



Methane to Markets

**Methane to Markets
Steering Committee Meeting
10 – 11 September 2009
Washington, DC**

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Summary of Key Discussion Points and Conclusions

The Sixth Session of the Methane to Markets Steering Committee met in Washington, DC on 10 – 11 September 2009 to review past accomplishments and set forth action items for the coming year. Fourteen Methane to Markets Partners were represented at the meeting, including: Australia, Canada, China, Colombia, European Commission, Finland, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Russia, United Kingdom, and the United States. Representatives from New Zealand and Norway attended as observers on the first day to hear the Partnership update and participate in the enteric fermentation discussions. A complete list of participants is presented in Attachment 1.

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

- [Outreach and Communications Efforts](#): Web site redesign, materials distribution and event participation, utilization of the *Methane International* newsletter, press/media exposure, the online project tracking system, Project Network status, Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report, and the next Partnership Expo.
- [Enteric Fermentation and Rice Cultivation](#): Sector overview and options for inclusion.
- [Wastewater](#): Sector overview and options for inclusion.
- [Future of the Partnership](#): Proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference as well as potential timing/location for a second Ministerial meeting.

During its deliberations, the Steering Committee approved the Dominican Republic's request to join the Partnership.

The following sections provide more details of the meeting discussions.

THURSDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 2009

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

Ms. Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and new Steering Committee Chair, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to Washington, DC. She explained she had been on the job for 10 weeks and this was her first Methane to Markets meeting. Based on Administrative Support Group (ASG) briefings, she possessed a strong sense of what the Partnership has been doing. Ms. McCarthy said she was excited to be involved in the new direction discussions from Day 1 and thanked the participants for building a strong foundation for the Partnership over the last 5 years. She further explained that she has more than 30 years experience in air quality, environmental, and climate changes issues, in which she is strongly and passionate involved. She discussed her experience in dealing with climate change issues at the state level and expressed her excitement to now be working on

clean energy and climate change at the federal level. She also emphasized that the new U.S. Administration is committed to clean energy and climate change, particularly as it relates to near-term changes.

Introductions (Agenda Item #2)

Ms. McCarthy thanked the Steering Committee delegates for traveling to Washington, DC and asked participants to introduce themselves since this was her first meeting. She also noted that New Zealand and Norway were in attendance as observers. A complete list of attendees is provided in Attachment 4.

Statement of Meeting Goals (Agenda Item #3)

Following delegate and Partner Country representative introductions, Ms. McCarthy noted there were several observers in the room, including attendees from New Zealand and Norway. She proceeded to review the meeting goals as what the Steering Committee should hope to accomplish during the next day and a half.

- Have an active discussion among Steering Committee members to share views and perspectives on the future of the Partnership.
- Share updates on key Partnership activities (e.g., outreach) and discuss the ASG findings on potential new sources (e.g., enteric, rice, wastewater).
- Discuss, identify, and come to consensus on possible modifications and enhancements to the Partnership (e.g., new/increased commitments, the role of Multilateral Development Banks, enhanced monitoring and reporting).
- Establish a path forward (i.e., TOR modification/renewal, ministerial meeting).

Ms. McCarthy stated she viewed this as one of the more pivotal meetings for the Partnership and encouraged robust discussion among the delegates. She also commented on how the Partnership had built up over the years and noted recent consideration of new sources and other opportunities to influence the Partnership. She referenced the white papers that were circulated in advance of the meeting (also included in the Steering Committee packets) and indicated they serve as the foundation for the meeting's discussions. She noted that these topics indicated movement in areas that might have maximum impact for the Partnership.

Adoption of the Agenda (Agenda item #4)

Ms. McCarthy directed the attendees' attention to the [agenda](#) in their packets. She outlined the items for discussion on the first full day, with additional time for discussion on the second day. She asked if there were any other issues of business for the agenda and hearing none, the agenda was adopted.

Consideration of Dominican Republic's Request to Join the Partnership (Agenda Item #5)

Ms. McCarthy indicated the ASG received a request from the Dominican Republic to join the Partnership and that a copy of the letter was provided in the Steering Committee packets. She added the Dominican Republic did not request to join the Steering Committee at this time. She asked if there was any feedback on this request and hearing no objections, she announced approval for adding the Dominican Republic as the 31st Partner.

Partnership Update (Agenda Item #6)

Mr. Henry Ferland, ASG Co-Director, provided an overview of the [outreach and communications efforts](#) that have been undertaken since the Mexico meeting. He further explained this overview did not include any Steering Committee decisions and merely served as an update, particularly as it relates to the 2010 Partnership Expo.

Web site

Mr. Ferland explained the Methane to Markets Web site has served as an important component of the Partnership's outreach efforts and encouraged all of the Partners to use it to highlight their activities. He remarked the Web site has recently been redesigned to be more efficient and allows users to translate pages into 40 languages. The new Web site also places more emphasis on the Partner countries and provides greater access to sector-specific information. He stated the Web site provides an opportunity to communicate with the world as well as advance the activities and achievements of the Partnership. Mr. Ferland lastly highlighted some of the new site's features and navigation on a screen capture.

Outreach

Mr. Ferland stated that Methane to Markets continues to have a presence at many of the global carbon- and clean energy-related venues—in addition to recent Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) events—to highlight the upcoming Expo. He indicated the ASG would be open to suggestions for future events and explained they hope to secure a side event at the United Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Methane International Newsletter

Mr. Ferland remarked the *Methane International* newsletter is now fully Web-based and will comprise more issues than the previous quarterly version. He emphasized the newsletter is an available venue for all Partners to share information and news highlights. He indicated the ASG will continue to provide a Call for Articles and encouraged Partners to contribute stories from the country perspective. He lastly stated the newsletter will be a critical outreach and publicity component for the 2010 Expo, with both pre- and post-Expo issues.

Press

Mr. Ferland explained that most of the Methane to Markets-related press releases are generated from the EPA Press Office. He noted the ASG is open to share news from all Partners and reviewed the media attention received for the 2007 Expo in Beijing, China (e.g., articles picked up by numerous Chinese outlets, additional press releases by other Partner countries). He emphasized there is a more prominent "News" link on the redesigned Web site and that the ASG will continue to seek highlights from Partners.

Project Tracking System

Mr. Ferland reviewed the status of project tracking database, indicating that more than 170 ongoing projects and project ideas have been entered to date. He explained that database access is open to all Partners and Project Network members, and that information is sortable by sector, geographic focus (i.e., Partner country, regions), project stage (e.g., idea, planned, ongoing, completed), and Expo venue (i.e., Beijing, New Delhi). As such, the ASG will enter information on the projects featured at the upcoming 2010 Expo.

Project Network Status

Mr. Ferland stated the Project Network is an important component of the Partnership given its expertise. He noted there are currently more than 900 Project Network members and indicated that discussion about increasing their participation—particularly as it relates to Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs)—will be addressed under “Future of the Partnership.” He noted that during past meetings, incentives to improve Project Network participation that have been discussed and adopted include:

- Creating success stories in the newsletter and on the Web site.
- Co-locating Subcommittee meetings with trade or industry-related conferences.
- Issuing a “Call for Presentations” to solicit Expo topics and potential Project Network speakers.

Partnership Accomplishments Report

Mr. Ferland eluded the forthcoming Partnership Accomplishments Report will be a critical communications tool and will serve a single resource to highlight the Partnership’s achievements over the first 5 years. He described the development process to date (e.g., draft text reviewed by Subcommittees and Project Network members, layout approved by Steering Committee) and noted that the draft mockup was currently out for review, with comments due by 18 September 2009. Following document approval in the coming weeks, the electronic files will be provided to the printer for production in time for the 15th UNFCCC Conference of Parties (COP15) in Copenhagen. The ASG views the Partnership Accomplishments Report as a great tool to promote the Partnership to existing Partner government officials as well as potential new Partners.

Partnership Expo

Mr. Ferland emphasized promotion of the 2010 Partnership Expo will be the most significant communications effort over the coming months. He explained that India offered to host the next Expo and four Indian ministries—Coal, Environment and Forests, New and Renewable Energy, and Petroleum and Natural Gas—have endorsed the Expo, with FICCI serving as the in-country partner. The Taj Palace Hotel has been secured for the meeting facility and three prominent corporations—Clarke Energy, India’s Oil and Natural Gas Corporation, and Coal India Limited—have become sponsors. Mr. Ferland said the ASG is also looking at ways to increase sponsorship by providing information for Partners to recruit sponsors within their own countries (e.g., flyers, clip art for trade publications). He directed participants’ attention to the Expo brochure provided in the Steering Committee packets and also reviewed the outreach to date, including the Call for Presentations, Sponsorship/Exhibitor information, and the Call for Projects. In particular, he noted the Partnership Expo would be an ideal audience for potential projects with new feasibility studies and/or assessments.

Linkage to UNFCCC

Mr. Ferland explained the ASG applied for observer organization status under the UNFCCC in February 2009 but the UNFCCC Secretariat denied the application in April 2009, citing the absence of juridical personality (e.g., non-profit status). He said the ASG is considering appealing the decision and has asked that the application be forwarded directly to the COP for consideration. Until the issue is resolved, he emphasized that the ASG cannot apply for side events, reserve booth space, display Partnership materials, or badge attendees at UNFCCC events. In recent years, the ASG has had to rely on a Partner to “sponsor” Methane to Markets and provide access to its side events.

Upon conclusion of the Partnership update, Ms. McCarthy reiterated that Partners should talk up the upcoming Expo by encouraging sponsorship, engaging the Project Network to help spread the word, and

focusing on the opportunities to tout the Partnership's growth (e.g., new Web site, accomplishments report). She then opened the floor to comments.

Ms. Sandra Herrera from Mexico's SEMARNAT asked if the Partnership would consider purchasing greenhouse gas (GHG) offsets for participant travel to meetings. She also indicated that Mexico would be holding a side event in Copenhagen and would explore opportunities for including Methane to Markets in its event.

Mr. Paul Gunning with the U.S. EPA expressed gratitude to India for hosting the next Expo and explained that the Partnership Expo Task Force helps to support and facilitate the planning (e.g., marketing, identifying session topics). He invited attendees to participate in the Task Force as a way to influence the Expo planning process. He added that the United States was looking for an appropriate pavilion at COP15 and thanked Mexico for its offer.

