

GLOBAL METHANE INITIATIVE

Ministerial Declaration Discussion and 8th Steering Committee Meeting 30 September 2010 Mexico City, Mexico

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Summary of Key Discussion Points and Conclusions

The Eighth Session of the Methane to Markets Steering Committee met in Mexico City, Mexico on 30 September 2010, following a brief discussion and adoption of the Ministerial Declaration. Thirteen Methane to Markets Partners were represented at the meeting, including: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, European Commission, Finland, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Poland, South Korea, United Kingdom, and the United States. A representative from Vietnam also participated as an observer. A complete list of participants is presented in Attachment 1.

During its deliberations, the Steering Committee approved requests from Nicaragua and Turkey to join the Partnership. The Steering Committee also approved the new Terms of Reference (TOR), heard an update on Subcommittee progress, and discussed:

- Action Plans and Reporting
- Charge to Subcommittees
- Partnership Expo Results

The following sections provide more details of the meeting discussions.

THURSDAY, 30 SEPTEMBER 2010

Ministerial Declaration Discussion

The Chair of the Steering Committee, Ms. Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator of Office of Air and Radiation in the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) opened the discussion on the Ministerial Declaration, with hope everyone was comfortable with the interim final version that had been circulated in advance. Ms. McCarthy explained the process for developing the Declaration, stating the issue emerged during the March 2010 New Delhi Steering Committee meeting. The draft Declaration was circulated for initial review and a revised version with incorporated comments circulated for a second review during an interactive Webinar. She noted from the Webinar minutes there was a thorough discussion and considerable input provided by the Partners. Comments from the Webinar were incorporated into an interim final version and distributed in advance of this meeting. Given how far and fast the Partners had achieved consensus on the document, she anticipated the final Declaration could be adopted with ease. She also explained how the Declaration presented evolution of the Methane to Markets Partnership into the Global Methane Initiative (GMI).

Ms. McCarthy indicated following circulation of the interim final version, the ASG received a question regarding proposed language on inclusion of trade and investment barriers. She acknowledged this was clearly an issue for the Partnership, but questioned if the Partnership was the right forum and/or since other barriers were clearly articulated. Mr. Jose Manual Hernandez with the European Commission (EC) explained they had raised the issue, and said they might be comfortable with simply taking out the “trade” reference since it was

implied in previous sections. Mr. Gabriel Blanco with Argentina's Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Pcia de Buenos Aires agreed with keeping the language simple and added that investment was inherent to project development. Ms. McCarthy re-emphasized the barriers described in previous sections (e.g., technology deployment and project development) and Ms. Dina Kruger with U.S. EPA provided support for incorporating parallel language from a previous section into this section. Mr. Stephen Lysagt with the British Embassy of Mexico indicated the United Kingdom would be open to suggested ways to capture "trade and investment" and echoed the dual reference.

Ms. McCarthy commented the Partnership always had a technology and project focus and felt the barriers previously mentioned adequately captured the concerns associated with trade and investment. She specifically asked if the concepts need to be called out. Mr. Lysagt said as long as the sentiment was implied, it was not necessary to be specific. Mr. Blanco agreed to keep the language simple/parallel to the first page, stating technology deployment and project development did indeed imply investment.

Ms. McCarthy indicated appreciation for the approach, stating the first page showed what had been done while the second instance emphasized what the Partnership will do in the future. She also indicated there had been little focus to date on mitigating trade and investment barriers and without ample success, justified explicit inclusion of these terms.

Mr. Edgar Del Villar with Mexico's Secretariat for Natural Resources and the Environment (SEMARNAT) proposed adding "and long" to reflect the long-term...as well as short-term...benefits that could be achieved through methane emission reductions. Mr. Fernando Tudela, Vice Minister for Planning and Environmental Policy and Principal Negotiator on Climate Change Issues in Mexico, suggested removal of methane's life time, adding the exclusion would not diminish the impact or importance of methane's presence in the atmosphere. **[EDGAR, PLEASE CONFIRM MR. TUDELA'S PRESENSE/CONTRIBUTION]** Ms. Kruger expressed the U.S.' reluctance to lose the life time reference since it helps to justify near-term reductions, particularly given methane's potency compared to carbon dioxide (CO₂). She added that the tipping point (e.g., given short life time, efforts have near-term impact) was an important issue for participants in the Arctic Council. The Mexican delegation agreed with the need to maintain the language describing methane's potency. Ms. Kruger suggested reworking the section to remove specific reference to methane life time (i.e., 12 years). Ms. McCarthy commented the new language was crisper and thanked the participants for useful discussion.

Mr. Zbigniew Kamienski with Poland's Ministry of Economy requested moving up the acronym associated with "metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent" (MTCO₂E) to the first instance and everyone agreed. Mr. Hernandez suggested replacing "carbon dioxide" in the second paragraph sentence with "other greenhouse gases" to be more encompassing. Again, the suggestion met with consensus. The ASG called attention to two consecutive sentences starting with "Methane" and suggested changing the second instance to "Reducing..." Mr. Darren Goetze with Environment Canada recommended removing the first instance to start "Methane accounts for..." Ms. Kruger inquired about the remaining bracketed text and the ASG indicated they would insert revised numbers based on the Steering Committee's outcomes (i.e., approval of new Partners).

