

**Methane to Markets
Steering Committee Meeting
27-28 January 2009
Monterrey, Mexico**

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Summary of Key Discussion Points and Conclusions

The Fifth Session of the Methane to Markets Steering Committee met in Monterrey, Mexico on 27-27 January 2009 to review past accomplishments and set forth action items for the coming year.

Thirteen Methane to Markets Partners were represented at the meeting including: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, European Commission, Finland, India, Japan, Mexico, Poland, United Kingdom, and the United States. Representatives from Chile attended the first day of the Steering Committee meeting in order to present on Chile's activities in methane reduction. The complete list of participants is presented in Attachment 4.

During its meeting, the Steering Committee heard country statements and updates from Partners and received progress reports from Subcommittee chairs. Other issues discussed included:

- [Project Network Status and Future Engagement](#): Ways to recruit new Project Network members and better engage existing Project Network members.
- [Outreach and Communications Efforts](#): Web site redesign and enhancement, materials distribution and event participation, utilization of the *Methane International* newsletter, press/media exposure, and utilization of the online project tracking system.
- [Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report](#): Distribution of template for Subcommittee input and proposed development schedule.
- [Next Partnership Expo](#): Proposed location and date, marketing efforts, Partner commitments and participation, developing sector-specific sessions, and project highlights.
- [Potential Expansion of the Agriculture Sector](#): Exploration of enteric fermentation and rice cultivation.
- [Future of the Partnership and Potential Ministerial Meeting](#): Proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference and potential for second Ministerial meeting.

During its deliberations, the Steering Committee approved Chile's request to join the Partnership and Finland's request to join the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee also developed a charge to Subcommittees for Year 5 (see Attachment 1). Specific actions were tasked to the Steering Committee and Partners as well as the Administrative Support Group (see Attachments 2 and 3, respectively).

The following sections provide more details of the meeting discussion.

Tuesday, 27 January 2009

Welcome and Opening of the Meeting (Agenda Item #1)

Mr. Paul Gunning, Acting Chair of the Methane to Markets Steering Committee, welcomed the participants to Monterrey and thanked Mexico's Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (Secretaría del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales or SEMARNAT) for hosting the meeting. He announced there were nearly 300 people registered for the Partnership-wide meeting and he anticipated a very exciting two days of dialogue following informative site tours in each sector. He was also

encouraged to see continued growth in the Partnership to meet burgeoning interest in energy and climate change issues.

Mr. Gunning explained that he would serve as the Acting Steering Committee Chair for these meetings during the transition within the U.S. government as President Obama's administration is confirmed. He expressed the new leadership brings a different perspective on environment and climate change issues than the previous administration and he hoped to learn shortly if there is political support for the initiative.

Introductions (Agenda Item #2)

Mr. Gunning thanked the Steering Committee delegates present in the beautiful country of Mexico and extended a special thanks to Dr. Guoquan Zhao from China for traveling more than 50 hours during the Chinese New Year celebrations. Mr. Gunning asked participants to introduce themselves since there are some new faces around the table. In particular, he announced that Chile has requested to join the Partnership and Finland has asked to become a Steering Committee member. A complete list of attendees is provided in Attachment 4.

Statement of Meeting Goals (Agenda Item #3)

Following introductions, Mr. Gunning provided an overview of the meeting goals:

- Continue tracking activities and successes (e.g., Partnership-Wide Accomplishments Report)
- Strengthen Project Network engagement and outreach efforts
- Agree on plan for the 2010 Methane to Markets Partnership Expo
- Hold open discussion on future of Methane to Markets
 - Renewing Terms of Reference
 - Ministerial meeting
 - New directions and linkages

He explained for new members to the Steering Committee that the ASG developed white papers on the various technical and policy issues to advance discussions and expedite the decision process. The white papers were distributed via e-mail in advance of the meeting and there are copies in the packets for discussion tomorrow. He asked that they pay particular attention to the critical goals for the meeting, placing strong emphasis on this being a period of change given the expiring 5-year window for the first Terms of Reference (TOR).

Adoption of [Agenda](#) (Agenda Item #4)

Although out of order on the agenda, Mr. Gunning introduced the idea to modify or change the TOR as the Steering Committee charts its work over the coming year for successful continuation of the Partnership. He described additional ideas to expand or grow the Project Network and continue Partnership outreach and communication. He also outlined other issues for discussion, including a Partnership-wide accomplishments report to highlight ongoing efforts. This was an idea introduced in Italy, and the ASG has been working over the past year to begin pulling this together. As Methane to Markets approaches the end of its fifth year, the Partnership will also begin planning for the next or second Expo. He reminded participants of the success of the Beijing Expo, which attracted more than 700 attendees from nearly 40 countries and featured 91 project opportunities. As these discussions move forward, he anticipated a robust policy and technical discussions.

Mr. Gunning explained the role of the Steering Committee is to provide guidance for the Partnership as a whole, and develop the charge to the Subcommittees whom do a lion's share of the Partnership's work. The Steering Committee also provides the charge to the ASG for the coming year and he explained that Steering Committee decisions are made by consensus.

Mr. Gunning noted a short set of items following country statements on the agenda. As part of its directive during this meeting, the Steering Committee would seek to welcome Chile as a new Partner and Finland as the newest member of the Steering Committee. He lastly indicated that the Steering Committee would get into the discussion items more intently on Day Two.

Mr. Gunning indicated that Agenda Items #9 to #14 comprise the white papers developed by the ASG:

- Project Network Status and Future Engagement
- Outreach and Communications Efforts
- Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report
- Next Partnership Expo
- Potential expansion of the Agriculture Sector
- Future Direction of the Partnership and Potential Ministerial Meeting

A summary of the recommended actions included in each white paper will be developed as the charge to the Subcommittees as Agenda Item #15.

Mr. Jeremy Eppel from the United Kingdom Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) asked how the Steering Committee works as far as all Partners having a voice. Mr. Gunning explained that when a country joins, they have the option to request to be on the Steering Committee. Of the current 27 Partners, 20 are on the Steering Committee and others have opted not to be members. He indicated there was a discussion at the 2006 Rome meeting regarding the size of the Steering Committee and the members decided to keep it open for the time being, although it might be good to reconsider this issue as the Steering Committee explores future direction for the Partnership. He added that all Partners present at the Steering Committee meetings, regardless of status (e.g., delegate, observer), are invited to provide a country statement.

Mr. Franck Portalupi with Environment Canada asked if quorum was required for Steering Committee decisions. Mr. Gunning reiterated that decisions are made by consensus of those around the table and not based on a quorum of the entire Steering Committee membership. Mr. Kunihiko Shimada with the Japan Ministry of the Environment interjected the Steering Committee might consider the quality (e.g., attendance at meetings, participation in Partnership activities) as well as the quantity of the Steering Committee members. Mr. Gunning acknowledged that was a good point for consideration during discussions on the future direction of the Partnership.

Mr. Gunning then requested a motion to adopt the agenda and upon receipt, the agenda was approved.

Country Statements (Agenda Item #5)

Mr. Gunning invited the delegates in attendance to provide updates describing what Partners have been doing as well as how they have been helping other countries with their projects.

Argentina

Mr. Gabriel Blanco with the Secretariat of Environment and Sustainable Development (Secretaria de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable) explained that Argentina is currently carrying out several Methane to Markets-related activities. He explained the National Strategy for Waste Management was encouraging programs within different cities in Argentina. The first phase involved establishing different management programs for each city (similar to a feasibility study) under a grant from the World Bank. The Strategy also included implementation of plans to eliminate open dumps and replace them with sanitary landfills for collection of biogas. Mr. Blanco explained that U.S. EPA had awarded Argentina a grant for a landfill project to treat biogenic gas and conduct an informational forum for universities and municipalities. The recovered landfill gas will be used for energy, whereas it was previously flared.

Mr. Blanco continued by describing biogas recovery efforts from the agriculture sector, and that research in this area will be completed within the next month. Mr. Jorge Hilbert from the National Agricultural Technology Institute (Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria or INTA) explained that Argentina is exploring creation of its own Methane to Markets program and the various players have been engaged in meetings and developing white papers. He also described the national renewable energy program, which includes methane. Recently, the Secretary of Agriculture doubled efforts on anaerobic digesters in Argentina.