Mr. Eero Ailio of the European Commission (EC) inquired if the ASG had considered incentives or prizes to encourage the Project Network to become more involved. Ms. Ashley King, ASG Co-director, explained the Steering Committee had discussed the issue at previous meetings and made the decision to use informal (e.g., outreach) rather than formal recognition (e.g., "best project" awards). Mr. Ferland announced informal recognition now includes highlights on the new Web site organized by country, Project Network members, and projects.

Dr. Debapriya Dutta from the Embassy of India asked about the diversity of Project Network members (i.e., pie chart) and indicated the need for more substantial projects at the next Expo. He suggested more institutional Project Network outreach within Partner countries and commented on the need for Project Network expertise to move projects forward. Ms. McCarthy acknowledged his suggestions and said they made a good segue into the "futures" discussion. Dr. Huang Shengchu from the China Coal Information Institute (CCII) also commented on the need for more projects to be featured at the next Expo and encouraged Partners to identify and showcase potential Expo projects as posters and/or country displays. Ms. McCarthy expressed her appreciation for his comments and Mr. Ferland said the ASG will circulate a list with the number of project templates received by a certain date (e.g., matrix by country and/or sector) to help Partners identify other potential projects and encourage more submittals. Mr. Gunning commented that in addition to potential project opportunities, Partners should be encouraged to submit success stories and/or case studies describing completed projects and results.

Ms. McCarthy commented on her involvement with the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative and her attendance at COP14 in Poznan, and while it is good to talk about what can be done, it is more important to focus on what has already been done. She emphasized that the Partnership is at this stage with its on-the-ground projects so it should celebrate that fact.

Mr. Robert Grant with the British Embassy inquired about a breakdown of Web users by the various sectors and also expressed his disappointment with the UNFCCC decision. Ms. King explained the ASG usually provides sector information in the Web update, but omitted the data this time because it had only been a few months since last reported in January. She indicated that usage data will be reported at the next Steering Committee as it relates to the redesigned Web site. She added that the ASG appreciated the continued UNFCCC support from Partners.

Mr. Kunihiro Shimada with Japan's Ministry of Environment expressed disappointment with the UNFCCC decision as well and stated that Japan provided its support for the ASG's application. He has high expectations for the India Expo and anticipates more Project Network involvement than Beijing. He wondered, however, if 15 November 2009 wasn't too earlier for project template submittals and if it was the absolute deadline. Ms. King said the 15 November deadline was necessary to guarantee that high

quality, accurate posters could be generated in time for the India Expo. She further stated that templates would be accepted after the deadline, but encouraged delegates to submit on time to ensure quality. Mr. John Karas with Australia's Department of Resources, Energy & Tourism said the Web site changes were excellent, but he wondered how the Partners will be responsible for maintaining their own pages. He also asked if Partner Countries would receive free booth space at the Expo and if the Steering Committee approved the addition of new sectors, how they might be incorporated into the Expo. Mr. Ferland explained in response to the first question that it would be more of an "opportunity" rather than responsibility for Partners to provide updates to their pages. He confirmed that Partners would be offered free booth space on a first come, first serve basis. After a certain date, any space that is not spoken for will be offered to paying exhibitors. Ms. King interjected that any countries willing to pay for additional booth space will not be denied. She also added that new sector tracks might be included in the Expo technical and policy session, pending Steering Committee decisions.

Country Remarks (Agenda Item #7)

Ms. McCarthy invited participants to take five to ten minute to provide updates on Methane to Markets activities within their own countries, including any remarks on the future direction of the Partnership.

Australia

Mr. John Karas showed slide on [Australia's emissions](#) to remind attendees how methane weighs in the GHG realm, comprising approximately 20 percent of Australia's GHG emissions. He encouraged the delegates to consider solutions that include abatement opportunities, as it would go a long way toward Australia's commitment under the Kyoto Protocol to reduce GHGs by 10 percent of 2000 levels and pollutants by 50-60 percent by 2050. He continued by saying if Copenhagen discussions are successful in engaging developing countries, Australia will strive for 25 percent cut in 2000 GHG levels by 2020 and it will be a massive effort to find ways for early reductions. Australia perceives Methane to Markets as the only group addressing methane issues and making important contributions by advising further actions and promoting achievements. As countries head toward the need for bigger reductions, they will need to accelerate action by 2020; this will be a vital role for the Partnership. Mr. Karas reiterated his comments on possible new sectors and the question of abatement versus capture and use (i.e., value-added). As the need to reduce near-term emissions (i.e., "low hanging fruit") grows, the Partnership might benefit from greater options (e.g., sector expansion).

Mr. Karas also provided an overview of Australia's forthcoming emissions trading scheme, which imposes a price on carbon emissions paid primarily by the power producers. When looking at energy generated from coal (approximately 400 MW), it wasn't feasible to pass on the cost of the trading scheme so the program includes coal mine methane (CMM) as a renewable energy as well as waste gas from other sources. As such, Australia views abatement and flaring just as important in the push to reduce methane emissions, and seeks ways to address challenges on how to be a serious player and reduce emissions by 25 percent by 2020.

Canada

Mr. Duncan Stewart of the Embassy of Canada expressed appreciation to U.S. EPA for hosting the meeting and welcomed Ms. McCarthy as the new Steering Committee chair. He apologized for Mr. Franck Portalupi's absence and read from the statement Mr. Portalupi prepared. Mr. Stewart explained that Canada is pleased to be taking part in projects in China and Mexico that support collaborative or joint initiatives to address energy security in both countries. He commented these efforts help to fulfill Canada's G8 commitments for technology transfer. He also outlined Environment Canada's work (since 2007) in the oil and gas upstream fugitive emissions, thereby: reducing GHGs and pollutants, improving

efficiencies, conserving nonrenewable resources, and providing training (e.g., China Petroleum & Chemical Corporation, China National Offshore Oil Corporation). He further described Environment Canada's work with PEMEX, which includes identifying energy management opportunities and providing employee training modules.

Mr. Stewart announced that Environment Canada will be hosting a joint Methane to Markets workshop in advance of Asian-Pacific Partnership meetings in Lake Louise, Canada to showcase the role joint initiatives might play in quantifying emissions, providing economic opportunities, and preventing leaks. In closing, he stated Canada is pleased to continue its participation in the Partnership.

China

Mr. Lee Haiyan from the Embassy of the People's Republic of China provided a few comments on China's role in the Partnership and its helpfulness in meeting China's national goals for reducing emissions, conserving energy, and improving mine safety. He expressed appreciation for efforts by U.S. EPA and thanked the Partnership for its contributions in China to control and reduce emissions. He was pleased to hear people talk so positively about the success of the Beijing Expo.

Dr. Huang Shengchu provided [China's country update](#). He explained that China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs is the main organization involved in China's efforts under the Partnership. He provided an overview of China's national goal to save energy and emission reduction (i.e., 20 percent energy for per GDP unit; 20 percent pollutant emissions) by 2010—a four to five percent reduction per year—in coordination with Methane to Markets. He indicated that China is most active in the coal and landfill sectors and explained there is less involvement in the oil and gas sector because private companies have already taken actions to reduce leaks. He continued by noting the China is the largest coal producer AND user, and much attention has been paid to mine safety in recent years. He noted that China has installed 3,400 vertical wells drilled, with assistance from Australia and the United States. He provided an overview of CMM/CBM usage in China (i.e., nearly 2 billion cubic meters of household fuel, 920 MW installed power generation capacity), and the increasing move toward greater power generation.

Dr. Huang provided a review of the Jincheng coal mine project, the biggest CMM/CBM power factory in the world. The project—which will yield 120 MW CBM/CMM power generation, 820,000 m³/d total CBM/CMM liquefied production, and 5 million tons of carbon dioxide (CO₂) annual emissions reductions—received funding and assistance from the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the World Bank (WB), and the U.S. Trade and Development Agency (USTDA). He indicated there are additional projects operating in other provinces, including one where methane is being used for transportation (i.e., taxi fuel). He also outlined the number of coal mine projects that have been approved by China's National Reform and Development Commission and/or registered under CDM.

Within the landfill sector, Dr. Huang explained the volume of domestic refuse in 655 Chinese cities reached 152 million tons in 2007, and it is estimated that potential methane production urban refuse could generate 12.8 billion kWh of electricity if captured. By the end of 2008, about 30 landfill gas collection and treatment project had been constructed and put into operation. There are 19 landfill gas power generation stations with the installed capacity of more than 40 MW.

As previously mentioned, China's oil and natural gas companies have been making investments to reduce methane leaks and their activities comprise most of the emission reductions. For the agriculture sector, China is pursuing rural biogas utilization projects and stalk power generation projects. Complete details for all of China's activities can be found in Dr. Huang's presentation.

Upon conclusion, Ms. McCarthy thanked Dr. Huang for reminding participants that methane mitigation also provides an opportunity to save lives (i.e., mine safety).

Colombia

Ms. Sandra Lopez with the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development provided an overview of Colombia's activities and emphasized how substantial Methane to Markets has been toward development of methane reduction projects, particularly in the landfill sector. She indicated that Colombia supports the ASG efforts to incorporate other sectors and stressed the importance to grow and expand the Partnership's scope. Colombia also supports efforts to enhance monitoring and reporting. Colombia ranks 21st as a methane emitter, and agriculture is the largest emitting sector within the country. She also noted there was great potential within the wastewater sector using anaerobic lagoons, and there are two wastewater projects currently operating in Colombia. In closing, Ms. Lopez asked the ASG to act carefully to coordinate its efforts with other related organizations and recognizes the role the Partnership could play in a post-2012 realm.

Ms. McCarthy acknowledged Colombia's support, particularly as it relates to monitoring and reporting.

