supporting Documentation Checklist is intended to confirm that all required supporting materials have been included with the proposal (e.g., letters of commitment, organizational documentation, or other required attachments).*
- *Section 8: Supplemental Evidence provides respondents with the opportunity to include optional materials that strengthen or substantiate the proposal, such as technical reports, peer-reviewed publications, pilot results, validation studies, case studies, or other supporting analyses.*

Q: Can we include hyperlinks to relevant materials for supplemental evidence instead of combining full documents into a single PDF file? Is there a required template for the letters of commitment?

A: *Yes. Hyperlinks to relevant supporting materials are acceptable, provided they are functional, publicly accessible, and not behind a password, login, or paywall at the time of proposal review. And, no, there is no required template for letters of commitment. However, letters should clearly describe the partner's intended role and level of commitment to the proposed intervention.*

Q: Will we get any feedback on our submission after we submit the LOI or is that solely for the purpose of estimating the volume of submissions?

A: *The Letter of Intent (LOI) is primarily intended to help Beyond Alliance estimate the expected volume and diversity of proposals and does not include a formal review or feedback process.*

Q: Will Beyond Alliance provide feedback on proposals after the evaluation process?

A: *Following proposal evaluation, respondents may request a brief, one-time feedback discussion, noting that any feedback provided is for informational purposes only and will not result in a re-evaluation or change to the proposal's score or selection outcome.*

Q: Will Beyond Alliance issue an RFP each year?

A: *This RFP is a pilot initiative designed to test market interest, intervention quality, and commercial execution. Whether Beyond Alliance issues future RFPs will depend on the outcomes of this pilot, including the quality of proposals received, successful implementation of selected interventions, and member demand. While there is strong interest in building this into an ongoing program, Beyond Alliance is not committing to an annual RFP at this time.*

Q: Can respondents know who is on the advisory group?

A: *To avoid delaying the launch of the RFP, we did not seek formal approval from every advisory group participant to publicly disclose their involvement. The advisory group is composed of Beyond Alliance member companies and representatives from leading standards bodies. The standards bodies participate in a technical advisory capacity, helping answer questions related to how different interventions could be associated with companies' value chains and how they could be reflected in greenhouse gas inventories.*

Q: Can respondents set up direct meetings with the Beyond Alliance team?

A: *No.*