Mr. Blanco questioned the inclusion of "support technology transfer" in the third paragraph and suggested starting a new sentence to read "Projects may also contribute to technology transfer..." To echo previous language and discussions, Ms. McCarthy recommended making it "technology deployment and project development." Mr. Goetze requested making it two sentences instead. Ms. McCarthy asked if there were any objections to the proposed revisions and hearing none, asked the ASG to make the change.

Mr. Hernandez brought attention back to exclusion of methane's short life time, saying it was difficult to express its short-term impact in the absence of the time frame. Mr. Goetze explained the clarifying sentence would remain and only the time frame would be removed. The ASG recommended combining the two revised sentence into one using "therefore" and Partners agreed. Ms. McCarthy asked if there were any further changes and hearing none, congratulated the delegates on successful adoption of the Declaration.

The Declaration session was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Steering Committee Meeting

The Chair of the Steering Committee Gina McCarthy again welcomed the delegates and thanked them in advance for their participation in the 8th session of the Steering Committee meeting. She provided an overview of the [meeting goals](#) she hoped to achieve during the session, including:

- Adoption of the revised Terms of Reference (TOR)
- Development of the Charge for the Subcommittees
- Discussions regarding action plans and reporting
- Consideration of a 3rd Partnership Expo

Most importantly, though, she stressed the importance of finishing on time so delegates could welcome and meet with their Ministerial counterparts in advance of the evening's activities.

Adoption of the Agenda

Ms. McCarthy asked if there were any changes or additions to the Steering Committee [agenda](#) provided in the participants' packets. Hearing none, she announced the agenda adopted.

Applications to Join the Partnership

Ms. McCarthy expressed excitement to see the Partnership continue to expand, explaining the ASG had recently received requests to join from Nicaragua and Turkey. She noted that when applications are received within 60 days of a Steering Committee meeting, the ASG foregoes the typical 60-day review period and allows Partners to express consensus and/or support for their immediate inclusion at the meeting. Hearing no objections to the requests, Ms. McCarthy welcomed Nicaragua and Turkey as the 37th and 38th Partners, respectively. She also noted that continued growth was a testament to the Partnership's overall success.

Terms of Reference

Ms. McCarthy acknowledged that much work had been made during previous Terms of Reference (TOR) discussions at the previous two Steering Committee meetings held in Washington, DC and New Delhi. She noted key new elements include expanding the scope to include wastewater and methane abatement, and indicated the ASG would update the TOR to reflect the name change to "Global Methane Initiative." She then opened the floor to questions or concerns from Partners regarding the TOR. None were provided so Ms. McCarthy announced the TOR would be effective for a 5-year period beginning on 1 October 2010 and thanked all of the contributors for their efforts. Canada requested that Section 6.1.1 reflect the new date and Ms. Ashley King with the ASG indicated they would switch the footnote text to accommodate the request.

Subcommittee Progress Reports

Mr. Henry Ferland and Ms. Ashley King, ASG Co-directors, provided an [overview of the Subcommittee progress reports](#) that were developed for the Steering Committee (individual progress reports for each Subcommittee are linked below). Mr. Ferland commented the Subcommittees held productive meetings in New Delhi and had made significant contributions to the Expo (e.g., project opportunity posters, session development). He also indicated that each of the Subcommittees would be holding meeting in the coming months. He continued by outlining some of the Subcommittee highlights and future activities for each sector:

- [Agriculture](#): Significant work has been done on the development of an international Anaerobic Digestion (AD) guidance, particularly as it relates to overcoming implementation barriers. The

Agriculture Subcommittee has also been developing an international database to track AD projects, with the United States leading the effort. In the future, the Subcommittee will focus on implementing the AD guidance and populating the database.

- [Coal Mines](#): The Coal Subcommittee has helped produce two important technical documents, including the UNECE *Best Practices Guide* (soon to be available in French and Russian) and the *Global Coal Mine Methane Overview*, which was updated in September 2010. The coal sector is also creating an international database to track more than 300 global coal projects, and will be working in the coming year to implement the new elements of the TOR as it pertains to coal mining (e.g., methane abatement).
- [Landfills](#): The Landfill Subcommittee has prepared several technical for trade and/or technical journals and conducted numerous workshops, primarily in Latin and South America. Part of its future efforts will include incorporating the wastewater sector into its purview and identifying top biogas “best practices.”
- [Oil & Gas](#): The Oil & Gas Subcommittee has made a concerted effort to conduct better Partner outreach while pursuing project development in various countries. In the future, this Subcommittee will evaluate its current leadership, develop country-specific action plans, and explore the linkages to methane abatement through the World Bank’s Global Gas Flaring Reduction Program.

Mr. Ferland also provided a brief overview of the activities that have taken place in the wastewater sector. He noted significant developments since the New Delhi meeting, including the decision to keep this work within the Landfill Subcommittee while the sector is more fully explored via a Waste Water Task Force. This Wastewater Task Force was created and convened its first conference call in mid-July, during which participants discussed the possibility of holding a wastewater session during co-located Agriculture and Landfill Subcommittee meetings. Following this session, the Wastewater Task Force will prepare a memo for the Steering Committee’s consideration as to its future direction.