European Commission

Mr. Eero Ailio provided the [EC's update](#), starting with an overview of the EC's energy and climate change objectives (e.g., limit global warming to a maximum of 2°C above pre-industrial levels, reduce GHGs by 20 percent by 2020). He noted that the EC methane emission sources are concentrated in the Partnership's currently-targeted sectors and reviewed the activities where the EC is involved in coal and gas projects, mostly in developing countries. Mr. Ailio described the various financing instruments, including: Thematic Programme for Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources (ENRTP), the Framework Programme for Research (FWP), and Research Fund for Coal and Steel (RFCS), which served as the historic beginnings of the EU and remaining funds have now been used for clean coal efforts. He outlined the various CMM projects under these programs and commented on how they placed emphasis on gases other than CO₂. He added that given lack of awareness, the EC has not received solid proposals under its FWP and hopes that better outreach will yield increased results in the future. Under RFCS, several European projects have been initiated and one China project has been completed.

To wrap-up, he reiterated that projects are mainly located outside EC member state borders and reminded participants that the EC routinely issues Calls for Proposals. Potential future activities include joint initiatives in India, Russia and Ukraine, as well as another China project. From the Partnership perspective, the EC recognizes the need to get agriculture and landfill colleagues involved given relevance to EC goals and sector-related legislation in place. Mr. Ferland made an observation on the featured projects/proposals and encouraged the EC to use the Methane to Markets Web site as a vehicle to promote the availability of technical and financial assistance (i.e., Call for Proposals).

Finland

Mr. Erik Ulfstedt with the Ministry for Foreign Affairs thanked U.S. EPA for hosting the meeting and providing overall administrative support for the Partnership. He remarked primarily on the future of the Partnership and the TOR, indicating that Finland viewed the TOR as adequate for now and would support its extension. Finland would welcome a new subcommittee for wastewater and any new administrative models that would need to be considered. He noted that Finland would not be supportive of a financial pledge from Partners, but they would endorse close cooperation with MDBs. He commented that greater involvement from the financial institutions would improve the economic viability of projects and serves

the Partnership's purpose to advance methane capture and use. Lastly, he stated Finland full supports UNFCCC observer status for Methane to Markets.

Ms. McCarthy thanked Finland for the wealth of thought given to the questions posed by the ASG. She further noted there would be time on the second day to discuss the UNFCCC process.

India

Dr. Debapriya Dutta provided the country update and reviewed India's commitment to climate change issues under the Bali Action Plan, as well as its own national plan. He stated India views Methane to Markets as a beneficial global partnership and outlined India's activities as they relate to the CMM/CBM clearinghouse and anticipated CMM volumes, increasing from 1.5 million cubic meters per day (m³/d) in 2008 to 3.6 million m³/d in 2012. He reported on a United Nations Environment Protection demonstration project that currently yields 500 kilowatts of electricity and described an in-seam gas drainage and utilization demonstration project slated for year's end. Dr. Dutta emphasized that India needs technical support from Methane to Markets for continued project development. He further noted that India would welcome the inclusion of new target sectors, as well as enhanced monitoring and reporting and greater MDB involvement. He also reminded participants to consider the national banks within various countries. Lastly, he announced that India supports holding a Ministerial meeting during the Expo.

Italy

Mr. Francesco Presicce with the Ministry of the Environment, Land and Sea opened by stating this was a critical moment for discussions around the future of the Partnership, and he encouraged participants to think about how to build on its results in the future. He reported that Italy has experience in all of the Partnership's targeted areas: landfill gas capture and use technologies are widely used; research and feasibility studies concerning CMM, CBM, and enhanced CBM are underway; the country has technical experience in the oil and gas sector (i.e., exploration, production, storage, distribution, conversion, and utilization); and agriculture is also a prominent sector, with anaerobic digestion (AD) operated in several livestock farms and new technology options (e.g., co-digestion of agro-industrial waste and manure) being explored. He noted that Italy currently serves as the chair of the Global Bioenergy Partnership.

Mr. Presicce concentrated the remainder of his remarks on further work for the Partnership, including: enhancing private sector involvement through project expos and additional mechanisms; enhancing contacts with NGOs and the civil society; creating links with UNFCCC and other international entities for reflecting on how Methane to Markets might contribute to the negotiations; improving tracking/monitoring/reporting to recognize the Partnership's advancements, and strategizing on how to attract greater participation from African countries.

Japan

Mr. Kunihiro Shimada thanked U.S. EPA and the U.S. government for supporting the Partnership. He indicated that Japan's August elections brought about major change for the national government and he anticipates positive direction from the new Administration and continued interest in international partnerships. He outlined Japan's commitment to reduce emission by 25 percent of 1990 levels by 2020. He added that he is trying to identify colleagues and/or sector experts for the various subcommittees, while he will likely continue to support the Steering Committee. As previously mentioned, Japan recently held a private sector event that attracted more than 100 attendees, who expressed great interest in the upcoming India Expo.

Mr. Shimada reported that he hopes to invite experts to the next Partnership-wide meeting that can address the Greenhouse Gas Observation Satellite (GOSAT) applicability to other sector beyond oil and gas. He also emphasized the co-benefits of methane reduction (e.g., public/respiratory health, safety) beyond GHG reductions and clean energy potential.

Mr. Shimada expressed his extreme disappointment with the UNFCCC decision to deny Methane to Markets' application for observer status, despite the glowing recommendation he provided when interviewed by the Secretariat. He indicated Japan's support for enhanced monitoring and reporting—as well as verification models—to share with the broader climate change community. He also encouraged the Partnership to avoid scheduling events that conflict with other climate change-related meetings (e.g., COP) in order to maximize high-level officials' participation.

Mexico

Mr. Edgar Del Villar with SEMARNAT provided [Mexico's country update](#), beginning with an overview of the basic ideas behind Mexico's climate change concerns (e.g., severe drought, flooding). He indicated that Mexico has joined most international agreements in an effort to fulfill commitments under its National Development Plan, National Strategy for Climate Change, and the recent Special Programme for Climate Change (PECC), which includes a line-item about Methane to Markets. The PECC includes four years of GHG programming (i.e., 2008-2012) and targets 18 enterprises within the highest risk areas. He reviewed Mexico's goals (i.e., 50 percent reduction by 2050 with respect to 2000 levels) and outlined its reduction potential, including collaboration with Environment Canada and U.S. EPA at PEMEX facilities as well as various agriculture operations, coal mines, landfills, and wastewater treatment facilities. Mr. Del Villar commented on Mexico's views toward the future, which includes: building local capacity; developing best practices/implementation guidelines; replicating pilot projects; promoting methane as clean, local energy; integrating new areas (e.g., wastewater treatment), facilitating greater access to financing (e.g., MDBs); and promoting broader participation/projects in regional and international carbon markets.

Ms. McCarthy commented on Mexico's national action plan and how it highlights the opportunities to mitigate methane and realize co-benefits (e.g., clean/local energy).

Poland

Mr. Adam Normark with the Embassy of the Republic of Poland expressed gratitude to U.S. EPA and highlighted the Partnership's progress with its growth from 14 to 30 Partners and 100 to nearly 1,000 Project network members. He emphasized the importance to increase awareness of methane's impacts, and the need to continue outreach efforts. He echoed Finland and Japan's position as supportive of the Partnership obtaining UNFCCC observer status. He indicated that Poland was also supportive of extending the TOR and expanding the scope to include wastewater, given the country's progress to advance biogas, but stated the Partnership should remain focused on practical goals and achievable results so they would not support inclusion of enteric fermentation and rice cultivation. Poland agrees with efforts to engage the MDBs and improve the Partnership's strength by expanding cooperation to finance projects.

Ms. McCarthy acknowledge Poland's comment on raising/maintaining awareness of methane-related issues, and expressed her view that the original TOR was well-developed since many of the Partners felt comfortable to extend it.

Russia

Mr. Andrey Orekhov with the Embassy of the Russian Federation commented that his attendance at the meeting was unexpected so he did not provide an update, but he was pleased to participate in the discussions.

United Kingdom

Mr. Robert Grant stated the United Kingdom recognized the important role Methane to Markets has played to date, but stressed the need to build on its reputation. He commented the Partnership has numerous outcomes/outputs (i.e., achievements) and has been a very effective international body. To further identify and promote these efforts, the United Kingdom would support enhanced monitoring and reporting to collect and make available more data related to Partnership activities. He added that once this process is completed, he hoped the UNFCCC would recognize the contributions the Partnership has made and grant it observer status.

Mr. Grant acknowledged that the Partnership's administration was solid, but had limited activity within the research realm. He noted there are other organizations conducting research and the Partnership could do a better job of positioning itself and promoting what has been done (e.g., fact sheets, scoping papers, accomplishments reports). Regarding the issue of a Ministerial meeting, the United Kingdom would support holding the meeting in conjunction with the India Expo, noting it would be well-placed following the COP. However, he added that all Partners need to get their ministers more involved in and/or educated about the Partnership.

Ms. McCarthy thanked the United Kingdom for its comments regarding increasing Partnership viability within Partner countries and keeping the ministers engaged.

United States

Mr. Paul Gunning thanked the Partners for their attendance at this important meeting and expressed his excitement about the progress Methane to Markets has made over its first 5 years. He proceeded to deliver the [United States' update](#). Regarding increased Partner commitments, he echoed other's observations that methane issues cut across many federal agencies and acknowledged the efforts that China, the EC, and Mexico have made to coordinate efforts. He explained the United States promised \$53 million over 5 years and was pleased to announce he expects \$10 million for Fiscal Year 2010. He also noted the Project Network has been successful in leveraging these funds (upward of nearly \$300 million) toward project development.

Mr. Gunning provided an overview of the U.S. activities/accomplishments, such as advancing project development in developing countries, exporting expertise from domestic programs, and engaging in more than 150 projects around the world. He indicated these efforts would yield 60 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO₂E) cumulative reductions and he also directed participants attention to the U.S. government annual report, which highlights project successes as well as lessons learned.

Looking forward, he hoped the Partnership could build off Australia's observation that methane is an important GHG with great mitigation potential within the realm of climate change. Mr. Gunning indicated he had been working on methane reduction programs for more than 12 years and that methane's impact as a short-term climate forcer cannot be overstated. He also noted the cost-effective opportunities to mitigate methane in the near-term. He emphasized that the Partnership is well-mobilized within the global methane community and Partners now have significant opportunity to reshape and expand its influence.