Upon conclusion of Argentina's country statement, Mr. Gunning acknowledge Argentina's efforts to create a Methane to Markets model across multiple Ministries (similar to Mexico's program), which is great to hear.

Australia

Mr. John Karas of the Department of Resources, Energy & Tourism provided [Australia's update](#) and indicated there have been many changes since the last meeting. He described their efforts under the Kyoto Protocol as aggressive and emphasized Australia's commitment to reduce emissions by 60 percent (from 2000 levels) by 2050. Australia is putting into place an emissions trading scheme to be launched by July 2010. The scheme would impose a 5 to 15 percent reduction target for industrial process and covers all six Kyoto greenhouse gases (GHGs). Currently, the scheme addresses landfills and oil and gas systems and major emitters (approximately 1,000 entities) comprise 75 percent of the emissions. The scheme will allow emitters to purchase permits on the open market through transitional arrangements. Mr. Karas lastly reviewed specific activities as they might apply to these transitional arrangements within the four Methane to Markets sectors.

Mr. Eppel asked why 60 percent of the emissions from the oil and gas sector were eligible for free permits. Mr. Karas explained that emissions in excess of transportation were eligible for free permits. It is hoped the industry will hit 60 percent and then that percentage will be reduced in future years. Mr. Gunning asked about offsets and Mr. Karas responded that yes, they intended the system to involve recognized credits. There will be no cap on a particular industry but as the number of available permits diminishes, the cost will go up. Mr. Gunning asked how the trading scheme might apply to coal mines. Mr. Karas indicated that gassy mines, in particular, would be severely impacted. He described the potential compensation package and emerging technology applications (e.g., oxidation) and stated those arrangements would also be forthcoming. Mr. Henry Ferland with the Administrative Support Group (ASG) asked if all sources of agriculture emissions (e.g., manure management, rice cultivation) would be excluded and Mr. Karas confirmed it. He did express, however, that the scheme would have an impact on the transportation fuels they purchase.

Canada

Mr. Franck Portalupi with Environment Canada explained his country's climate position and its belief in Partnership engagement. Canada has made advancing existing technology a priority and feels Methane to Markets is making real progress in that arena. As with Mexico and Argentina's model, Canada's approach is to provide opportunities to transfer the application of technology to other countries. Canada is currently working to inventory its GHG emissions and create state cap-and-trade regimes that are quantifiable and verified. This process forms a basis for expanding Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects for the oil and gas sector. Mr. Portalupi also announced that Canada would be pleased to host the next Oil and Gas Subcommittee meeting in Calgary in September 2009. He added that the Asian-Pacific Partnership (APP) Cleaner Fossil Energy Task Force would be meeting at the same time. Mr. Roger Fernandez with the U.S. EPA asked for more information on Canada's role to develop CDM projects. Mr. Portalupi indicated it was too premature but expressed willingness to put together technical partnerships toward one goal. This includes looking at the whole process and how it will feed off itself.

China

Dr. Zhou from the China Coal Information Institute explained that the China National Development and Reform Commission is in charge of the activities that fall under Methane to Markets. He described the excellent media coverage following the Partnership Expo. He explained China is currently undertaking two pre-feasibility studies at coal mines and reaching an agreement for using low quality methane as sponsored by U.S. EPA. He continued by saying a recent meeting on coalbed methane (CBM) and coal mine methane (CMM) power generation attracted nearly 100 people.

Upon conclusion of China's county statement, Mr. Gunning thanked Dr. Zhou for China's leadership in CBM/CMM activities. Mr. Eppel commented that he understood China was also involved in agriculture projects but lacking participation in the Agriculture Subcommittee. He expressed hope that China would become more linked in and asked Dr. Zhou to take back an invitation to participate. Mr. Shimada inquired about the link between CBM/CMM projects and China's 5-year plan, and the relationship between Methane to Markets projects and the plan. Dr. Zhou explained that it is different.

Chile

Mr. Sebastian Bernstein Llona with Metrogas thanked the Steering Committee for inviting Chile to make a statement and provided an overview of general facts regarding [Chile's energy situation](#). In the recent past, Chile was entirely dependent on oil and more recently has turned toward natural gas, since the biogas industry is still in its infancy, and Chile is reliant on Argentina for its energy imports. He continued by explaining the energy crisis that resulted from lack of investments, emphasizing that no gas was available in 2006/2007. At that time, Chile began to explore alternative energy sources, including biogas. Prior to 2004, it had not been cost effective to explore but following the energy crisis, it became necessary. He stated there is a potential for 2,000 million cubic meters of biogas, yet less than one percent is currently available for use. He explained the two primary sources include landfills and waste water treatment plants. From these sources alone, there might be 250,000-300,000 cubic meters, which could be enough to power 200,000 homes. Chile might also consider natural gas injection, but it is difficult to upgrade the biogas to pipeline quality. He also described the current market conditions in Chile and talked to the environmental benefits (e.g., pollution abatement) associated with capturing the methane that is presently flared. He added that 12 projects are in place but there is no gas going to market. He provided a CDM projects overview and also commented there is increased opportunity for getting biogas to market, despite lower prices for oil. He indicated there might be a better way to improve their efforts regarding processing, upgrading, and transporting the biogas – particularly from incentives. He also emphasized the need to network with service and technology providers.

Mr. Llona continued by providing an overview of the waste water treatment plants and its potential for biogas. He commented that Chile has been studying U.S and New Zealand technologies, as well as those currently employed in Europe. He sees the Partnership as a good opportunity to further technology transfer ideas. Next steps for Chile include upgrading this biogas for vehicular use. He also mentioned the ongoing government initiative to organize study trips to other countries.

Mr. Shimada interjected that Chile provided an interesting presentation and he encouraged Chile to partner with Japan on its future projects. He also mentioned the technology need assessment conducted under UNFCCC and available project support and questioned whether Chile had considered those opportunities. Mr. Llona said that presently, Chile's efforts are primarily pursued via private avenues but they will explore government support in the near future. Unfortunately, the practices are not common and it has proved difficult to find the right person. Mr. Eppel also commented that the Chilean presentation was informative and expressed he was glad to have them as a Partner. He also inquired as to where the Partnership might be when it came to consideration of waste water as a possible methane source. He added that Chile has not only looked at the possibilities but already identified many solutions. Mr. Gunning commented that Methane to Markets is looking at biogas more broadly and the possibility of expanding to include waste water is mentioned in one of the discussion papers. Waste water has been seen

as an interesting way to add additional wastes to the mix and this interest area will be up for discussion on the second day.

Mr. Hilbert asked about Chile's effort to capture biogas from pig farms. Mr. Llona explained that potential is somewhat limited and that Chile is also analyzing its potential from landfills, therefore other projects might become more feasible as time goes by.

Finland

Mr. Pasi Patokallio with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs for Finland indicated it was a privilege to address the Partnership as one of the newer members, having joined in August 2008. He explained there were a number of elements to Finland's participation in Methane to Markets, including coverage of most major players in the climate change community, very little bureaucracy associated with participation, and no direct financial commitments on Partners. He further explained the context for participation in the Partnership stems from Finland's commitment to environmental issues. For example, of Finnish companies, one-third of all exports are deemed environmentally-friendly.

Mr. Patokallio provided an overview of the climate goals put forth under the European Commission (e.g., 20 percent reductions by 2020). He also mentioned the renewable energy targets for European Union (EU) members, which includes an increase from the current 7 to 8 percent upwards of 20 percent. Finland currently achieves 28 percent usage of renewable energy so has set its own future target of 38 percent. He indicated that use of biogas is important to meeting these goals, with particular interest in agriculture and landfills. Local and small enterprises – typically with an average 12 employees and grossing approximately one million Euro per year – comprise a majority of the Finnish biogas industry. He added there are a few multinational enterprises seeking to reduce methane emissions and increase the use of biogas. He also mentioned there are several effective CDM projects underway in other countries, such as landfill capture in Jordan and Nepal as well as energy production in South Africa and Southeast Asia. More complete details can be found on the [Finnish government Web site](#). Upon conclusion of Finland's presentation, Mr. Eppel said he looked forward to working with its experts to the Agriculture Subcommittee.