Lastly, Mr. Ferland provided dates and locations for the upcoming Subcommittee and Task Force meetings:

- Coal: 21 October in Beijing, China
- Oil & Gas: 3 November in New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
- Agriculture, Wastewater, and Landfills: 11-12 November in Venice, Italy

Ms. McCarthy noted that three Subcommittee chairs—Dr. Pamela Franklin with U.S. EPA for Coal, Mr. Blanco from Argentina for Landfills, and Ms. Sandra Lopez from Colombia for Landfills—were present for comments and questions. Mr. Kamienski commented that one of the main coal sector issues involved the capture and utilization of ventilation air methane (VAM), given there are no good solutions since the methane concentrations in VAM are generally low. He, therefore, requested this topic be incorporated into the upcoming meeting agenda. Dr. Franklin acknowledged that VAM presents a technical challenge and that the Subcommittee has been working to promote its capture and use. She added the Coal Subcommittee has been eliciting information from Partners on successful VAM ventures, noting there were exciting developments in an Australian project that will generate 6 megawatts of power from VAM, as well as a number of mitigation oxidation projects underway in China and the United States. She also noted the United States was funding further study in Poland and that Australia was conducting studies in China. She invited Mr. Kamienski to talk with her further about his concerns. Mr. Hernandez interjected that the EC had been conducting a project in New Zealand since 2002 and would also chat offline with Dr. Franklin to provide more information to the Coal Subcommittee.

Ms. King added that the Agriculture Subcommittee’s AD guidance on performance will allow users worldwide to compare AD technologies in various regions to help determine which might be most effective and worth replicating within their climate/conditions.

Mr. Blanco commented that he was unaware of the many workshops held in the Landfill sector and assumed similar missed communications occurred within other sectors. He encouraged the ASG to explore ways for better coordination to ensure all delegates were informed about activities within their sectors. Ms. McCarthy suggested tabling the topic until the agenda’s “Other Business” portion.

Action Plans and Reporting

Ms. McCarthy stated an [Action Plans and Reporting discussion paper](#) had been provided in advance of the meeting as well as in participants' packets, and invited Ms. King to provide an overview [presentation on Action Plans and Reporting](#).

Ms. King indicated her hopes this discussion would help tee up the next phase of the new Initiative and provide ways to improve important elements needed to facilitate, grow, and share the Initiative's success (e.g., EC project in New Zealand).

Action Plans

Ms. King explained the Subcommittees were initially charged with developing sector-wide action plans. Following their completion, the Steering Committee realized that project opportunities varied among Partners and recognized the need to understand country-specific conditions. In 2007, the Steering Committee charged Partners with developing these country-specific action plans. Each Subcommittee provided templates to assist Partners with identification of critical information, but the degree and/or level of completion has been low and the results not aggressive enough to demonstrate Partner achievement. In September 2009, the Steering Committee engaged in deeper discussions regarding country-specific action plans and in March 2010, added new TOR language to reinforce the need for action plans (e.g., useful tools, better coordination). The Steering Committee also acknowledged that some Partners might require assistance in developing action plans (e.g., leverage existing resources) and suggested that Subcommittees might serve this capacity.

Ms. King indicated that next steps for action plans would include identifying Points of Contacts within each country, creating new templates to capture critical information, and supporting the development and implementation of action plans.

Reporting

Ms. King explained that in November 2005, the ASG was charged with developing an online project tracking system. To date, more than 300 ideas and ongoing projects have been entered into the database but Partner comments indicate there are more activities underway than currently reported. She explained the ASG tried to reach out and garner additional information from Partners and Project Network members during development of the *Partnership Accomplishments Report* (PAR) and in advance of the 2010 Expo with relatively little success. She emphasized the need for this critical input to help communicate the Partnership's success. In March 2010, the Steering Committee added language to the TOR requesting Partners periodically report activities and/or achievements to the ASG.

Ms. King noted that next steps for reporting included discussions on reporting frequency (e.g., annual), obtaining comments on the online project tracking system, and evaluating utility of a one-page template similar to the Asia-Pacific Partnership (APP) reporting form. In closing, she outlined the items relating to action plans and reporting for the Steering Committee's consideration and encouraged comments from Partners.

Mr. Hernandez inquired as to what the ASG hoped to achieve with Action Plans and whether these would merely describe uses for methane and/or reduction targets. He also wondered if the action plans were intended to better engage the financial community. Ms. McCarthy asked the ASG if the sector-specific action plans developed within each Subcommittee included country-specific information. Mr. Ferland said the country-specific information was limited and the expanded action plans would also help provide perspective on the resources (e.g., funding, technical assistance) available from developed countries to advance projects in developing countries. Ms. Kruger added that each Partner might have different priorities for its action plan and envisioned these plans might include information that would be useful within the country itself as well as to external project developers (e.g., level of emissions, where projects might be feasible, what policies/barriers

exist). She also noted that depending on the Partner, some level of this information may or may not currently exist (e.g., emissions inventories).