Mr. Gunning reviewed the U.S. position on national action plans and noted that he sees the plans as an opportunity to transition from sector- to country-specific activities moving forward. He also viewed the plans as formal indoctrination of country efforts as sort of a blueprint or framework for action, as well as understanding emission sources and mitigation opportunities. He noted that specific policies could call out how best to addressing mitigation, including abatement and destruction (i.e., flaring). He emphasized the need to improve tracking and communication regarding what has been done, as this will help guide further support.

Regarding Partner commitments, he noted that U.S. EPA has been very vocal about its inputs and urged other countries to step up and provide the resources needed to build additional capacity and increase technical support. He indicated that provision of resources should be flexible (i.e., no centralized fund) and pointed to Canada's support in Mexico (i.e., resources could be directed and/or prioritized based on each country's needs per its action plans). He stated he would not belabor the topic of monitoring and reporting given other Partners' support and in particular, acknowledged Colombia's comments and the need to see tangible results from the Partnership's efforts. The United States encouraged robust discussion regarding consideration of new methane sources and he also recognized United Kingdom's comment on existing research efforts by organizations and finding ways to support—but not duplicate—these efforts. Again, he emphasized promoting the Partnership as results-, not research-oriented. In regards to the Project Network and greater engagement of MDBs, the United States fully supports this idea and also supports linkage to the UNFCCC, ensuring the Partnership maintains its reputation as a unique and adaptive initiative that supports incentives under the current Kyoto Protocol while remaining a separate entity.

Mr. Gunning indicated the United States would be supportive of extending the TOR until such time that it could be renewed. He acknowledged that ministerial attention is critical to the Partnership, but that the United States is open to location for the next Ministerial-level meeting.

Ms. McCarthy thanked the Partners for their statements and commented that all raised the various discussion issues outlined in the white papers, but she encouraged the participants not to feel constrained by those issues and invited them to introduce other topics for discussion.

Future of the Partnership (Agenda Item #8)

Mr. Ferland provided an overview of the [future of the Partnership](#) and as mentioned earlier, noted many of these issues were brought up in country remarks (e.g., inclusion of enteric/rice, wastewater sectors). By way of background, he reviewed the purpose of the Partnership to promote near-term methane capture and use and not to serve as a research entity. He also emphasized this meeting would determine how best to shape the revised TOR. He continued by outlining Partnership accomplishments such as developing sector-specific and country-specific actions plans, creating new tools and protocols, and hosting the world's largest gathering of the international methane community in Beijing. He did note, however, that many of the Partnership-supported projects are not currently being tracked.

Mr. Ferland addressed the areas of consideration including new and increased commitments (i.e., action plans, resources), new target methane emission sources (i.e., enteric/rice, wastewater), and enhanced monitoring and reporting, as well as the need to consider methane abatement as well as reduction. He also commented on the need for greater engagement of MDBs given their definitive funding for climate-related projects and expertise working within countries, and how best to encourage their participation (e.g., Steering Committee). Regarding the UNFCCC application, he indicated the ASG will likely not learn anything more before Copenhagen and that a decision might not be made until 2010. Lastly, he outlined the items for consideration regarding the TOR (e.g., one-year extension, development process) and the potential Ministerial meeting (i.e., timing, location).

TOR/Ministerial Meeting

Following the Futures overview, Ms. McCarthy indicated her sense from the morning's discussion that most countries support extension of the existing TOR so the best use of time might be spent focusing on other future items instead. She asked for consensus to extend the TOR for one year, during which time the evolution might be undertaken via teleconferences. Mr. Karas asked what, if any, input was required from the ministers and the ASG pointed out that the Steering Committee had the authority to extend the TOR. That said, the one-year TOR extension was approved.

Ms. McCarthy reiterated the general consensus that yes, there would need to be a ministerial-level meeting to adopt the new TOR but there was still a question of when and where. Mr. Shimada expressed concern that March 2010 (i.e., in conjunction with the India Expo) might interfere with the final UNFCCC negotiations and suggested late 2010 as a more convenient time. Dr. Dutta stated it might be best to hear discussion of all the issues first to determine what all might be needed in the new TOR, and to best gauge how much time would be necessary to develop the new document. He also reiterated India's support for holding the Ministerial meeting during the Expo. Mr. Grant referenced the difficulty in trying to speculate as to where the status of UNFCCC negotiations might be in March 2010, and wondered if picking the date now might cause the Partnership to miss an opportunity to incorporate those decisions in the scope and architecture of the new TOR. Ms. McCarthy reiterated that the decision regarding the next Ministerial needs to be made during this meeting, pending discussion outcomes.

Mr. Ferland reviewed the remaining issues before the Steering Committee: new commitments (e.g., action plans), monitoring and reporting, new sectors, MDB engagement, and UNFCCC linkage.

Action Plans

Ms. McCarthy acknowledged Mexico's thoughtful explanation of its national policy and further indicated that country-specific action plans would help identify opportunities for collaboration and investment. Mr. Grant interjected the need to make sure these proposed action plans complement existing country GHG inventories. Ms. Dina Kruger with the U.S. EPA commented the word "commitment" might be a bit strong but from a facilitative view, it is a logical next step to apply any lessons learned to the development of action plans, particularly as they relate to project implementation and how these plans might translate into actions. The EC supported the idea of action plans to help focus and organize thoughts and views the concept of a plan as a useful tool to provide a solid basis for action. Mr. Ailio also perceived the word "commitment" as problematic and suggested "strongly recommended" instead.

Colombia agreed with the implementation of action plans, but expressed concerns regarding the readiness and availability of resources (e.g., funding, personnel) for some countries to complete nation-wide plans given many do not even have sector-specific plans. Ms. Lopez did indicate, however, that Colombia is currently working on its climate change strategy. Mr. Grant added that some countries might only have the capacity to provide emissions data or breakdowns by gas, and not specific sectors.

Italy commented that while it was important to talk about country plans, especially in areas where sector-specific information already exists, in some sectors it makes more sense identifying country goals. Mr. Presicce added that although "commitment" might be perceived as a strong word, nonetheless the Partnership is voluntary and therefore it would not be an official requirement.

Mexico commented on its PECC and directed participants' attention to a graphic that showed GHG sources as the basis for the program and also illustrated how Mexico hoped to achieve 50 percent reductions by 2050, provided they receive the necessary financial and technical assistance.

Japan agreed that countries should identify what technical resources they might need in addition to external project funding. He asked for clarification that the purpose of the action plans would not only describe the current climate status within a country, but also outline the needs to facilitate change.

In response to Colombia, Ms. McCarthy interjected that the Partnership would help identify ways to assist countries without experience and/or resources to develop their action plans. She also raised the question whether the TOR should include a timeline for all countries to complete action plans with the goal of creating a level playing field for all Partners moving forward (e.g., knowing everyone's needs and/or available resources). Ms. Kruger noted there appeared to be strong support for the concept of action plans within the confines of a voluntary partnership, but emphasized the need to be flexible and recognize Partners' constraints. She added that the United States would support integrating action plans into the new TOR.

Finland was impressed by Mexico's diagram, as well as description of project action and with which Partners (e.g., Canada, United States). Mr. Ulfstedt announced, for example, that Finland is currently supporting a biogas projects that supplies fuel to 10,000 households in China's Hunan Province, yielding emissions reductions totaling 1.4 MMTCO₂E. He inquired if there was a Partnership-wide diagram like Mexico's that illustrates the whole picture. Mr. Gunning echoed the need for speaking from the same sheet of music or template, as the United States also has biogas projects in China. He noted these action plans would also serve as instruments to facilitate sharing what it happening in each country. Ms. Lopez said Colombia would support the idea of the action plans with acknowledgement and/or assistance to Partners with limited resources. The United Kingdom also commented on Mexico's diagram, and how it showed the emission sources and how to address reduction. He noted, however, that the immediate need should be to get a grip on the first part (i.e., emissions) before tackling the second (e.g., actions).

Ms. McCarthy asked the participants if action plans might include any strategic climate change plan a country has compiled, or should they be limited to methane emissions and the targeted sectors (i.e., should not address all sources/sectors). She also noted as part of the overall national plans, the need to beef up counting (i.e., tracking, reporting, verification). She tasked the ASG to look at the TOR language to determine if any changes might be needed to achieve this desired outcome. Australia inquired about available tools to help Partners assess and assemble the necessary information and if not, suggested accessing Project Network expertise to help develop these tools. Mr. Karas also noted that Australia's Department of Climate Change is supporting inventory management skills under the UNFCCC.

Ms. McCarthy tabled further discussion on action plans to allow time to discuss the other issues.

Funding

The United States indicated that a Ministerial meeting to sign the new TOR would be an optimal time for Partners to announce financial commitments. Ms. Kruger further stated that such a high-level meeting would have the necessary program development and infrastructure to support media outreach and that absence of formal communication might not yield as strong a reaction or momentum. Ms. McCarthy noted Finland's concerns regarding a centralized fund and indicated that Partners would have choices for how to invest any promised funding, as is already being done (e.g., Canada's project support in Mexico). Mr. Gunning acknowledged Colombia's concern about resources and noted that broader commitments could be either financial or technical, which are both essential to the Partnership's growth. He reiterated that efforts to date have built a strong foundation for cooperation among Partners and he viewed increased commitments as necessary for developing and implementing action plans in order to make further progress. He again stressed the need for flexibility, as it will be a country-level decision as to how to direct funding.

The EC wondered about the role of the Partnership and its ability to call for support in this area. Mr. Ailio said he understood it would be useful to focus ideas but he would be interested to learn more about the types of issues encountered and an example of where a Partner (besides the United States) has successfully secured funding. While he had no official comment at this time, he indicated that he would take the message home to Brussels while emphasizing the added value of the Partnership (e.g., collaboration, Project Network leveraging). The United Kingdom commented on the need to recognize and/or recruit financial institutions like MDBs, given that is likely where some of the project development funding might come. Mr. Grant also indicated this might be a better approach than top-down (e.g., ministers) or bottom-up (i.e., delegates).

Project Network and Engagement of MDBs

Given that segue, Ms. McCarthy stressed the importance of outreach to highlight what the Partnership is doing and encouraged Partners to take ownership of their actions. She indicated that funding is available for infrastructure work (e.g., assistance) beyond just project work (e.g., inventories). She added the need to ensure the Partnership is identifying financial institutions working with methane-related projects and bringing them into the fold (e.g., as part of the Project Network, member of the Steering Committee). She noted the importance to look for ways to marry the Steering Committee with stakeholder meetings as a way to involve MDBs and also identify other opportunities to engage them.