India

Mr. Vivek Kumar Dewangan with the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas of India opened his country's statement by saying India is excited about the prospect to host the next Partnership Expo. As part of India's update, he indicated the Ministry of Environment and Solid Waste has been providing support for several CDM activities. He mentioned that the Ministries for Coal, Petrochemicals, and Commerce have also been supporting methane mitigation-related projects under the Partnership. Mr. Dewangan explained that India is home to the world's second largest population and stands fifth in GHG emissions, and has recently undertaken a new initiative to reduce methane emissions.

Mr. Ajit Kumar Hazarika with the Oil and Natural Gas Corporation, Ltd. (ONGC) provided an overview of oil and gas sector support, which diverts from strict government policy and instead employs corporate initiatives to reduce emissions from its plants. He explained that presently four of approximately 100 installations have been initially selected for improvement in India. He commented that he personally sees how cooperation with the Partnership has helped to introduce solutions to further reduce emissions.

Mr. Gunning thanked the Indian delegation for its presentation and expressed gratitude for the Ministries' support for the next Partnership Expo. He also pointed out the impressive efforts undertaken by ONGC through its cooperative agreements. He further stated that having worked on climate change issues for the past 15 years, he is personally impressed with the commitment to climate change in addition to environmental and safety issues and acknowledged the great work of the ONGC chairperson.

Japan

As the sole delegate to the Steering Committee and all subcommittees, Mr. Shimada explained which Japanese ministries have responsibility for the various sectors:

- Agriculture: Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
- Coal: Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI)
- Landfills: Ministry of Environment
- Oil and Gas: Ministry of Environment and METI

He emphasized the importance for Partners to communicate the benefits of Methane to Markets whenever they meet with Japanese agencies to further promote the Partnership.

Mr. Shimada announced that the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA), the National Institute of Environmental Studies, and the Ministry of the Environment launched the [Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite \(GOSAT\)](#) in late January 2009 and anticipates the satellite will be fully operational by September 2009. The purpose of the GOSAT is to capture and record data from the same geographic location every three days, including methane and carbon dioxide emissions. He also indicated that the GOSAT data will be linked to the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration system.

Mr. Shimada continued by saying that methane emissions in Japan are approaching zero and the ratio is decreasing every year so there is very little in-country potential so Japan seeks to enter CDM and Joint Implementation (JI) projects in other countries and also to provide financial and technical assistance, particularly as it relates to the coal mining and landfill sectors. He further indicated that Japan is very interested in providing support for expansion into other others of agriculture sources, so it might be possible there will be new designee to the Agriculture Subcommittee in the near future.

Me. Shimada commented on the loss of Japan's New Energy and Industrial Technology Development Organization (NEDO) support for travel assistance to Coal Subcommittee meetings and workshops, but he hopes to identify a new funding source. Again, he encouraged other Partners to mention Methane to Markets whenever meeting with Japanese agencies to garner more support for Partnership activities.

Mr. Blanco asked Mr. Shimada to confirm that the GOSAT captured both methane and carbon dioxide emissions and therefore, might the technology have more applications beyond the oil and gas sector. Mr. Shimada responded affirmatively and added the satellite measures both emissions from 56,000 data points so it has broad application across all sectors. He also explained that anyone can register to receive free data from JAXA. Mr. Mike Layer with Environment Canada commented there was a lack of effective methodologies for third-party verification of emissions reductions and wondered if GOSAT might meet that need. Mr. Shimada admitted it was a great suggestion to use the data sets and he would bring back that idea to the GOSAT staff. He also indicated that METI would be responsible for developing any future methodologies.

Mexico

Mr. Edgar Del Villar Alvelais from SEMARNAT explained there are currently 10 projects underway in Mexico and another 50 potential project concepts have been identified. He elaborated on the collaborative cooperation between SEMARNAT and other Mexican government agencies, including:

- Secretariat of Social Development (Secretaría de Desarrollo Social or SEDESOL)
- Secretariat of Agriculture, Ranching, Rural Development, Fisheries, and Food Supply (Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación or SAGARPA)
- Secretariat of Economy (Secretaría de Economía or SE)
- Secretariat of Energy (Secretaría de Energía or SENER)
- PEMEX, Mexico's state-run oil and gas corporation

Mr. Del Villar stated that Mexico's achievements can be specifically derived from its participation in Methane to Markets and feels it is one of the main global efforts toward climate change. He further indicated that Mexico would support expansion into the waste water sector, particularly since 80 percent of the Mexican population now lives in urban areas. He also indicated that [detail about Mexico's activities](#) would be provided by Ms. Sandra Herrera Flores, Undersecretary for Environmental Regulation, during the plenary session.

United Kingdom

Mr. Eppel explained there is a new department of energy and climate change that is still determining how best to engage in Methane to Markets, and a representative will likely serve as the Steering Committee delegate in the future. In the meantime, Mr. Eppel explained that the oil and gas sector is balancing issues and focused on staying involved and in recruiting some new potential Project Network members. From the coal perspective, most of the methane emissions come from abandoned coal mines and have been decreasing in recent years. He indicated this is not a big area for the United Kingdom, but added that Alcan – a major coal sector player – is currently a PN member.

Mr. Eppel stated from an overall perspective, there is continued emphasis on methane in the climate change arena. A recent climate change act from November 2008 provides strong leadership and a framework for future activities in the United Kingdom. He also described five elements regarding the Act:

- Targets of 80 percent reductions by 2050 for all six GHGs (currently on track to reach 26 percent by 2020).
- Carbon budgets set over 5-year periods (through 2020).
- Creation of a climate change committee to advise the government (first report was provided in December 2008 regarding the best least-cost solutions).
- Emissions trading scheme.
- Adaptation.

Mr. Eppel also described the new energy act passed in November 2008, which includes renewable energy certificates with biogas projects receiving two credits for each project. He explained other strategic policy developments (e.g., feeding tariffs on installations for up to 5 megawatts) have been put forward and stated there has been high-level government interest in this arena from the Prince of Wales and associated ministries. Meetings will be conducted among numerous stakeholders with hopes for agreement on a vision by the end of February 2009.

As the Agriculture Subcommittee co-chair, Mr. Eppel announced the United Kingdom's goal to have 1,000 farm-based digesters by 2020. Despite these efforts, the country is also trying to get out of sector-specific impacts and focus on broader benefits, such as the impact of agriculture on water quality and energy use on cultural activities. The United Kingdom is hoping to employ collective thought to help bring together various agencies under Methane to Markets, similar to the efforts in Mexico and other Partner countries.

Mr. Karas asked how the least-cost effective policies might conflict with emissions trading schemes. Mr. Eppel explained that the United Kingdom developed marginal abatement cost (MAC) curves to study the compared technologies and allow users to determine what they might expect for a certain price and activity level. Mr. Gunning mentioned that the United States has also conducted MAC studies, which revealed the cost-effectiveness of various methane mitigation opportunities.

Mr. Layer commented on the goal to grow the number to 1,000 biodigesters and how existing policy might inhibit this expansion or growth. Mr. Eppel explained they looked at various costs and barriers and determined a cost framework for certain wastes based on the current pricing structure. He acknowledged the need to get water regulators involved and how the aforementioned feeding tariffs might impact the

goal. They are also exploring costs and issues related to electricity grid connection. Mr. Layer also asked if the United Kingdom might be in the position to share its insight and knowledge among all Partners. Mr. Eppel responded yes, once the policy discussions were complete.

United States

Mr. Roger Fernandez with the U.S. EPA provided the [United States' country statement](#). He started by outlining the methane emissions from the Partnership's target sectors: natural gas and oil systems = 26 percent, landfills = 24 percent, coal mining = 10 percent, and manure management = 6 percent. The United States has developed domestic programs (e.g., Natural Gas STAR, Coalbed Methane Outreach Program, Landfill Methane Outreach Program, and AgSTAR) to encourage U.S. industries to reduce methane emissions. President Obama recently announced a plan to invest in renewable energy, including an aggressive goal of achieving 80 percent renewable energy by 2050.