Mr. Blanco expressed concern regarding action plans, indicating that if anticipated at the national level, it might be difficult for many countries and/or sectors depending on internal organization (e.g., territorial or regional governments). He also stated the Partnership interests had historically been organized by sector (i.e., decentralized) and wondered if country-specific action plans would accomplish their perceived purpose. He suggested the ASG provide a list of what might be useful for inclusion in action plans before making any final decisions.

Mr. Goetze indicated he liked how the language was outlined in TOR Section 2.10, stating it reflected the nature of the Partnership and how Partners participate. He also noted that action plans should include information regarding ongoing international collaboration and country priorities (e.g., collaboration, cooperation, investment) and there might be a range of motivation for different Partners. He assumed the ASG was not looking at relaunching the Partnership as the GMI to serve as a driver for countries to undertake new activities, but merely have the action plans focus on what might be needed within countries and/or what countries might be able to contribute (e.g., resources).

Ms. Kruger indicated the United States struggles with the concept of a template or model when Partners approach methane project from different aspects. She worried that a template might be too prescriptive and/or overlook an important element simply because it was not included. She recommended putting together a notional list that includes the type(s) of information and/or reflects a suite of needs from which developing countries might request assistance. Mr. Kamienski agreed that each country should have the flexibility to specify what might be occurring within its boundaries and ultimately, this might serve as a good model for methane reduction activities in the absence of a more comprehensive national plan.

Ms. McCarthy acknowledged the concerns regarding country-specific versus more strategic plans (i.e., why versus how to get involved). She echoed comments that a template might be too defined and that not all Partners will have [the same] needs and/or activities in every area. She also requested additional clarity from the ASG before proceeding.

Mr. Goetze repeated the value of action plans as a means to demonstrate what might be contributed (i.e., resources) could not be understated as well as a way to identify priorities to which others might be able to provide assistance. This goes back to individual Partners' motivation, which might help shape future efforts.

Ms. Kruger again requested the ASG identify possible elements that might be encompassed in country-specific action plans, perhaps by working off the sector-specific plans developed by the Subcommittees, and present these items for Steering Committee consideration. She admitted, however, that the Subcommittee action plans might be too global to provide the desired details and also suggested looking at the action plans already submitted by Partners. Mr. Blanco reiterated that the Partnership supports activities from a sector perspective and wondered if anyone in the room was in the position to set a national methane action plan for its country.

Mr. Paul Gunning with the U.S. EPA emphasized that the action plans were not intended to set national policy, but rather help to inform other Partners and project developers where additional information and/or assistance might be useful. He viewed the action plans as mutually supportive of the Partner's methane reduction goals. He also acknowledged that some of the Subcommittees operated at that level of detail/coordination, while others did not. He added that action plans might help coordinate efforts across sectors within the same country.

Mr. Lysagt indicated the United Kingdom was supportive of action plans as a way to move from isolated to shared projects, and found the steps outlined in the discussion paper helpful. Mr. Hernandez acknowledged the discussion provided a clear explanation as to why action plans would be useful tools for identifying resources (versus developing policy) and he also saw the critical need for reporting, thereby making it easier to cross-

check activities outlined in the action plans. He agreed with the United States that a list of potential elements would be helpful.

For emphasis, Ms. McCarthy clarified the proposed action plans would be country-specific versus sector-specific, with the intent to exchange information and technical assistance. Ms. Kruger added the plans did not commit Partners to take action, but merely describe opportunities. Mr. Goetze stated the clarification was helpful, and inquired as to the locus of the final action plans (e.g., report to the Subcommittee for compilation into an aggregated sector report, while being mindful that each Partner might provide different levels of detail). Ms. Kruger agreed the work might be supported by the Subcommittees (as indicated in the revised TOR Section 2.1 and 3.4), but they have already prepared sector-specific action plans. She also recognized the need for flexibility and allowing each country to approach its action plan in the most convenient way.

Mr. Erik Ulfstedt with Finland's Ministry of Foreign Affairs re-emphasized it would be helpful to see a proposed template to know how national policy and/or laws might be impacted. He also indicated that Finland has 110 € available to support methane projects in several (but not all) Partner countries.

Mr. Hernandez returned to Ms. McCarthy's comment regarding how the action plans serve more as strategies and sees the necessity of country-level detail for determining how much each Partner might have to contribute. Ms. Sandra Lopez with Colombia's Ministry of Environment noted that while it will be difficult for some of the developing countries to assemble plans, she also sees the importance. Ms. McCarthy recapped the discussion by noting consensus that plans were good from a strategic perspective.

Again, Ms. Kruger noted it would be useful to see a framework (e.g., list of elements, proposed template) to better understand what type(s) of information might be included. The ASG indicated that the Subcommittees attempted to develop country-specific templates, but there were additional elements that might be considered. Ms. McCarthy reinforced that Partners were not making commitments within the action plans but were merely articulating ways to maximize their participation, share lesson learned, identify ongoing needs (e.g., technical assistance), and/or outline potential benefits. She added the action plans had two intended audiences: the Partner itself, and other Partners and/or Project Network members that might be able to provide assistance (e.g., markets, opportunities). She encouraged the ASG to think about the template as a series of questions that Partners might ask themselves regarding their methane reduction efforts (i.e., what's working/needed).