Ms. Kruger commented on the integration of the Project Network at the sector level and indicated that Methane to Markets does this well. She noted that ADB and WB have been active in several sector-specific projects and meetings, and have served as catalysts to move resources in ways that differ from the technology vendors. She wondered about the value of having that perspective available at the Steering Committee level, given the need to marry financing with projects versus policy. She also asked how the Partnership might build the MDB relationship into a new TOR. Ms McCarthy explained that options might include having MDBs as members of the Steering Committee, incorporating them as a stakeholder group, or encouraging greater participation in the Subcommittees. Understandably, the greatest value would come from opportunities to discuss project opportunities with potential investment partners in the room.

Regarding the best way to involve financial institutions/MDBs, the EC suggested the Steering Committee could invite them to participate as observers, but noted they might not come unless the discussions were clearly related to specific projects and/or a well-defined topic that appealed to the banks. Mr. Ailio suggested the Partnership focus its recruitment efforts through funding workshops or stakeholders meeting rather than Steering Committee participation. Japan concurred, adding that regular Steering Committee participation would not hold appeal. Mr. Shimada did, however, wonder if an occasional invite (i.e., ad-hoc) to the Steering Committee rather than strictly Subcommittees might allow MDBs to see the Partnership's "big picture." Mexico commented they frequently face situations when there are viable projects, financial constraints emerge and inhibit progress. Specifically, Mr. Del Villar wondered how best to get the banks' attention.

Australia inquired about MDB support at the Beijing Expo and for several of the projects showcased. He asked if it might be possible to follow-up with the MDB attendees to learn what they got out of the Expo and if not, what could have been done differently; specifically, what they perceive as the benefits of Methane to Markets membership. Ms. Barbara DeRosa-Joynt with the U.S. State Department interjected that for its policy group meetings, they hold a stakeholders' workshop the day before to get their perspectives. She indicated this could extend to the sector level (i.e., Subcommittees), as many of the sectors have been successful in attracting financial institutions as speakers. She also encouraged the participants to look at regional development banks.

As an aside, Ms. DeRosa-Joynt emphasized that U.S. EPA has invested approximately \$40 million in the Partnership and she encouraged other Annex I Countries to consider making financial commitments. She stated this type of support garners positive attention and creates good public relations opportunity for ministers to promise money toward global efforts. The United States is routinely asked by its Congress what other Methane to Markets Partners have contributed so she provided gentle—but firm—urging for other to consider commitments.

Going back to financial institution participation, Finland expressed its full support for involvement at the Subcommittee level, adding the requirement for well-prepared agendas and potential projects primed for development. Mr. Ulfstedt echoed the need to consider regional banks, indicating that the European Regional Development Bank (ERBD) has money available to projects in Eastern Europe. The EC inquired if the Ministerial meeting might be a good opportunity to showcase and solicit financial institution support. Australia commented on the prevalence of bilateral programs (e.g., in-kind services) in lieu of funds directly to Methane to Markets.

Given prior commitments, Ms. McCarthy turned the chair over to Ms. Kruger for the remainder of the meeting. Ms. Kruger commented on the useful discussion and noted the commonality of views, including consensus that MDBs should not be Steering Committee members but other ways to engage MDBs so participation is useful to them (e.g., topics, viable projects). She also stated that it appeared focus should remain on the work within the Subcommittees, but that it might also be appropriate to elevate awareness at the Steering Committee level (e.g., ad-hoc basis). Recognizing Australia's comment regarding MDB involvement in the Beijing Expo, she asked the ASG to describe the status for the next Expo. Ms. King explained that ADB provided travel assistance to Beijing for attendees from developing countries and looking toward India, she anticipated the same level of travel support from ADB. She also echoed sentiments that there has been good engagement at the Subcommittee level and on a project-by-project basis. Ms. King added that in conversations with MDBs on how to get methane projects covered under their programs, many have indicated the projects are sometimes too small (e.g., agriculture) if not bundled (i.e., \$5 million versus \$500 million). Mr. Gunning provided additional insight on future direction and moving toward a country focus; looking where the Partnership was four years ago and how far it has come, this might be an appropriate time to re-engage a higher-level, stakeholder group to discuss specific areas of interest.

Ms. Kruger summarized the discussion points and asked for consensus on having the ASG contact MDBs currently involved in the Project Network to learn more about their observations and experiences with the Partnership. This outreach could also include an inquiry as to the value convening a financial stakeholders group in India. She also reiterated the perception that it might not be necessary to build MDB participation on the Steering Committee into the new TOR, but Steering Committee attendance would be encouraged on an ad-hoc basis. Hearing no objections, these points were confirmed.

Monitoring and Reporting

To open the discussion, Ms. Kruger noted Australia's previous comment that not all projects and/or funding in Partner countries is attributed to Methane to Markets. She asked participants for ideas on how to build a more robust system. The United Kingdom asked the ASG to describe the existing project tracking database. Mr. Ferland explained the database contains both ongoing projects and project ideas that can be sorted by geographical area of interest (e.g., country, region) or sector. He indicated that anyone can enter information online—to date, all projects have been entered by the ASG—and he strongly encouraged the Partners to use it. Ms. King commented there is currently no language in the TOR regarding reporting and recommended adding a commitment for Partners to use the database to track projects. Mr. Gunning highlighted the U.S. experience to showcase project success stories, but indicated the story is only as good as the data behind it. He indicated it was difficult relying on the

Subcommittees to enter data so the Steering Committee should pursue a more formal system for reporting progress. He pointed to the annual U.S. government report as an example for how Partners could highlight accomplishments. Ms. DeRosa-Joynt commented on the types of reporting under various programs, from a simple one-page form to online systems that provide an assigned number to each project for cross-referencing purposes, as the Methane to Markets project tracking database does. This latter method also assists with coordination between similar or nearby projects. She said the State Department would support modifying the TOR to add language on tracking Partnership accomplishments.

The United Kingdom offered a bottom-up approach, stating it would be useful to separate the various domestic activities by sector, although Mr. Grant also wondered what type of criteria (e.g., additionality) might be applied to the data. He suggested putting the onerous on the Project Network members involved in the projects. The EC expressed unfamiliarity with the database but said it sounded logical and a good way to track projects. Mr. Ailio stated the EC would support a tracking element if it was not difficult to enter and maintain information (i.e., online access). The United Kingdom added it might be helpful to share information with the Partner countries to see who is doing what and where (i.e., a matrix analysis). Colombia indicated they are facing similar problems with CDM projects, but there are tools to help sort out these issues. Ms. Lopez suggested adding a searchable column by project needs (e.g., financial, technical).

Ms. Kruger summarized the discussion points as the Steering Committee should consider adding language to the TOR about reporting while keeping the requirements loose enough to suit each Partners' needs, and identifying existing tools to support development of a more formal reporting system. The EC expressed its support for adding language to the TOR. Finland supported reporting as long as it was not burdensome to the members. Mr. Ulfstedt said it sounds as if the current system would work well for existing projects, but that it might be difficult for potential projects that are performed in conjunction with other Partners. Australia agreed the existing approach (i.e., online system) makes sense, and was not surprised that reporting was omitted from current TOR given the voluntary nature of the Partnership. Mr. Karas also suggested that as new countries request to join, they should have already completed methane emissions inventories. If not, perhaps the Partnership could provide assistance assembling the information. He also asked for guidelines to make reporting easier.

Ms. Kruger commented that there appeared to be consensus to build reporting language into the TOR and asked the Partners to think about what level of commitment they might be willing to make (e.g., annual inputs/updates). She also touched on United Kingdom's comment about the importance to understand a country's emissions inventory and link it back to its national plan.

Enteric Fermentation and Rice Cultivation

Ms. King provided an overview on methane emissions from [enteric fermentation and rice cultivation](#) and options for inclusion in the Methane to Markets Partnership. She explained this issue arose from discussions in Beijing and as a result, the ASG developed a scoping paper that was delivered in Monterrey. She added that the purpose of this discussion was to provide an update on additional research and outcomes from a related UNFCCC workshop.

To begin, Ms. King provided an overview of the sectors. She described enteric fermentation as the largest source of agricultural methane, accounting for almost 60 percent, and that the methane is a byproduct of the digestive process of ruminant animals. She outlined the options for reducing enteric emissions including improving animal efficiency through better nutrition, feed additives and/or improved genetics and emphasized a relative decrease per unit instead of absolute decrease overall. She reviewed the various challenges associated with these sectors, including: no opportunities for methane recovery and use; methodologies are site-specific, complex, and may contain many uncertainties; proven mitigation options

might not be appropriate for implementation in many Partner countries, and the organizations/countries involved in enteric mitigation research and deployment are not currently well-engaged in the Partnership. Ms. King explained that the Livestock Emissions and Abatement Research Network (LEARN) plays a similar role as Methane to Markets has in its sectors to date, and currently serves as a clearinghouse of enteric information. Possible activities for the Partnership include disseminating information and supporting country-specific assessments, with action plans representing a useful next step. She explained that LEARN is focused on measurement methodologies, but not building inventories so this might be a role for Methane to Markets.

Turning to rice cultivation, Ms. King provided a sector overview and outlined many of the challenges similar to enteric, with the additional potential to produce nitrogen. She noted the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) has been working in this area and developed a water management regime called “alternate wetting and drying” or AWD. She explained that mitigation opportunities from rice cultivation might be more appropriate and more immediately available than enteric, but added that IRRI is less active than LEARN so there might be more opportunities for Partnership involvement (e.g., information dissemination, capacity building, training). In both arenas, Ms. King remarked there are similar pros/cons regarding how to incorporate the sector(s) into the existing Subcommittee structure (e.g., part of the existing Agriculture Subcommittee, working group within the Agriculture Subcommittee, separate subcommittee). To date, there are more/active Partners involved under the rice sector. During its meeting the previous week, the Agriculture Subcommittee expressed its concern that these sectors relate to abatement rather than the Partnership’s goals for capture and use.