Mr. Fernandez also reviewed the U.S. commitment to Methane to Markets, having pledged \$53 million over 5 years. He also thanked everyone around the table for leveraging additional funds toward these projects. He explained that the U.S. government also provides logistical and meeting support via the Administrative Support Group (ASG). He continued to describe sector-specific project highlights and support provided by EPA, which includes these common themes:

- Strategic focus: targeted technical assistance, capacity building, leveraged Project Network involvement.
- Activities: technical assistance and project identification, tool development and technology transfer, training and capacity building, action plan implementation, addressing key barriers.

Key U.S. successes include significant Partnership support through the ASG and technical support across all sectors, leveraged investment totally more than \$270 million, and anticipated emissions reductions of 24 MMTCO₂E. Mr. Fernandez concluded his report by again stating that success was due to those around the table and organizations in Partner countries with whom the United States is cooperating.

Consideration of Chile and Finland's Requests (Agenda Item #6)

As the last agenda item for consideration on the first day, Mr. Gunning asked the Chilean and Finnish delegates to step out of the room and then opened discussions on the consideration of Chile's request to join the Partnership and Finland's request to join the Steering Committee. Mr. Blanco inquired how Chile's request was received and Mr. Gunning explained the request came from Chile's National Energy Commission. He further clarified that Steering Committee delegates should be official government representatives, but that Subcommittee members can be private sector representatives as long as they are appointed by the Partner government. Following this clarification, Mr. Gunning asked for support for Chile's request to join the Partnership and hearing no objections, Chile's request was approved.

Mr. Gunning explained that while Finland's request to join the Partnership was approved in August 2008, the Finnish Ambassador only recently requested participation in the Steering Committee. By way of background, when countries request to join Methane to Markets, they can request or decline membership in the Steering Committee as well as identify up to three representatives to each technical subcommittee. Following clarification, Mr. Gunning raised the issue of the size of the Steering Committee that had been previously discussed at the 2006 Rome Steering Committee. Mr. Del Villar stated that since there was no official guidelines restricting Steering Committee size (i.e., number of members), Mexico would approve Finland's request but he encouraged the current members to reconsider size and criteria. Mr. Shimada agreed with Mexico's statement and stated consideration of Steering Committee size and criteria could be part of the future direction discussion. He added that frequency of attendance and contributions to Methane to Markets might be part of the Steering Committee criteria. He added that Japan would support Finland's inclusion on the Steering Committee. Mr. Blanco also agreed with Mexico and Japan, but asked for a moratorium or freeze on new Steering Committee members until membership guidelines or criteria

could be adopted. Mr. Portalupi concurred with the concept of a freeze. Mr. Karas commented that he recalled from the Rome meeting discussions that if all Partners had members on the Steering Committee, it might become unmanageable. However, he noted, that scenario has not presented itself so it would be Australia's recommendation to keep membership open. Mr. Gunning put forth a proposal for Finland's petition to join the Steering Committee and also to continue the discussion on Steering Committee membership the next day. Hearing no objections, Finland was added to the Steering Committee. The Chilean and Finnish delegates were invited to rejoin the group and welcomed to the Partnership and Steering Committee, respectively.

Mr. Gunning concluded the first day's discussions and announced the Steering Committee would reconvene at noon the next day.

Wednesday, 28 January 2009

Welcome and Opening of Meeting (Agenda Item #7)

Mr. Gunning called the second half of the Steering Committee meeting to order at 12:20 p.m. and emphasized the pressures to adjourn on time for the Mexican cultural reception that evening. He immediately acknowledged that Partners Brazil and the European Commission were in attendance and invited them to provide a country statement before the day's discussion.

Brazil

Ms. Josilene Ferrer of the Brazilian Technology Centre for Environment Conservation (Companhia de Tecnologia de Saneamento Ambiental or CETESB) provided a brief update on Brazil's activities, particularly as they relate to the landfill sector. She also commented that several states within Brazil are starting GHG inventories under a new National Strategy on Climate Change.

European Commission

Mr. Derek Taylor with the European Commission (EC) expressed its support for Methane to Markets given its importance to climate change and indicated the EU members were very active in the fight against climate change. He also provided a brief overview of the following sector activities:

- Landfills contribute significant emissions among member states, despite an EU directive to reduce biomass to landfills. There has been a 39 percent reduction in emissions from landfills for the period 1990 to 2006 based on the original 50 EU members. The EU continues to work with its newer members to reduce emissions.
- Coal is not a significant source of emissions, but large quantities of funding are spent on research within the sector. The EC currently has coal projects underway in Poland, Kazakhstan, and Russia. The EC issued solicitations for additional projects but no bids were received so it is likely this solicitation will be re-issued.

Mr. Taylor concluded his statement by encouraging Partner countries to consider the EC coal solicitation when re-issued.

Subcommittee Progress Reports (Agenda Item #8)

Oil and Gas

Mr. Layer provided the [Oil and Gas Subcommittee progress report](#), after thanking Mr. Gunning for his encouraging words from the opening plenary session. Highlights included:

- Importance of getting industry involved through Project Network.
- Ongoing dialogue with Romania in hopes they join the Partnership.
- Continuing project activities in Partner countries.

Following the presentation, Mr. Layer fielded questions from the Steering Committee. Mr. Fernandez requested that a GOSAT expert make a presentation at the next meeting to explain its applicability to all sectors. Mr. Blanco asked about Mr. Layer's view of the role of government in Methane to Markets. Mr. Layer explained the perceived disconnect and lack of communication between government agencies dealing with the various sectors of the Partnership. He encouraged Partners to consider how best to engage all the agencies in an effort to leverage available resources. He indicated interconnectivity could not be understated and only now is the full potential of intra-agency cooperation being recognized in Canada, for example. He added the importance to mobilize and make links between programs. Mr. Karas asked about engagement and the lack thereof between the producers and downstream distributors within the Australian oil and gas industry. Mr. Layer said upstream producers have often pointed downstream; however, 70 percent of the emissions reduction potential exists upstream. He added that the Australian experience was not unique, particularly for the regulatory set. Mr. Fernandez offered to share the U.S. approach with Australia to help engage downstream distributors.

Coal Mining

Dr. Pamela Franklin of the U.S. EPA provided the [Coal Subcommittee progress report](#) on behalf of her Chinese and Indian co-chairs. Highlights included:

- Revising the Action Plan to focus on four key areas (i.e., legal/regulatory issues, technology/technical knowledge, site-specific feasibility studies/technology demonstrations, financing).
- Advancing projects featured at the 2007 Expo (i.e., progress at 12 of 20 projects).
- Revising the CMM global overview to include Mongolia (now up to 33 countries).
- Advancing project financing (e.g., UNECE initiative, online CMM Cash Flow Tool, CMM project financing guidance document).
- Developing a Best Practices Guide for CMM drainage and recovery.
- Emphasizing the diversity of Partner efforts through country-specific strategic plans and project updates.

In closing, Dr. Franklin announced the UNECE has offered to host the next Coal Subcommittee meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Upon conclusion, Dr. Franklin invited questions from the Steering Committee. Mr. Del Villar commented that in Mexico, only the government was allowed to use CMM to produce energy. He pointed to a landfill example that allows operators to provide electricity to end users and indicated that a new regulation might allow more recovery and use projects in the future. Mr. Dewangan asked what other countries might be considered for a CMM clearinghouse. Dr. Franklin stated that clearinghouses currently exist in China, India, and Russia, and that Ukraine might be considered. Mr. Shimada expressed to Dr. Franklin that he was still trying to identify a new funding source to replace NEDO and help finance travel to coal meetings and workshops. Dr. Franklin acknowledged his efforts and said she would welcome the return of Japan's assistance. Mr. Dewangan asked if Dr. Franklin could provide more information on regulatory issues like those faced in Australia and commented on the overlap between the coal and oil and gas sectors. Dr. Franklin said the Subcommittee was looking into these issues and would need to work with other Partners to address fully (perhaps as a future workshop session).