Mr. Blanco restated his concern that the group decided against commitments and did not see the point of action plans since it was not the way the Partnership has been working (i.e., operational). He said he would be more interested in having a list of what countries can do/bring to the table than what they plan to do. Mr. Lysagt expressed that with "action," it was important to capture what to do as well. He acknowledged that the model would not be the same for everyone and the Partnership cannot expect to get 38 copies of the same document. Ms. McCarthy viewed this as all the more reason not to create a template to force the same or similar information.

Mr. Del Villar commented it was less about the need for national greenhouse gas (GHG) guidelines versus mitigation strategies for all five sectors. He perceived the action plans as a way to capture specific activities already underway (i.e., putting it down on paper) and communicate ambitions so he supported the concept of a "framework." He indicated it was the best way to identify issues and request assistance. Mr. Ferland echoed that sentiment and saw the action plans as an opportunity to engage multi-lateral development banks (MLDBs) and demonstrate where funding was needed. Mr. Sergio Machado Rezende with Brazil's Ministro de Ciencia y Tecnologia indicated his country was close to agreement on a country-specific action plan for the Subcommittees.

In response to Mr. Goetze's question about consolidating action plans within Subcommittees, Ms. McCarthy indicated they would not be compiled. Ms. Kruger added, however, the country-specific plans would be made available to the Subcommittees as well as the Steering Committee.

Ms. King stated the ASG would develop a list of possible elements, while ensuring they would not require involve from the national governments (i.e., Subcommittee delegates would remain likely source of country-specific information). She emphasized the elements would not be too prescribed or fixed. Mr. Hernandez inquired if the action plans would be made available to the public and Ms. King indicated that yes, they would continue to be posted to the Web site.

Mr. Goetze reiterated the discussion had been helpful to understanding the true intent of the action plans and suggested adding language to express what Partners were expected to do (e.g., “strongly encouraged,” non-committal) and the level of detail would be left to each Partner’s consideration. Mr. Hernandez echoed the use of “strongly encouraged.” Ms. McCarthy commented on the need for Partners to commit to developing action plans, despite voluntary nature of the Partnership, based on the expectation to advance opportunities. Ms. Kruger indicated that commitment language was already included in the adopted TOR, and also raised the issue of “reasonable time frame.” She suggested an 18-month period in hopes to premier the action plans at the anticipated 2012 Expo. Mr. Kamienski stated the process should not be annual and recommended every two years, indicating that an annual process might be too short to show achievement. Mr. Hernandez suggested before discussing reporting frequency, it would be important to know what was being reported (e.g., action plans, projects). Mr. Ferland interjected that funding is often available from Partners but within limited time frames (e.g., 60-day deadlines) so every two years might be too late.

Mr. Goetze commented that reporting should be in a centralized location and Partners should be encouraged to report when projects are completed or considered successful rather than waiting for a reporting “season.”

Ms. McCarthy indicated the group could decide later on how often to report, but should agree to be more forceful on the need to report on projects. Mr. Blanco commented on the need to engage the Project Network in reporting as well and Ms. McCarthy stated the Steering Committee could charge the ASG to explore. Ms. Kruger agreed with Argentina but asked the participants to keep in mind regarding ongoing reporting but more importantly upon request, particularly in advance of an Expo and/or accomplishments report. She suggested having results from action plans reported every two years and projects reported on an ongoing basis. Ms. Nicole Thomas with Australia’s Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism echoed the need to have projects reported more often or as needed, whereas action plans could be periodic.

Ms. King commented on mechanisms for facilitating the exchange on activities, noting that on the redesigned Web site, every Partner has the opportunity to post information but the country pages are not being utilized. Mr. Blanco said Landfill members would prefer to provide updates at Subcommittee meetings rather than in an exclusive time frame (e.g., “additional homework”). Ms. McCarthy asked if there might be Points of Contacts (POCs) from which updates could be extracted. Ms. King explained that most of the current reporting was provided at the Subcommittee level, with Administrative Liaisons utilized in different ways within the Partner countries (e.g., coordination across all sectors). She noted that perhaps there might be too much reliance on the Subcommittees, and Partners might have assumed someone else is providing information. Ms. Thomas asked if a more frequent reminder could be sent to Partners requesting updates. Mr. Hernandez asked who benefits and/or has access to the information on the Web site and noted the process should not be time-intensive. Ms. McCarthy commented that everyone currently has access to the online tracking system but also expressed concerns regarding quality control, particularly as it relates to Project Network members and project costs. Mr. Ulfstedt inquired about anticipated reporting details and wondered if the existing Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development process might be an appropriate source for obtaining project information. Mr. Goetze added that the APP process was also easy, consistent (i.e., who, where, how much), and accessible. Ms. McCarthy asked for comments on the existing online tracking system, but it was apparent that many Partners were not familiar with the database. Mr. Ferland explained the ASG had entered most of the existing data (e.g., projects associated with U.S. EPA grants and/or Expos).

Ms. McCarthy reiterated the discussion points as follows:

- Partners will be charged with developing strategic Action Plans.