Following the presentation, Mr. Terry Mickle with the New Zealand Embassy, an observer, commented that 42 countries are currently involved with LEARN, which holds periodic meetings around the world (e.g., Europe in April, Chile in August, New Zealand in November). Mr. Mickle added that LEARN is more focused on research than the Partnership’s emphasis on methane end uses. Finland commented that it sees no added value from abatement, which could also be extended to other methane sources (e.g., releases from permafrost). Italy thought it might be premature to form an entirely new Subcommittee, particularly one outside of the current Partnership’s scope. Since these sectors were obviously of issue, however, Mr. Presicce said Italy would support a task force or working group for the time being, with the potential to become a full-fledge subcommittee if there was demonstrated willingness and participation from Partners. Mr. Karas indicated that the Australia Agriculture Department is exploring enteric reductions and would be willing to engage in the group. The United Kingdom, which chairs of the Agriculture Subcommittee, views Methane to Markets as a main body or “hub” of all methane-related information so it might be prudent to pursue these sectors, although it also makes sense to recruit the major enteric stakeholders to join the Partnership first. Ms. King clarified that the right Partner countries are currently on the Agriculture Subcommittee for rice cultivation, but the wrong people (i.e., focused on AD). The Partners would need to identify the right experts to participate in whatever group was assembled. Mexico commented that although there was no current market for emissions reductions from these sources, it might not be reason enough to drop consideration of these sectors since future markets might emerge. Mr. Del Villar continued by saying if still no market in the future; there is still abatement potential so Mexico would support establishing a task force. Colombia agreed with Mexico’s support for inclusion of the sectors as a task force and would be happy to participate. Ms. Lopez stated explicitly she did not see the need for a separate subcommittee.

Ms. Kruger reiterated the view expressed by the participants as it might be too pre-mature to expand the Partnership to include these sectors, but there is obviously interest. She asked for consensus for the ASG to solicit interest among Partners as to who might be interested in participating in further discussions. She also recommended holding an Expo session during the Agriculture technical and policy track and using participation to determine future action and at what speed. After consultation on the existing TOR, it was determined that the Steering Committee has the authority to establish a new task force. The United

Kingdom reiterated previous comments regarding the perception of Methane to Markets as a methane “hub,” and encouraged the ASG to promote this concept when talking with Partners to determine what the Partnership’s role and/or actions might be. Mr. Gunning noted he foresees at least one TOR change to emphasize recovery and use: if the Partnership takes a step back to include abatement, the preference for capture and use should still be noted. The United States would also support methane destruction (e.g., flaring) when no other cost-effective option is available.

Ms. Kruger recapped the discussions in light of retaining flexible TOR language.

Before concluding for the day, Mr. Del Villar announced that Mexico is hosting the next COP so it might make sense to hold the Ministerial meeting in conjunction with one of the preparatory meetings. Ms. Kruger recognized his suggestion as a potential good alternative time and location to the next Expo in India.

Ms. Kruger adjourned the first day’s meeting at 5:00 p.m. and invited the participants to attend a networking reception hosted by the Chinese delegation and CCII.

FRIDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 2009

Ms. Kruger opened Day 2 by thanking the CCII for hosting the previous evening’s networking reception. She then indicated that discussion would pick up where they left off.

Wastewater

Ms. King provided an overview on methane emissions from [wastewater](#) and options for inclusion in the Methane to Markets Partnership. She explained this sector was raised at the Monterrey meeting in January and the ASG was tasked with develop a scoping paper. This paper focused on emissions from municipal wastewater treatment rather than agro-food waste, which is covered under the Agriculture Subcommittee, or wastewater from industrial processes such as pulp and paper. She continued by providing a sector overview, explaining wastewater represents nine percent of anthropogenic methane emissions, which makes it a bigger sector than manure management (four percent) and coal mining (six percent). Wastewater is a good fit within the Partnership since Partners represent 70 percent of the global emissions, which are expected to grow by 20 percent by 2020. She noted public health and improved water quality as co-benefits of wastewater treatment, which also contributes to Methane to Markets goals. Ms. King reviewed the mitigation options (i.e., anaerobic sludge digestion, biogas capture systems, centralized aerobic treatment facilities) and noted the various challenges (e.g., high initial capital costs, lack of local capacity, site-specific design characteristics, utility policies).

Ms. King provided an overview of the organizations involved in wastewater (e.g., Water Environment Federation, International Water Association, Global Water Partnership, Water Supply and Sanitation Council). Many of these organizations promote environmental and climate change initiatives but do not include mitigation. There are also numerous information gaps, such as raising awareness. To maximize efforts, Ms. King indicated it would be advisable to engage the water-related as well as the carbon units within financial institutions. Possible Partnership activities might include providing Partners with access to safe drinking water funds through the United Nations and MDB programs, but as with the other organizations, she noted there are no or little efforts toward methane mitigation from wastewater. She also remarked that CDM projects to date only target agro-industrial waste water and not municipal wastewater. She stated that similar committee structure options exist for wastewater as enteric and rice (i.e., working group within the Agriculture Subcommittee, separate subcommittee) and asked the Steering Committee to consider whether there was enough information to justify adding wastewater as a new sector.

Ms. Kruger thanked Ms. King for the thorough presentation and asked if there were any clarifying questions. Hearing none, she solicited reaction from the participants. Japan viewed wastewater as an important sector that would benefit the Partnership, and felt a separate subcommittee might be appropriate given the broader range of issues (beyond the Agriculture Subcommittee) as well as its impact on other sectors. Mexico considered the source as more of an urban issue (i.e., aerobic treatment) and therefore, suggested the Partnership expand the Landfill Subcommittee to include wastewater treatment under an Urban Infrastructure Subcommittee. Italy expressed support for inclusion of wastewater under the Partnership, particularly given the proposed methane “hub.” Mr. Presicce reiterated the need to involve more of the developing African countries in the Partnership, remarking that interesting emissions reduction projects are underway (e.g., North Africa). As with enteric and rice, he suggested the Partnership start with a task force or working group to see which countries and/or experts might be interested. This action might also help indicate whether this sector aligns more with Agriculture or Landfills. The United States stated it appears there is general interest in moving forward, although the current scoping paper excludes Mexico’s interests in urban aerobic projects. Mr. Gunning acknowledged the good suggestion from Italy to determine who has interest to pursue this sector by establishing a task force to conduct additional thinking/work to how the issue might play out.

Mr. Karas provided Australia’s support for inclusion of wastewater, although he declined to comment as to which was the more likely Subcommittee. As most municipal waste operations are managed by local governments in Australia, he acknowledged Mexico’s suggested fit within Landfills. He recognized, however, that agro-water issues are supported under Agriculture. Without clear definition where the sector fits, he indicated it might come back to Subcommittee expertise and suggested charging the Subcommittees to determine the most appropriate fit. The United Kingdom viewed Agriculture as the most compelling fit given its expertise and familiarity with AD technologies.

Ms. Kruger thanked participants for their insights and commented on the apparent consensus to consider wastewater as a potential new methane source. Going forward, she presented the option to establish a task force—with volunteers as chairs—to explore the interrelationships between the Agriculture and Landfills Subcommittees (i.e., whether to combine with an existing subcommittee or become a separate subcommittee) and also task the Agriculture and Landfills Subcommittees to look at how this sector might fit within their structure/expertise. She asked if there were other proposed options and hearing none, opened the floor to reaction. The United Kingdom asked, in regards to logistics, if the two subcommittees ever meet at the same time. Ms. Kruger commented occasionally at Partnership-wide events such as the Expo but not usually. Ms. King interjected that Agriculture had met in the week prior to the Steering Committee and Landfills would be meeting in the coming week. Ms. Kruger inquired if the topic of wastewater came up at the recent Agriculture Subcommittee meeting and Ms. King responded affirmatively, but only because both sectors employ AD as a primary mitigation technique. She added that she anticipated push-back from the Agriculture Subcommittee if wastewater was included in its purview. The United States proposed a hybrid option to accommodate different countries’ views and/or needs despite similar AD technologies. Moreover, the experts would likely be different people than currently on the existing subcommittees. Mr. Gunning added that creation of a task force could provide a sense of the resources/people needed to tackle the issue and help determine the best path forward. He suggested that a representative from each the Agriculture and Landfills Subcommittees participate in virtual discussions leading up to the Expo.

As proposed, Ms. Kruger asked for consensus on establishing a task force to further evaluate and report-out in India with a recommendation to incorporate into an existing subcommittee (and which one) or become a separate subcommittee. She encouraged joint representation as suggested by the United States, with teleconference facilitation by the ASG. Mexico volunteered to serve as a chair and requested that the task force have both an urban and nonurban view. The United Kingdom also volunteered to serve as a chair. Ms. Kruger accepted their self-nominations and hearing no objections, proclaimed consensus for

the new task force and invited other Partners to participate. She also tasked the ASG with raising this issue at the upcoming Landfill Subcommittee.

Finland inquired about mitigation opportunities with MDBs and whether the task force should be in contact with them to tap into existing resources and projects. Ms. Kruger responded yes to inclusion of the financial organizations.

Linkage to the UNFCCC

Ms. Kruger explained that while many of the Partners are parties of the UNFCCC, Methane to Markets is not formally linked to the Convention. She opened discussions by asking what type of role the Partnership should play in order to help Partners achieve their goals under the UNFCCC.

Mr. Gunning commented on the previous day's discussion, saying that Methane to Markets has been supportive of advancing CDM and Joint Implementation (JI) projects. He remarked that the Partnership made no connection to the UNFCCC at its launch five years ago but he now views the efforts as complementary. He indicated the Partnership should do its best to educate the UN on Methane to Markets' efforts helping all countries in meeting their UNFCCC commitments. As previously stated, though, he emphasized the unique and flexible perspective of Methane to Markets needs to be retained (i.e., exclusive of UNFCCC).

Mr. Grant of the United Kingdom suggested creating documents to layout where the Partnership fits in relation to other international bodies and outline the process as to how it addresses climate change, similar to Mexico's diagram of methane sources and mitigation opportunities.