Agriculture

Mr. Eppel and Mr. Hilbert jointly provided the [Agriculture Subcommittee progress report](#), which included the following highlights:

- Placing emphasis on other agriculture sources (e.g., agro-food waste).
- Addressing six key, cross-cutting themes within the Action Plan (e.g., national capacity, technology, financial and economic, policy, awareness, project identification and development).
- Undertaking new projects in Partner countries.

There were no questions from the Steering Committee for the Agriculture Subcommittee.

Landfills

Mr. Blanco provided the [Landfill Subcommittee progress report](#), emphasizing its request to the Steering Committee to consider a regional meeting structure to increase the number of participants, plus improving the meaningfulness of meetings.

Ms. Ferrer commented on the workshops held in Brazil in May and June 2008, stating they are investing strongly in capacity building and training landfill managers. She added that Brazil is also preparing a GHG inventory. Mr. Dewangan expressed India's support for the regional meeting concept. Mr. Eppel said it was important to consider the number of global meetings, particularly from a climate perspective and associated emissions, and he asked Mr. Blanco to elaborate. Mr. Blanco explained while it is interesting to learn everyone's activities, it might not be practical to have all the delegates come together twice a year. Regional meetings could provide the opportunity to focus on particular topics specific to that area and/or regionally-available technology. Mr. Eppel asked if under the regional meeting model, there would only be one subcommittee meeting per year, to which Mr. Blanco responded yes. Mr. Ferland directed participants' attention to the Project Network white paper, which includes a discussion of potential regional meetings. Mr. Blanco added that the regional concept might not be applicable to all sectors.

Discussion Papers (Agenda Items #9-14)

Before turning attention to the various white papers, Mr. Gunning encouraged the delegates to think about other issues for discussion, and recommended perhaps grouping the issues as follows:

- Project Expo
 - Emphasis on Beijing success
 - Ongoing work for 2010 (e.g., technical agenda, project identification)
- Country-Specific Action Plans
 - Good progress to date
 - Encourage continued efforts
- Meeting Structure
 - Co-locating meetings to increase attendance
 - Regional meeting concept
- Focus Areas
 - Enteric fermentation
 - Rice cultivation
 - Waste water

Mr. Del Villar echoed the inclusion of waste water as new sector under areas to consider. Ms. Barbara DeRosa-Joynt from the U.S. State Department commented on the cross-cutting issue of financing barriers and the possibility of inviting more experts (e.g., The World Bank) to address project funding. Mr. Eppel

interjected that the Agriculture Subcommittee has been inviting the World Bank to its workshops, but admits that it is not always easy to get them to attend. He continued by stressing the overall engagement of national governments and the need to employ more of a top-down strategy, versus bottom-up as most often done.

Mr. Shimada indicated that under the UNFCCC, participants make Action Pledges and perhaps Methane to Markets was too focused on projects versus other or additional contributions. Ms. DeRosa-Joynt added that the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)-supported Private Financing Advisory Network (PFAN) match-making service assists entities in writing proposals and analyzing potential project for capital feasibility. Mr. Del Villar mentioned that the Latin America Development Bank has soft loans for agriculture and landfill projects. Mr. Karas commented that in relation to development banks, perhaps there might be a need to look at greater engagement of financial institutions and to start thinking about their involvement in the next Partnership Expo. He added that at the Copenhagen Convention of Parties (COP15), the delegates will be considering new financing rules.

Mr. Gunning asked if there were any other thoughts or new ideas. Hearing none, he recapped the idea to engage financial institutions and suggested that the Expo Task Force could be tasked to recruit finance entities. Mr. Eppel commented that he would rather see the Task Force chair tasked to contact high-level officials within the finance entities to get the most traction to achieve the intended results. Mr. Shimada asked whether Methane to Markets could be included in the World Bank Climate Investment Funds mechanism. Mr. Gunning said he was unsure of the process, but he didn't see why not. Mr. Gunning also explained that Methane to Markets was able to secure Asian Development Bank (ADB) sponsorship for the 2007 Expo. He added that the ASG would work with the Task Force on these efforts. Ms. Ashley King with the ASG encouraged anyone interested in participating in the Expo Task Force to contact the ASG. Mr. Eppel asked if the World Bank could be considered for Steering Committee membership (possibly as an observer) in order to feel more involved. Mr. Gunning said he would take that suggestion under advisement for further consideration and indicated that in the near term, the Steering Committee could be charged with reaching out to financial institutions and finding a robust way for them to get involved (e.g., Expo). The Subcommittees would be charged to continue outreach efforts to engage the financial entities in meetings as well as the Expo. Mr. Taylor added consideration for the national banks, especially as carbon markets and funds emerge. He also suggested a centralized and coordinated approach to the banks. Mr. Del Villar commented on the Mexican carbon fund that was put into place in 2008, and he will share the results once available. Mr. Gunning acknowledged the suggestion for a centralized approach, and indicated there was room during discussions on the future of the Partnership for including the element of engaging financial institutions.

Project Network Update (Agenda Item #9)

Mr. Ferland provided an overview of the discussion paper regarding the Project Network (see slides 3-8 of the [“Overview of Discussion Papers” presentation](#)). In particular, he emphasized the Landfill Subcommittee's concept to organize regional meetings as a way to attract more Project Network participation. Mr. Gunning commented on how Project Network outreach is important, particularly in light of Canada's recent success with engaging Romania. He then opened the discussion to comments.

Mr. Karas stated that focus should be away from recruiting new Project Network members and instead on finding ways to have better contact with existing Project Network members. He also said it would be beneficial to have Project Network members feed information and ideas to the ASG and Subcommittees rather than the existing top-down approach. Mr. Shimada agreed and also reiterated the concept of Action Pledges, which might help the Project Network members feel more ownership of [their] issues. He recommended retaining recruitment as part of the strategy but he also concurred with Australia's suggestion to reinvigorate the existing Project Network membership. He added perhaps each Partner could also be responsible for invigorating specific Project Network members within their country. Mr. Fernandez mentioned specific organized efforts that might serve to engage the Project Network, such as:

- Issuing a Call for Papers to the Project Network to identify session topics for the next Expo.
- Making it a goal for each Subcommittee to devote time to reinvigorate the Project Network.
- Creating an additional goal for providing technology transfer (i.e., speaking) opportunities at meetings and workshops.

Mr. Patokallio agreed with both Project Network recruitment and enhancement. Mr. Blanco also concurred with both concepts, but with an emphasis on increasing the effectiveness of Project Network participation. Mr. Portalupi expressed Canada's support for recruitment and engagement, and added that the Partnership cannot afford to stop outreach at such a pivotal moment (i.e., when Methane to Markets is gaining international recognition). Mr. Karas suggested adding Project Network engagement to the Subcommittee charge for country-specific action plans.

Mr. Gunning directed the participants attention to increasing Project Network participation and summarized many of the suggestions that had been raised in discussion, including:

- Adding engagement as part of the Subcommittee Action Plans.
- Creating attendance incentives such as speaking opportunities at meetings and workshops.
- Conducting regional meetings or workshops.

Mr. Blanco commented that Project Network members might have different interests for meeting agendas. Mr. Shimada referenced the difference between the APP and Methane to Markets, and the inability to attract more private sector members to Methane to Markets meetings. Ms. DeRosa-Joynt explained that the key difference is that APP Partners decide what percentage of the private sector participates in its delegation and those members have an equal voice with the government representatives. She added this might be something to think about in consideration of the new TOR. She further stated that some of the difficulty arises from trying to justify Project Network participation in the absence of a clear role in the meeting. Mr. Gunning clarified that each Methane to Markets Partner can appoint up to three representatives to each Subcommittee without regard to ratio of government to private sector participation.

Mr. Gunning asked if there were any objections to adopting the decision items related to Project Network recruitment, participation, and recognition. Hearing none, he noted they would be added to the various charges. Mr. Patokallio requested the incentive for a more robust service and technology directory, which was tasked to the ASG.