- To facilitate the information gathering, the ASG will compile a list of potential elements that could be included.
- The Steering Committee will initiate another discussion at its next meeting.
- At that time, potential time frames will be proposed.

She then asked participants if they agreed with the process. Hearing no objections, she reiterated that general consensus revealed that country-specific action plans were good. Regarding reporting, Ms. McCarthy noted this effort was critical to communicating available opportunities and readily capturing results.

Charge to Subcommittees

Ms. McCarthy opened by noting new TOR directions helped to operationalize many Subcommittee activities (e.g., leadership review, methane abatement, inclusion of wastewater) that were discussed in New Delhi. She also recognized the Subcommittees' strong development over the last 6 years and hoped Chairs would view the new directions as flexible guidance to continue sector evolution over time.

Ms. King stated a [Charge to Subcommittee discussion paper](#) had been provided in advance of the meeting as well as in participants' packets, and then delivered the [Charge to Subcommittee presentation](#). Regarding Subcommittee leadership, she explained the Steering Committee had modified the TOR to allow up to three co-chairs per Subcommittee and encouraged leadership review every 3 years. She noted that several Subcommittees had added new co-chairs in New Delhi and others would be undertaking leadership review during their upcoming meetings. She indicated the review could be accomplished via a slate of candidates and/or individual nominations to fill vacancies.

Ms. King explained the Steering Committee had also expanded the Partnership's scope beyond recovery and use activities to include abatement and the Subcommittees should think about how to incorporate abatement opportunities and approaches (e.g., sub-sectors). She added that abatement should also be incorporated into the Subcommittees' sector-specific action plans.

On inclusion of wastewater, Ms. King indicated there had been significant attention in recent years (e.g., scoping paper, Washington and New Delhi discussions) that led the Steering Committee to add this new focal area. As previously reported, she re-iterated the a Wastewater Task Force had been convened via conference call, during which the participants agreed to hold a wastewater meeting in Venice, Italy (in conjunction with the Landfill and Agriculture Subcommittees). Following this meeting, the Task Force would provide the Steering Committee with recommendations for the sector's future direction. She noted that Partners and Subcommittee delegates were encouraged to consider participation on the Wastewater Task Force.

Ms. King turned to the items of consideration (e.g., leadership review, abatement, inclusion of wastewater) and the delegates agreed the Subcommittees should be charged with the activities. Ms. McCarthy commented it was great to learn there would be opportunities to raise and review the leadership issue. Mr. Blanco indicated the Landfill Subcommittee had begun discussion in New Delhi and would be making decisions at its November meeting. Dr. Franklin stated the Coal Subcommittee had elevated China to the position of co-chair in New Delhi and its leadership was stable, but it was good to keep leadership open to future dialogue.

Mr. Hernandez asked for clarification on the difference between Subcommittee and national action plans. Ms. King explained the Subcommittee action plans were sector-based, whereas the proposed national action plans would be country-specific. Mr. Hernandez asked if it might be more appropriate to think of the Subcommittee action plans as "work plans" and Mr. Blanco confirmed. Ms. Sandra Herrera with SEMARNAT asked which countries were participating on the Wastewater Task Force. Ms. King provided the list of existing members (i.e., Argentina, Australia, Colombia, Finland, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, United Kingdom, and United States) and stated she also viewed the upcoming meeting as an opportunity for more countries to become involved.

Partnership Expo

Mr. Ferland explained a [Partnership Expo discussion paper](#) had been provided in advance of the meeting as well as in participants' packets and presented an [overview on the Partnership Expo](#), starting with background on the previous two Expos held in Beijing, China (2007) and New Delhi, India (2010). He indicated the primary purpose of the Expos was project-focused and both had served as the premier event(s) for methane mitigation opportunities. He continued by noting both Expos received positive input in post-event surveys of attendees and explained for the second Expo, the Expo Task Force had employed "lessons learned" and/or recommendations from the first event that included site tours, early outreach, and topic abstracts. He added that a third Expo would greatly benefit from the numerous mechanisms (e.g., Web site, poster templates) that were developed for the previous events. He closed by saying the main issues associated with holding a third Expo included where (e.g., location) and when (i.e., timing).

Mr. Ferland reviewed the items for the Steering Committee's consideration. On the first item of whether to hold another Expo, the delegates agreed. Mr. Lysagt encouraged the Partners to think about how to better engage the Project Network in the next Expo. Mr. Del Villar requested there be a more concerted effort to include researchers in the process and Mr. Blanco echoed the comment.

Mr. Ferland asked if there was a particular region that should be considered. Hearing none, he indicated the ASG would explore further and provide recommendations to the Steering Committee. Ms. McCarthy inquired as to the timing for the next Expo, to which Mr. Ferland responded mid- to late 2012. In response, Ms. McCarthy commented that if a date of late 2012 were considered for the next Expo, than late 2011 might be a preferred deadline for preparation of draft country-specific action plans.

Mr. Ferland asked if the current framework (e.g., Task Force, project highlights, call for abstracts, site tours) for developing and promoting the Expo should be employed for the next event. The delegates concurred, and Mr. Kamienski added that additional attempts should be made to ensure project highlights include multi-national collaborations among Partners. In closing, Ms. McCarthy encouraged Partners that might be interested in hosting the Expo to contact the ASG.