Mr. Karas of Australia commented that it was key to the UN relationship to highlight the role Methane to Markets plays in facilitating projects to abate and mitigate methane (e.g., well-established methodology). Mr. Karas added that more needs to be done to demonstrate and document eligibility for methane projects under CDM/JI. Regarding these mechanisms under the Framework (e.g., additionality for consideration/proposed projects), he wondered what role does Methane to Markets hope to take in consultation to support achievement of its objectives.

Mr. Shimada supported Australia's recognition that most of the talk surrounds CO₂ and Methane to Markets helps to reinforce methane's needs for attention. Again, he referenced the UNFCCC interview and the Secretariat's perception that Methane to Markets was merely an extension of the U.S. government. He emphasized the request for observer status needs to be pushed by another Partner country, not the United States or Japan (since currently serving as chair). He asked that all Partners consider making comments at the COP to reinforce the case. He explained that the Parties put everything under a group (e.g., Ad-Hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action), but Japan—again, as chair—cannot make suggestions. He asked the Partners to take the message back to their ministers, particularly those from developing countries, and he strongly encouraged everyone to include Methane to Markets in their country statements.

Ms. Kruger summarized the Participants' views, starting with the need to be more explicit that Methane to Markets supports the Framework. She recognized comments from the United Kingdom to keep methane at the forefront despite CO₂'s popularity (i.e., focus on co-benefits, short life). This includes how the Partnership communicates its message (i.e., methane is important, Methane to Markets is a way forward to address climate change) and the venue (e.g., new materials). When issues arise, she expressed the participants' desire to create a more robust awareness/discussion through sharing (e.g., via new Web site). She encouraged the Partners to take up Japan's offer to incorporate Methane to Markets in the Working Group on Variable Mechanisms under Long-Term Cooperative Action. She acknowledged the request

those countries with representatives on the Group to add methane for consideration (same as HFCs and black carbon). She also reiterated comments to figure out how Methane to Markets fits within the UNFCCC mechanisms, prior to COP speculation (e.g., struggle with next steps for diplomats to negotiate). If the Partners agreed, she stated the ASG should continue to seek observer status.

On this last point, Ms. King provided a more thorough explanation of the application process, UNFCCC decision, and input received. She indicated there was open application through February 2009 and the ASG submitted all of the applicable documents, including an explanation that Methane to Markets does not have nonprofit status and the United States merely serves as host under the TOR. The documents also detailed why the Partnership was housed at the U.S. EPA (i.e., at the behest of all the Partners) and showed contributions from the United States and other Partners. The UNFCCC responded there was insufficient “juridicial” (i.e., enough differential) personality to qualify Methane to Markets as an international organization. The ASG asked the U.S. State Department to interpret the response and it was determined that the Secretariat created the distinction of “juridicial” for this instance. She indicated that despite the Secretariat’s ruling, the COP has final authority and has always approved observer status applications. Ms. King stated it is now the matter of challenging or overstepping the Secretariat’s bounds but the ASG cannot solicit for an appeal: only the Partner countries can do this. Another option is to forward the application to the COP for its direct consideration. In this case, the Partnership would need to ensure the application is put on the December agenda and that Partner countries make the necessary statements to get two-thirds approval. Until Methane to Markets achieves observer status, it cannot apply for side events (although as previously noted, the Partnership has been successful in getting around this by participating in Partner countries’ side events) nor can it procure COP booth space and provide booth staffing.

Mr. Shimada indicated that challenging the Secretariat is not a good approach but was hopeful for a better outcome if submitted directly to the COP since it has final authority. He stated that at the very beginning of the COP meetings, participants adopt the agenda and announce the acceptance of newly-granted observers. He said this might provide an opportunity to offer Methane to Markets as an observer. He added that to avoid conflict, the EPA/ASG staff should absolve their U.S. representative status and be dedicated or explicit to Methane to Markets. In a further effort not to irritate the Secretariat, he suggested asking the member countries to say something at the COP plenary (i.e., feed lines to the Partners). He held up APP as an example of an observer with only regional influence, whereas Methane to Market had a broader, global reach. This would also be the time for members to express strong support for the Partnership’s efforts. Lastly, he encouraged the U.S. representative at the umbrella meeting to share its concerns with the entire group and ask them to raise awareness of Methane to Markets’ application in advance of the COP.

Mexico inquired if the advance meetings in Bangkok or Barcelona might be appropriate places to raise the issue. Mr. Shimada responded yes and no, depending on the meeting. He said it would be appropriate at the Bureau meeting, which determines how to organize the COP/CMP, to raise the issue of Methane to Markets’ application being denied (i.e., “awkward, needs further consideration”). This might be done through the back or side door, but should not be broached during the plenary session. Colombia indicated they could raise the issue, pending consensus from the other Partners.

Ms. Kruger summarized the consensus and action items, indicating that the ASG should continue to pursue observer status but in a nonconfrontational approach (i.e., go through the appropriate channels to submit the application to the COP). She also tasked the ASG with thinking through potential message(s) to highlight the Partnership’s fit with UNFCCC and identify the best time to raise it in preparatory meetings.

Upon completion of the planned discussions, Ms. Kruger asked the ASG to recap the consensus and decisions for review and adoption.

ASG Recap

Mr. Ferland and Ms. King reviewed the [outcomes](#) from the meeting. *[NOTE: The language provided below incorporates the changes requested by Partners and reflects the final consensus. The narrative provides a summary of the actual discussion points.]*

New and Increased Commitments

- Consensus on the value of national methane action plans.
 - Plans can be blueprint for guiding coordinated action on methane reduction.
 - Developing countries might need resources to complete plans.
 - Need to connect to country climate action plans, and include appropriate linkages to national inventories.
- Take message home and discuss need for additional resources commitment for enhanced Methane to Markets initiative.
 - Communication should be both top-down (via U.S./Mexico in reference to Ministerial) as well as bottom-up.
- New TOR signing would be optimal opportunity to announce new Partnership support and resources (e.g., financial or technical).

The United Kingdom asked if Partners have to separate methane from their overall climate changes plans. India asked if action plans should include all methane-related activities or just those supported by Methane to Markets. Ms. Kruger responded that Partners have the flexibility regarding the contents of their plans as long as they include methane. Mexico pointed to its PECC, for example, which includes Methane to Markets component. The United Kingdom again requested that the plans connect back to country inventories. The EC encouraged Partners that have comprehensive plans to extract the methane portion for its Partnership action plan and in the case where plans do not exist, focus on methane emissions (as resources allow).

Project Network and the Role of Development Banks

- Recognition that the Project Network is a valuable part of the Partnership, and there needs to be more strategic MDB involvement.
- Regular participation in the Steering Committee is not the most ideal role for the MDBs, but should be included on an ad-hoc basis as appropriate.
- The ASG will collect information on how the MDBs would like to be involved in the Partnership and report back to the Steering Committee.
- The ASG will investigate holding a stakeholders meeting at India Expo.
- There is another level of financial institution (i.e., national development bank) that needs greater engagement.

Ms. Kruger commented on the second bullet, stating her understanding that MDBs should not be members on the Steering Committee. Japan clarified that consensus was they should be invited on an ad-hoc basis. The EC requested a more positive spin and asked the language to reflect they might also be involved in other ways. The United Kingdom added that while Steering Committee delegates would like their participation, the ASG was tasked with learning how the MDBs see the best fit.

Enhanced Monitoring/Reporting

- Acknowledgement of the value of enhanced monitoring and reporting to highlight Partnership activities and results.
- Consensus to add some element of reporting to the TOR.
- Agreement that reporting mechanisms should not be burdensome to Partners.

Upon review, there were no changes or comments.

New Target Methane Emission Sources: Enteric and Rice

- The ASG will solicit interest among Partners to participate in further discussions/consideration.
- Investigate opportunities to incorporate an enteric/rice session as part of the Agriculture policy/technology track at India Expo.
 - Gauge interest based on session participation.
- Evaluate new TOR language.
 - Position Methane to Markets as methane information “hub,” with an emphasis on capture and use.
 - Expand beyond capture and use to include abatement and destruction.

The clarification was made that if these sectors were adopted, the Partnership should add abatement and destruction language to the TOR.

New Target Methane Emission Sources: Wastewater

- General consensus that wastewater is an important sector but shared concerns over the need for new expertise within existing Subcommittees.
- The ASG will convene a new Task Force co-chaired by Mexico and the United Kingdom to gauge interest and explore possibilities for expansion.
- The ASG will also raise the issue at the upcoming Landfill Subcommittee meeting in Long Beach, CA.
- The Task Force will summarize its findings/results for discussion at the India Expo.

Upon review, there were no changes to the consensus/actions, but it was emphasized that Task Force discussion would be conducted virtually (i.e., via teleconference).

Linkage to the UNFCCC

- There should be language in the TOR reinforcing the link to UNFCCC process.
- Consensus on developing new outreach materials for UNFCCC highlighting the importance of methane and role of Methane to Markets.
- General consensus that it would be good to have language raised about Methane to Markets in the Ad-Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA).
 - The ASG will investigate what actions Partners might take to support inclusion.
- There was consensus on the value of observer status.
 - The ASG will investigate what actions Partners might take to support the application.

The United Kingdom reiterated its position on developing new outreach documents geared toward Ministers to educate them on Partnership activities and help leverage resources.

TOR Renewal

- The existing TOR should be extended until a revised version is put into place.
- A Ministerial Meeting should be held to sign and announce the revised TOR in conjunction to a COP-16 preparatory Ministerial meeting in Mexico.
- The ASG will develop a redlined, strike-out version for discussion at the next Steering Committee meeting, incorporating suggestions from the 6th Steering meeting.
 - The ASG will circulate the version no later than the end of January 2010.

Ms. Kruger commented that the TOR development/adoption process and timing issues would have an impact on when to hold the Ministerial meeting. She indicated the forthcoming redlined language would serve as the start of the process. She anticipated there might be additional issues that have not been raised in the meeting, but could surface as the process begins in earnest. She asked the ASG to circulate the redlined version prior to discussions. Ms. Kruger stated a virtual meeting would be held to review any major issues for further exploration. She envisioned the Steering Committee would prepare a draft TOR and the ministers would finalize the language prior to adoption.