Outreach and Communication (Agenda Item #10)

Mr. Ferland reviewed the Outreach and Communication discussion paper (see slides 9-12 of the [“Overview of Discussion Papers” presentation](#)), starting with the Methane to Markets Web site. He indicated that the Web site was developed in 2005 and was in need of a redesign, making the Countries more of a focus. This would also emphasize the availability of translated materials. Regarding events, Ms. King described the COP side event coordinated by Mexico, Poland, and the United States as well as the vendor panel organized by Brazil. She added that Methane to Markets is trying to achieve negotiator status for future COP events. Mr. Ferland lastly mentioned the importance of the project tracking database and its role as a living system for Partnership success.

Mr. Gunning pointed out that most of the outreach and communications activities are ongoing and responsibility falls to the ASG. He asked if there was acceptance of the tasks as outlined and participants agreed.

Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report (Agenda Item #11)

Ms. King provided an overview of the past actions (see slides 13-16 of the [“Overview of Discussion Papers” presentation](#)), which included distribution and approval of an annotated report outline in mid-2008 as well as solicitation for participation in a Report Task Force. In lieu of the Task Force, the ASG has recommended the Subcommittees serve as the focal point for submitting activities and conducting primary reviews of the report. Ms. King explained that the ASG hopes to garner accurate and substantial input from the Subcommittees via a forthcoming template and the ASG provided a development schedule for consideration. Mr. Gunning indicated his perspective that core Partnership information typically comes from the Subcommittees given its sector versus country focus. Mr. Karas emphasized the need to provide the Subcommittees with clear guidance as to the type of information requested and Ms. King said that was the purpose of the template.

As a side note regarding other discussions that took place at the 2006 Rome Steering Committee meeting, Mr. Karas commented on the methane indicators discussed and inquired what might have come from those talks. Mr. Gunning indicated that a research paper was circulated at the 2007 Beijing Steering Committee meeting and the information was developed into a new outreach piece on [methane mitigation opportunities](#). He continued by saying that information would also be included in the forthcoming Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report.

Mr. Gunning asked the delegates if they agreed with the missives to have the Subcommittees provide information (via templates) and serve as primary reviewers of the Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report. He also requested concurrence with the proposed development schedule, with emphasis on encouraging the Subcommittees to respond in a timely fashion. Participants agreed and Mr. Gunning noted that both actions would be added to the charge to the Subcommittees.

Partnership Expo (Agenda Item #12)

Mr. Ferland gave a brief recap on the success of the first Partnership Expo held in Beijing, China on 30 October – 1 November 2007 (see slides 17-20 of the [“Overview of Discussion Papers” presentation](#)). Following the Expo, a survey was conducted among attendees and based on the positive response, the Expo Task Force recommended to the Steering Committee that a second Expo be held, which was unanimously approved. He further explained survey responses also identified India as a potential location for the next Expo. In advance of this Steering Committee meeting, the ASG traveled to India to meet with various Ministries regarding their support for conducting a second Expo in India. Mr. Ferland indicated that India is a good location given India’s active participation in the Partnership and also the project development potential across all sectors. He added that New Delhi is the center of the Indian government and consideration has been given to holding the Expo in early 2010 to allow enough time to adequately plan a meeting of that size, to coincide with moderate weather in India, and also to avoid conflict with several events that will be held in India later in the year (e.g., Commonwealth Games in October 2010). Mr. Ferland touched briefly on the marketing aspects of the Expo, such as development of a dedicated Web site and “branding” (e.g., meeting logo, brochure). He also explained that in Beijing, each Partner country was provided free booth space to highlight activities related to Methane to Markets and several countries provided in-kind services (e.g., travel assistance) to help ensure the Expo’s success. He mentioned that Subcommittee involvement was key to the last Expo (e.g., development of the sector-specific sessions) and renewed Subcommittee planning was already underway. Mr. Gunning reiterated that if anyone was interested in serving on the Expo Task Force, they should contact the ASG. He continued by saying the Task Force serves as an effective mechanism for advancing Expo planning via periodic teleconferences.

Mr. Gunning asked for consensus on the discussion items presented, particularly on the proposed location and timing. Mr. Dewangan concurred and emphasized the Expo should be scheduled no later than mid-March 2010. Mr. Taylor added the European Commission’s concurrence that New Delhi was a good location and also agreed with India’s timing suggestion. He added that the CoalTrans India meeting

would take place the first week in March 2009 and if held at the same time next year, might serve as an ideal function with which to co-locate the Expo. Mr. Shimada indicated that while India was a good location, March would be difficult for the Japanese delegation given the end of its fiscal year (ends 31 March). Mr. Gunning said based on the comments, the ASG will try to find an optimal time for the majority of the Partnership. He also indicated there might be additional roles for the Steering Committee to play (e.g., marketing) once the final location and dates are approved. He reminded delegates that the Beijing Expo provided a combination of technical and policy sessions as well as project highlights, and the Subcommittees would be charged accordingly. Mr. Shimada commented that Japan was comfortable with the charge but he questioned the preliminary agenda, pointing out that the Steering Committee cannot participate in the technical sessions and perhaps it might be advisable to reverse the order of the Steering Committees and Subcommittees. Mr. Eppel echoed Japan's comment and also suggested the sessions should not be too sectoral-focused given some of the cross-cutting issues facing all the Subcommittees (e.g., finance). Ms. DeRose-Joynt acknowledged Japan and the United Kingdom's comments but reminded delegates to recognize the need to maximize everyone's time commitments and there might not be a simple way to address or re-organize the agenda to suit everyone. Mr. Gunning stated all were excellent suggestions and the Expo Task Force would explore options over the course of the year, particularly as it relates to potential cross-cutting issues. He proposed that the Task Force continue to work together and incorporate the Steering Committee's suggestions in cooperation with the Indian delegation. Lastly, he expressed his appreciation to India for its initial support and encouraged all of the delegates to think about how they might support the Expo (e.g., in-kind services) and to contact the ASG to participate in the Expo Task Force.

Expansion of Agriculture Sources (Agenda Item #13)

Mr. Gunning explained this issue arose from the Beijing meeting and overlaps with the future Partnership direction white paper to be discussed later. Ms. King then provided an overview of the sectors proposed for inclusion: [enteric fermentation and rice cultivation](#). She emphasized that within these large agriculture sectors, there is considerable inflexibility to affect or reduce yields, and mitigating methane is a low priority compared to water quality issues and soil erosion. Ms. King explained how enteric fermentation contributes methane to the atmosphere (i.e., inefficient energy conversion of feed in ruminant livestock or "burps"). She also indicated there is an imbalance between reducing methane and the potential to increase the amount of nitrous oxide. Barriers to greater mitigation from enteric fermentation include: cost, lack of training, available technology (e.g., feed, vaccines), and cultural practices. At present, there are several organizations conducting research in this area, but relatively few demonstration projects. Ms. King indicated options for Methane to Markets engagement in enteric fermentation might include: assembling good, reliable data; encouraging CDM projects (currently none); and developing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to coincide with water quality issues.

Regarding rice cultivation, Ms. King stated that the right players are already involved in Methane to Market but acknowledged that the mitigation opportunities depend on the type of rice farming (e.g., irrigated, upland) and length of time the paddies are flooded. Methane mitigation from rice cultivation encounters similar barriers to enteric fermentation (e.g., technical capacity, costs, cultural practices). As with enteric, several international organizations are conducting research projects and mitigation assessment. Methane to Markets engagement opportunities might include assembling inventories and developing BMPs. As part of the items for Steering Committee consideration, Ms. King pointed to the recent UNFCCC Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) study and suggested that Methane to Markets attend the upcoming AWG-LCA meeting.