Next Meeting

Ms. McCarthy explained the Steering Committee would likely meet again in mid-to late 2011 and asked for volunteers. She added that the last three of four Steering Committee meetings had been held in North America so she encouraged delegates to think of other locations. Ms. Kruger asked if the next meeting would involve only the Steering Committee or be Partnership-wide (i.e., include Subcommittees). Ms. King explained the Subcommittees meet approximately every six months and the next meetings following the October/November meetings would likely be held in May or June 2011 so the timing for the next Steering Committee might be too soon to hold a Partnership-wide meeting. She noted the Steering Committee should try for September or October 2011 versus any later in the year. Mr. Ferland confirmed that the ASG does most of the logistics for the Steering Committee so the meeting(s) so it would not be resource-intensive for the Host Partner. Ms. King also raised the opportunity to host a Webinar mid-year to discuss Action Plans and the Expo in advance of the next Steering Committee meeting.

Other Business

Ms. Herrera spoke regarding the upcoming COP events, noting that Secretary Elvira met with Mexico's climate group to discuss if Methane to Markets be part of a Mexican side event or if the Partnership might be featured in one of the trade pavilions. Mr. Del Villar indicated the side event would follow the same format as past COPs (i.e., speeches, presentations). Ms. Herrera added that if the Partnership exhibited in the trade pavilion, everyone would have access (versus if within the official area, only accessible to the delegates) so it might provide more opportunity to reach Project Network members versus potential Partner countries. Ms. McCarthy posed the question to the delegates whether they would prefer to exhibit in the trade pavilion or the official area. Mr.

Lysagt agreed with Mexico that the Partnership could have broader impact (i.e., access) in the trade pavilion. Mr. Machado asked if space was available in the climate change or green solutions pavilion. Ms. King suggested hosting two side events—in both the official area and one of the trade pavilions—since there are separate message for Partners and Project Network members. Mr. Blanco interjected it should be one consistent message: supporting work under the UNFCCC. Ms. Barbara DeRosa-Joynt with the U.S. State Department suggested focusing efforts on the trade pavilion since the official delegates have little to no time for side events so the Partnership would get the biggest return by targeting only the private sector. Mr. Goetze confirmed the sentiment that delegates are time-limited given his past negotiator experience. Ms. Herrera said she would ask which pavilion had space available and inform the ASG.

Ms. McCarthy inquired if it might be okay to invite outstanding countries to participate given the Partnership's relaunch as GMI and the Partners agreed. Ms. King announced opportunities to have Partners provide interns for the U.S. EPA, given the mutual learning experience for both EPA and the Partner's intern.

Mr. Hernandez asked what the Subcommittees have been doing and what more could be done to engage the Project Network. Mr. Blanco acknowledged it has been challenging and also varies by sector. He noted the Landfill Subcommittee discusses the topic at every meeting but have not arrived at a solution. He emphasized the need to demonstrate the benefits of Project Network participation/involvement but that, too, has proved difficult. Dr. Franklin admitted the Coal Subcommittee faced similar challenges engaging the Project Network. She indicated there are many drivers and/or stakeholders that want different things so it is hard to figure out what is the best method. She noted that project opportunities were the most useful, which emphasized the need for country-specific information.

Recap

Ms. King thanked everyone for their contributions and recapped the [Steering Committee decisions/outcomes and charges to the Partnership](#). Major decisions and outcomes include approval of two new Partners (Nicaragua and Turkey), adoption of the revised TOR, approval for the Wastewater Task Force meeting in Venice, and pursuit of a third Expo. The ASG was charged with the following tasks:

Action Plans/Reporting

- Update the TOR to reflect “Global Methane Initiative” and begin branding development.
- Develop a draft framework (e.g. series of questions) that outlines the key action plan elements, including a description of these elements and desired level of detail.
- Solicit specific feedback about the performance and operability of the on-line tracking system and other reporting mechanisms.
- Explore options for fostering PN participation in reporting and examine alternative mechanisms for project level reporting, such as those used in the APP.

Partnership Expo

- Contact individual Partner countries to find an interested host for the third Partnership Expo.
- Convene an Expo Task Force to assist in the Expo planning.
- Report on the planning process and to present options/plans to date at the Steering Committee's 2011 meeting.

Ms. King reiterated that Steering Committee tasked Partners to:

Action Plans/Reporting

- Work to improve project-level reporting on their activities.
- Provide the ASG with specific comments on aspects of the current reporting mechanisms that could be improved to facilitate future reporting.

Wastewater

- Identify additional participants for the Wastewater Task Force.

She also reviewed the charge to Subcommittees, which include the following activities:

- Encourage the Subcommittees to support and assist Partners in both the development and implementation of the *Action Plans*.
- Review current *leadership* and/or query delegates to determine if there might be other Partners interested in serving as chair(s).
- Determine the role of *methane abatement* within each sector, and update Subcommittee Action Plans accordingly.
- Identify additional participants for the *Wastewater* Task Force.