India questioned whether a good draft could be developed virtually, noting that developing country issues might be contentious and require face-to-face negotiations. Mr. Gunning explained the original TOR was reached in much the same process: draft language was circulated in advance, to the point where the Ministers only had to meet the day prior to signing to hash out the final details. If held in conjunction with the India Expo, the final TOR language would be decided at the Steering Committee meeting in advance of the Ministerial meeting. As an alternative, delegates could use the India Steering Committee to hash out the final TOR for adoption in Mexico. The United Kingdom suggested more frequent Steering Committee meetings in light of the TOR development.

India again expressed its support to hold the Ministerial meeting in conjunction with the Expo. Ms. Kruger commented that one important element to consider when selecting a location for a ministerial is the likelihood of attendance by the ministers themselves, noting there will already be a significant number of high-level officials at the COP preparatory meetings. Mr. Karas interjected this is an election year in Australia so he could not comment on the availability of his ministers. He also questioned whether there was capacity to handle the logistics of both the Expo and a Ministerial-level meeting in India and that separate events provided an opportunity to emphasize highlights from the Expo at the Mexico meetings to make both successful. Ms. Lopez also commented that Mexico would be better timing given Colombia's elections. Mr. Presicce expressed Italy's view that it would be easier to hold the Ministerial meeting in conjunction with a pre-COP event, thereby freeing the Expo from additional burdens and keeping the focus on projects. Mr. Grant indicated it will be an election year in the United Kingdom as well and while it was an interesting proposition to hold the Ministerial in conjunction with the Expo, he felt the pre-COP meetings in Mexico were the better option.

Ms. Kruger called for any other comments and hearing none, said it appeared there was consensus for holding the Ministerial meeting in Mexico, which also allows for an in-person Steering Committee meeting in India to discuss line item changes to the TOR and other issues not raised at this meeting. The United States asked, given the proposed schedule, if it might be possible to relax the revised TOR time line while still receiving the redlined document in advance of India (e.g., end of January). Mr. Gunning also emphasized that planning for the Mexico Ministerial as well as the India Expo will require additional support. He encouraged Annex I countries to consider resource development and implementation of action plans to make all Partnership activities successful.

Australia commented that it is difficult for Steering Committee delegates to make resource requests and suggested that the United States craft a letter to the other Ministers highlighting its 5-year commitment to

the Partnership. Mr. Gunning acknowledged the suggestion and said it should be a two-pronged approach: bottom-up from the Partners and if the United States provides a letter, it will be directed toward the top. The United Kingdom agreed with Australia's position and wondered if the letter could be couched as an advance invite to Mexico. Mr. Grant added that since the Steering Committee only meets annually, there is a need for tough decisions upon those occasions. Again, he stressed the need for regular communication among the Partners and outreach materials geared toward the Ministers.

Ms. Kruger acknowledged the participants' comments on the decision to revise the TOR for signature at a Mexican Ministerial meeting. She added that the ASG will consider ways to provide more opportunities for sharing ideas among the Steering Committee in the absence of frequent meetings.

Other Business (Agenda Item #9)

As another aside, Ms. DeRosa-Joynt encouraged implementing a bottom-up approach to reporting and pointed to the lack of project information in the tracking database. She noted the need for more data to create a better body of evidence for what the Partnership is doing and has done. Ms. King reminded participants of the plan to make the Partnership Accomplishments Report available by the COP and reiterated that comments on the draft mockup are due Friday, 18 September 2009. Ms. Kruger added this will be an excellent outreach piece to highlight what the entire Partnership has done.

Dr. Dutta explained that India has been holding internal Steering Committee meetings and he also reviewed FICCI efforts to raise awareness of the Expo at its various forums (e.g., Environment, Carbon conclaves). The United States thanked India for that update. Mr. Gunning also reminded participants that if there are any items for discussion as white papers for the next Steering Committee meeting in India, please share them with the ASG.

Adjournment (Agenda Item #10)

Prior to adjournment, Ms. Kruger explained the meeting summary would be available for review in two weeks, and the presentations would be made available on the Web site. Notice of their availability would be provided to attendees as well as the entire Steering Committee and Subcommittee chairs. She thanked all of the participants for their thoughtful inputs and robust discussions. In particular, she again thanked CCII for the networking reception, India for hosting the next Expo, and Mexico and the United Kingdom for chairing the new Wastewater Task Force. She bid the participants safe travels.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Final Participant List

AUSTRALIA

John Karas

Manager, Low Emissions Coal Policy
Dept. of Resources, Energy & Tourism
Resources Division
GPO Box 9839
Canberra 2601, ACT
Tel: +61-2-6213-7815
Fax: +61-2-6213-7818
Email: John.Karas@ret.gov.au

CANADA

Duncan Stewart

Environment and Fisheries Officer
Embassy of Canada
501 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: +1-202-448-6234
Fax: +1-202-682-7792
Email: duncan.stewart@international.gc.ca

CHINA

Lee Haiyan

Embassy of the People's Republic of China
2133 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, DC

Huang Shengchu

President
China Coal Information Institute
35 Shoayaoju, Chaoyang District
Beijing 10002-9, ACT
Tel: +86-10-84657818
Fax: +86-10-846578
Email: huangsc@coalinfo.net.cn

Liu Wenge

Director
China Coal Information Institute
35 Shoayaoju, Chaoyang District
Beijing 100029, ACT
Tel: +86 10 8465 7806
Fax: +86 10 8465 7806
E-mail: liuwenge@coalinfo.net.cn

COLOMBIA

Sandra Lopez Tovar

Advisor - Climate Change Mitigation Group
Ministry of Envir, Housing and Territorial Development
Bogota
Tel: +57-1-332-3400 x 1179
Email: sandra.lopez.t@gmail.com

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Eero Ailio

Principal Administrator
European Commission
European Union
DM24 03/015
Brussels, Belgium 1049
Tel: +32 2 29 68341
Email: Eero.Ailio@ec.europa.eu

FINLAND

Erik Ulfstedt

Ambassador
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
Department for External Economic Relations
P.O. Box 428
Helsinki 00023
Tel: +358-9-160-55576
Fax: +358-9-1605-5799
Email: erik.ulfstedt@formin.fi

INDIA

Debapriya Dutta

Counselor Science and Technology
Embassy of India
2536 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20008
Tel: +1-202-939-9803
Fax: +1-202-986-2968
Email: counselorst@gmail.com;
ddutta@indiagov.org

ITALY

Francesco Presicce

Expert
Italian Ministry for the Environment and Territory
Department for Environmental Research and Development
via C. Colombo 44
Rome 00147
Tel: +39 06 57228162
Fax: +39 06 57228178
Email: presicce.francesco@minambiente.it

JAPAN

Kunihiko Shimada

Principal International Policy Coordinator/ Principal International Negotiator
Ministry of the Environment, Japan
Office of Int'l Strategy on Climate Change
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8975
Tel: +81-3-5521-8330
Fax: +81-3-3580-1382
Email: kunihiko_shimada@env.go.jp

MEXICO

Edgar Del Villar Alvelas

Chief of Staff
Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos
Naturales
Blvd Adolfo Ruiz Cortinez 4209
Col. Jardines en la Montana 14210
Tlalpan 56280600
Tel: +52 55 56-28-06-86
Fax: +52 55 56-28-06-56
Email: edgar.delvillar@semarnat.gob.mx

Sandra Denisse Herrera Flores

Undersecretary of Environmental Regulation
Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos
Naturales
Blvd. Adolfo Ruiz Cortines 4209
Col. Jardines en la Montana 14210
Tlalpan 5628060

NEW ZEALAND

Terry Meikle

New Zealand Embassy

NORWAY

Espen Myhra

Assistant Director General
Oil and Gas Department
Ministry of Petroleum and Energy
P.O. Box 8148 DEP
Oslo NO-0033
Tel: +47-22-24-62-13
Fax: +47-22-24-27-78
Email: emy@oed.dep.no

POLAND

Anna Barbarzak

Second Secretary
Embassy of the Republic of Poland
Economic Section
1503 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: +1-202-467-6690
Fax: +1-202-466-3132
Email: a.barbarzak@polemb.us

Adam Normark

Second Secretary
Embassy of the Republic of Poland
1503 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: +1-202-467-6690
Fax: +1-202-833-8343
Email: adam.normark@trade.gov.pl

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Andrey Orekhov

Science and Technology Counselor
Embassy of the Russian Federation
2650 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20007
Tel: +1-202-298-5726
Fax: +1-202-298-5735
Email: andreyor@scientist.com

UNITED KINGDOM

Robert Grant

Energy Attache
British Embassy Washington
3100 Massachusetts Avenue
Washington, DC 20008
Tel: +1-202-588-6769
Fax: +1-202-588-7901
Email: robert.grant@fco.gov.uk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Barbara De Rosa-Joynt

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

Henry Ferland

Co-Director
Methane to Markets Administrative Support Group
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., (6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-343-9330
Fax: +1-202-343-2202
Email: ferland.henry@epa.gov

Pamela Franklin

Team Leader
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-343-9476
Fax: +1-202-234-2202
Email: franklin.pamela@epa.gov

Christopher Freitas

Program Manager Natural Gas Research and
Development
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave., SW
Forrestal Building
Washington, DC 20585
Tel: +1-202-586-1657
Fax: +1-202-586-6221
Email: Christopher.freitas@hq.doe.gov

Paul Gunning

Chief, Non-CO2 Programs Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-343-9736
Fax: +1-202-343-2202
Email: gunning.paul@epa.gov

Ashley King

Co-Director
Methane to Markets Administrative Support Group
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-343-9133
Fax: +1-202-343-2202
Email: king.ashley@epa.gov

Dina Kruger

Director, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-343-9039
Fax: +1-202-343-1204
Email: kruger.dina@epa.gov

Regina McCarthy - Chair

Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460

Drew McConville

Special Assistant to the Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6101A)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-564-7437
Fax: +1-202-501-0986
Email: mcconville.drew@epa.gov

Ross Natoli

Special Assistant to the Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6101A)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-564-2768
Fax: +1-202-501-0986
Email: natoli.ross@epa.gov

Anna Phillips

Program Manager for Europe
Office of International Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1300 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (2650R)
Washington, DC 20460
Tel: +1-202-564-6419
Fax: +1-202-565-2412
Email: phillips.anna@epa.gov