Upon conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Gunning opened the floor to discussion. Mr. Shimada thought it would be beneficial for someone to attend the AWG-LCA meeting on behalf of the Partnership, recognizing that they likely would not be invited to actively participate or present. He wondered what action(s) might be necessary to gain access to the meeting (e.g., observer status). Mr. Eppel thanked the ASG for its comprehensive overview and said he was glad to see the issue raised by the United Kingdom taken up by the Partnership. He emphasized the need to have a conversation with the UNFCCC and other

involved organizations to determine if there might be a role for Methane to Markets. He also acknowledged that since these sectors only involved methane mitigation and not necessarily “capture and use,” it was a departure from the Partnership’s mission and might require changes to the TOR. He recommended attending the AWG-LCA meeting to gage the potential role for Methane to Markets before embarking on further studies or proposals. He said he would be glad to serve as the Methane to Markets representative at the AWG-LCA meeting. Mr. Patokallio asked what might be the commercial aspect of enteric or rice if no markets for the methane exist (i.e., how does it serve Methane to Markets), although Finland would agree with the items as proposed. Mr. Gunning explained there are transparency and efficiency benefits associated with these mitigation opportunities and he also acknowledged that these areas were a departure from the Partnership’s core mission. Mr. Eppel addressed Finland’s comment, saying while there is no immediate market for the gas itself, the enteric and rice sectors might have market mechanisms in a carbon trading scheme. He also indicated the need for international community acceptance. Mr. Blanco thanked the ASG for its research but wondered if getting involved with other sectors – as well as different stakeholders and technologies – might diversify and dilute the Partnership’s resources too much. Regardless, he said Argentina would concur with the proposal with those concerns. Mr. Karas concurred with Japan’s previous comment about the lack of access to UNFCCC and echoed Argentina’s comment about diversity. He further indicated that agriculture issues are usually ignored in the international realm so he applauded Methane to Markets for providing that sector with a voice. Mr. Taylor added EC’s concern on the complexity of the topic. Mr. Portalupi encouraged the Partnership to keep a close eye on the potential to emit nitrogen oxide, saying it doesn’t behoove the group to reduce one GHG and increase another. Mr. Dewangan also expressed concern about the potential to release nitrous oxide. Ms. King explained that nitrous oxide generation depends on the type of technology used and the Partnership would focus on neutral technologies. Mr. Karas said enzymes in kangaroo stomach process feed more effectively than other ruminant animals and Australian scientists are trying to replicate the process.

Mr. Eppel repeated his perceived intention to simply attend the AWG-LCA workshop (i.e., not put forth a proposal or make a presentation at this time). He emphasized this should be an opportunity to get a better sense of how best to position Methane to Markets. He suggested switching the order of the discussion items (i.e., put workshop attendance first). Mr. Shimada concurred with the United Kingdom’s suggestion to gage workshop reaction and also outlined his understanding of the process by which the AWG-LCA meeting would be conducted (e.g., time allotted for presentations, negotiations). Mr. Gunning suggested rewording the proposal as to have Methane to Markets attend the AWG-LCA meeting, extend discussions among the Steering Committee, and then conduct an assessment of interest and analysis of available resources in light of the Partnership’s structure. He added that the latter point would be pertinent to moving the Partnership forward in future directions.

Future of the Partnership (Agenda Item #14)

Mr. Eppel raised the question as to when the Steering Committee might meet again to discuss the various issues. Mr. Gunning said the inquiry provided the perfect segue into the Futures white paper (see slides 22-25 of the [“Overview of Discussion Papers” presentation](#)). The expansion into other sources and other issues that test or push the limits of the existing TOR will necessitate an additional Steering Committee meeting to discuss these and other issues raised in the white paper and develop a new TOR, likely before the end of the year. Following these discussions, it will be necessary to hold a Ministerial meeting to officially adopt the new TOR. Mr. Gunning acknowledged it would be difficult to reach consensus in the limited time remaining and suggested the key element would be process. Mr. Shimada recommended against holding the Ministerial meeting in late 2009 because the ministers would be too focused on COP15. He indicated that holding the Ministerial meeting in conjunction with the Expo might work, but it depends on the latter event’s timing. He also suggested developing Steering Committee criteria (e.g., member limits, attendance requirements) as part of the new TOR. Mr. Eppel agreed with the proposal to have the Steering Committee meet again to discuss the white paper and echoed Japan’s comment to avoid year-end climate talks. Regarding the potential Ministerial meeting, he felt the best time might be 3 to 4 months after the climate talks. Mr. Dewangan interjected that the Indian delegation does not currently

have the government support for holding a Ministerial-level meeting and will have to seek approval. Mr. Gunning expressed the Steering Committee's understanding of India's position and would not pursue the issue without India's approval. Mr. Taylor emphasized the need for high-level issues to gather the Ministers. Mr. Eppel said it might depend on the level of enthusiasm for the Partnership and renewing the TOR might be significant enough to secure their participation.

Mr. Del Villar asked that waste water treatment be added to the list of options to be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting, stating the field has huge potential in several Partner countries. Mr. Blanco added Argentina's interest in exploring waste water, but expressed his concern to add any "commitments" for Partners as outlined in the existing white paper. Mr. Eppel supported Mexico and Argentina's comments on waste water, particularly in light of Chile's presentation and sees how this sector as a logical fit within the Partnership's existing mission.

Mr. Karas wondered about the new U.S. administration's support for a Partnership started under a previous administration, and warned against getting too far ahead itself. On behalf of the U.S. delegation, Mr. Gunning acknowledged Australia's comments but indicated continued optimism for administrative support for the Partnership. Mr. Gunning summarized the proposed actions as follows:

- Conduct an exploratory study on waste water exclusive of future direction.
- Continue discussion in late 2009, following a further flush of issues by the ASG (i.e., revised white paper).
 - Additional ideas from Partners would be welcomed!
- If the Partnership continues and the TOR are renewed, consider ideas for more commitment from Partners and percolate what the Partnership might do moving forward.
 - Need for high-level support if re-upped.

In closing, Mr. Gunning again encouraged the delegates to convey any thoughts to the ASG. He also indicated that a [Steering Committee report-out](#) based on the day's discussions – including the charge to Subcommittees – would be delivered in the closing plenary session the next morning. Hearing no other business or issues, Mr. Gunning adjourned the Steering Committee meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Attachment 1
Charge to Subcommittees for Year 5

Action Plans

- Continue efforts to complete country-specific action plans, including activities for further engagement of the Project Network.

Project Network

- Continue outreach efforts to recruit new Project Network members.
- Encourage stronger participation and engagement of Project Network members, particularly from the financial sector.
 - Providing greater attendance incentives (e.g., speaking opportunities).
 - Explore possibility of coordinating regional meetings.
 - Schedule meetings in conjunction with other energy- or industry-related conferences (e.g., ISWA).
- Facilitate Project Network recognition through informal venues (e.g., newsletter, Web site, Expo).

Outreach and Communications

- Work with the ASG to redesign and enhance the Web site (e.g., suggest possible input or ideas for improvement).
- Distribute outreach materials and/or make presentations at related conferences.
- Utilize the *Methane International* newsletter to highlight projects, conference, or other success stories.
- Undertake media outreach and provide link to press releases or other new items for inclusion on the Web site.
- Utilize the online project tracking system to facilitate greater information sharing on projects and activities.

Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report

- Provide information to the ASG (via template), including:
 - Project and activity description.
 - Potential or actual methane reductions.
 - Financial support (e.g., budgeted, leveraged funds).
 - Outcomes and result, including other environmental co-benefits.
 - Photos or other associated graphics.
- Serve as primary reviewers in lieu of a Report Task Force.

Next Partnership Expo

- Provide assistance in developing the sector-specific policy and technical sessions.
- Obtain updates on the projects presents at the 2007 Expo.
- Identify new projects to feature at the next Expo.

Future Meetings

- Plan to meet once more in 2009.
- Teleconference might also be necessary to facilitate planning the second Partnership Expo.

Attachment 2

Items for follow-up by Steering Committee and Partners

Project Network

- Continue and enhance outreach efforts to recruit new Project Network members and encourage stronger participation of existing Project Network members (particularly financial institutions).

Communications and Outreach

- Work with the ASG to redesign and enhance the Web site (e.g., suggest possible input or ideas for improvement).
 - Consider developing materials in native language(s) to increase dissemination of information to non-English speaking audiences.
 - Add links to the Methane to Markets Web site from appropriate government websites within Partner countries.
- Distribute outreach materials and/or make presentations at energy- or industry-related conferences (e.g., COP side events).
 - Identify events that Methane to Markets should attend (e.g., booth).
- Utilize the *Methane International* newsletter to highlight projects, conference, or other success stories.
- Secure greater press and media exposure, and provide updates to the ASG for inclusion on the Web site.
- Review, update, and/or add information to the online project tracking system.

Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report

- Encourage and support Subcommittees' efforts to follow the proposed schedule (below) and respond to requests for comments in a timely fashion.
 - Draft text ~ June 2009
 - Graphic layout ~ September 2009
 - Final report ~ December 2009

Next Partnership Expo

- Encourage early and frequent Expo marketing.
- Make requests to appropriate Ministries within Partner countries to help sponsor the next Expo by offering in-kind services or sponsorship funds.

Agriculture Sector Expansion

- Attend the UNFCCC AWG-LCA meeting to observe discussions and report back.

Future of Partnership/Ministerial Meeting

- Provide input to the ASG regarding potential new direction(s) and establish a process to discuss evolution and any potential changes to the TOR:
 - Scope (e.g., waste water, other agriculture sources).
 - Structure of activities.
 - Mechanism(s) of Partnership administration (e.g., Steering Committee memberships).
 - Consider a second Ministerial meeting.
- Initiate planning for additional Steering Committee meeting.

Attachment 3
Charge to the Administrative Support Group (ASG)

Project Network

- Create added incentives by providing a robust service and technology provider directory.
- Place greater emphasis on promoting Project Network success stories and/or activities in existing outreach venues (e.g., newsletter, Web site, Expo).

Outreach and Communications

- Redesign and enhance the Methane to Markets Web site.
- Distribute outreach materials and/or make presentations at energy- or industry-related conferences (e.g., COP side events).
- Continue to have Methane to Markets presence at major conferences (e.g. CSD, COP)

Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report

- Develop and distribute template for completion by the Subcommittee.

Next Partnership Expo

- Once location and dates are secured, develop an Expo logo (i.e., “branding”), dedicated Expo Web site, and associated marketing materials.
- Use project development successes from the Beijing Partnership Expo to help market the next Expo.

Agriculture Sector Expansion

- Depending on outcomes from AWG-LCA meetings, conduct further exploration to identify roles for Methane to Markets in enteric fermentation and rice cultivation.

Future of Partnership/Ministerial Meeting

- Develop a white paper (with input from Partners) exploring potential new direction(s) and establish a process to discuss evolution and any potential changes to the TOR:
 - Scope (e.g., waste water, other agriculture sources).
 - Structure of activities.
 - Mechanism(s) of Partnership administration (e.g., Steering Committee memberships).
 - Consider a second Ministerial meeting.



Methane to Markets

Attachment 4
Attendee List

Steering Committee Meeting
Monterrey, Mexico
27–29 January 2009

Attendees

ARGENTINA

Gabriel Blanco

Professor
Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo
Sustentable
Av. del Valle 5737
Olavarria, 7400
Argentina
+54-11-4348-8648
Fax: +54-11-4348-8407
Email: gblanco@fio.unicen.edu.ar

AUSTRALIA

John Karas

Department of Resources, Energy & Tourism
GPO Box 1564
Canberra, ACT 2601
Australia
61 2 6213 7815
Fax: 61 2 6213 7945
Email: john.karas@ret.gov.au

BRAZIL

Josilene Ferrer**

CETESB
Av. Professor Frederico Hermann Jr 345
Prédio 1, 9 Andar, Sala 905
São Paulo 05459-900
Brazil
55 11 31333563
Fax: 55 11 31334058
Email : josilenef@cetesbnet.sp.gov.br

CANADA

Frank Portalupi

Manager, Technology Partnerships
Climate Change International
Environment Canada
200 Sacré Coeur Blvd
Gatineau, QC K1A 0H3
Canada
+819-997-2375
Fax: +819-953-9333
Email: Franck.Portalupi@ec.gc.ca

Michael Layer**

Senior Program Manager
Natural Resources Canada
580 Booth Street
Ottawa Ontario K1A 0E4
Canada
1.613.943.5820
Fax: 1.613.947.1016
Email : mlayer@nrcan.gc.ca

CHILE

Sebastian Bernstein Llona**

Subgerente de Estudios
Metrogas
El Regidor 66, Piso 8 Las Condes
Santiago
Chile
Email: sbernstein@metrogas.cl

José Antonio Ruiz Fernandez**

Economista
Comisión Nacional de Energía
Alameda 1449 Edificio Santiago Downtown
II Piso 13
Santiago 83405-18
Chile
56.2.3656800
Fax: 56.2.3611118
Email: jruiz@cne.cl

CHINA

Guoquan Zhao

Project Manager
China Coal Information Institute
35 Shaoyaoju, Chaoyang District
Beijing 10029
China
+13911387907
Fax: +010-84657948
Email: guoquan_zhao@263.net

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Derek Taylor

Energy Adviser
European Commission
DM 24 6/55
Brussels, B-3080
Belgium
+ 32 2 295 3401
Fax: + 32 2 295 0061
Email: derek.taylor@ec.europa.eu

FINLAND

Pasi Patokallio*

Ambassador for Energy and Climate Change Policy
Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
Ankkurikatu 22
POB 278
Helsinki, 00023 Government
Finland
+358 9 16055501
Fax: +358 9 16055576
Email: pasi.patokallio@formin.fi

INDIA

Vivek Kumar Dewangan

Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas,
Government of India
209-B, Shastri Bhavan, DR.R.P. Road
M/O Petroleum & Natural Gas
New Delhi, Delhi 110001
India
+91-11-23387404
Fax: +91-11-23070688
Email: vk.dewangan@nic.in

Ajit Kumar Hazarika**

Director (Onshore)
ONGC
7th Floor, Jivan Bharati, 124 Indira Chowk,
Connaught Place
New Delhi, Delhi 11000-1
India
+91 11 23314552
Fax: +91 11 23725369
Email : dir_onshore@ongc.co.in

JAPAN

Kunihiko Shimada

Principal International Policy Coordinator/Principal International Negotiator
Ministry of the Environment Japan
Global Environment Bureau
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo, Tokyo 100-8975
Japan
+81-3-3581-4915
Fax: +81-3-3504-1634
Email: kunihiko_shimada@env.go.jp

MEXICO

Edgar Del Villar Alvelais

Chief of Staff of the Undersecretary of
Environmental Regulation
Secretariat of Environment and Natural
Resources – SEMARNAT
Blvd. Adolfo Ruiz Cortinez 4209
5 "A" Col. Jardines en la Montana C,
P 14210 Tlalpan, Mexico Distrito Federal
Mexico
+52-55-56280613
Fax: +52-55-56280656
Email: edgar.delvillar@semarnat.gob.mx

POLAND

Jacek Skiba

M.Sc.Eng MBA
Central Mining Institute of Katowice, Poland
Podleska 72, 43-190 Mikolow
Mikolow 43-100
Poland
+48-32-324 6603
+48-32-202 8745
Email: jskiba@gig.katowice.pl

UNITED KINGDOM

Jeremy Eppel

Deputy Director, Food and Farming Group
Defra
9 Millbank, c/o Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London, SW1P 3JR
United Kingdom
+020 7238 3117
Fax: +020 7238 3120
Email: jeremy.eppel@defra.gsi.gov.uk

USA

Barbara De Rosa-Joynt

Multilateral Initiatives Coordinator
U.S. Department of State
OES/EGC, Rm. 2480
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520
USA
+1-202-647-4511
Fax: +1-202-647-0191
Email: derosabm@state.gov

**Paul Gunning – Acting Steering
Committee Chair**

Chief, Non-CO2 Programs Branch
US Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460
USA
+1-202-343-9736
Fax: +1-202-343-2202
Email: gunning.paul@epa.gov

Roger Fernandez

Team Leader, Natural Gas STAR Program
US Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (6207-J)
Washington, DC 20460
USA
+1-202-343-9386
Fax: +1-202-343-2202
Email: fernandez.roger@epa.gov