In closing, Ms. King thanked participants for their past work. She also expressed the ASG was looking forward to working together under the GMI, and hoped the excitement and momentum surrounding the Ministerial Declaration could be maintained. Ms. McCarthy also thanked the attendees for their collaboration and compromise during the day's discussions. She then invited Mexico to outline the pre-Ministerial activities.

Mr. Del Villar explained that all participants were invited to a special tour of the Green Expo being held at the World Trade Center (WTC). He stated that SEMARNAT had arranged for private entrance at 6:00 p.m. and buses would depart from the hotel at 5:00 p.m. He continued by saying the Ministers would stay at the WTC for dinner and the remaining delegates were invited to return to the hotel for a dinner hosted by SEMARNAT.

Having missed the morning's Declaration session, Mr. Machado requested re-opening discussions to consider Brazil's comments:

- Change MTCO₂E to methane units.
- Drop "in the near and long term" in the second paragraph.
- Add "and its Kyoto Protocol" after UNFCCC in the seventh paragraph.

The group addressed each comment individually. Regarding the use of MTCO₂E, Ms. Kruger indicated the United States saw no problem with the existing language. Mr. Goetze stated that MTCO₂E were considered the standard unit across all UNFCCC documents and the Partnership was not the forum to change scientific references and/or terminology. Ms. Kruger echoed Canada's concerns that the Partnership does not want to use terminology exclusive of the rest of the global climate arena. Ms. McCarthy acknowledged that the units did matter, but not for the Declaration. Ms. King noted that the Partnership has used MTCO₂E since the beginning and is reflected in all of its communications. She added that MTCO₂E included offsets from Partnership activities that would not be captured by methane emission reductions alone.

As a compromise, Canada proposed removal of the first reference, which met agreement from Brazil.

Regarding omission of "near and long term," Ms. Kruger expressed concerns with dropping both references. Brazil explained they were more concerned with "long term." Mr. Goetze acknowledged that the most cost-effective strategies would be in the near term, but there was still a need to plan for longer-term activities. For the additional reference to the Kyoto Protocol, he indicated there had been extensive discussions in New Delhi and Canada would not be comfortable with the second inclusion (i.e., regarding future efforts). Ms. King also noted the Kyoto was not included in the revised TOR because the Protocol was set to expire in 2012.

Ms. McCarthy expressed that by re-opening the discussion and acknowledging their concerns, she hoped Brazil could understand why the Partners might concede on the first point (e.g., MTCO₂E) but not on the terms or Kyoto reference. Mr. Hernandez asked for clearer justification regarding "long term" to help explain its inclusion. Ms. Kruger reiterated her earlier comment that while near term activities were tipping events, the Partnership should not ignore long-term opportunities. Mr. Lysaght commented that omission of Kyoto from the Declaration did not take away from the intent, since UNFCCC encompasses more than just the protocol. Mr. Gunning added the previous TOR discussions were supportive of the framework and the importance not to

compete with the Protocol, but rather enhance the entire process. He also emphasized Ms. King's comment regarding the Protocol's expiration in 2010 and the need for the Partnership's language to be non-limiting (e.g., timeless).

Ms. McCarthy indicated there was a lengthy and thorough morning discussion and asked Brazil to concede the point given the other Partners' approval. Mr. Machado indicated it had been his responsibility to raise the concerns and expressed his appreciation for reopening the discussion.

Given resolution of the Declaration issues, Ms. McCarthy adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

Attachment A
Ministerial Declaration Discussion and
Steering Committee Participants

ARGENTINA

Gabriel Blanco

Profesor
Secretaria de Ambiente / Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Pcia de BsAs
Av. del Valle 5741
OlavarrÃ-a, Buenos Aires 7400
Argentina
+54-11-4348-8541
Fax: +54-11-4348-8541

AUSTRALIA

Nicole Thomas

Assistant Manager, Low Emissions Coal Policy
Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism
GPO Box 1564
Canberra, ACT 2602
Australia
+61 2 6213 7169
Fax: +61 2 6290 8954

BRAZIL

Sergio Machado Rezende

Ministro de Ciencia y Tecnologia

CANADA

Darren Goetze

Canadian International Climate Office
Department of Foreign Affairs and International
Trade
125 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Onatario
Canada

Franck Portalupi

Manager, Technology Partnerships
Environment Canada
200 Sacré Coeur Blvd.
Gatineau
Quebec K1A 0H3

CHINA

Qingoing Zhao

Primer Secretario
Embassy of the People's Republic of China
Mexico City, Mexico

Wang Gang

Consejero Politico
Embassy of the People's Republic of China
Mexico City, Mexico

COLOMBIA

Sandra Lopez

Advisor Climate Change Mitigation Group
Ministry of Environment of Colombia
Calle 37 No. 8 - 40
Bogota
Colombia
+57 1-3323400 ext 1216
Fax: +57 1-3323400 ext 1173

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Jose Manuel Hernandez

Policy Officer
European Commission
rue de Mot 24; office 03/24
Brussels 1049
Belgium

FINLAND

Erik Ulfstedt

Ambassador
Ministry for Foreign Affairs
P.O. Box 428
Helsinki, 00023 Valtioneuvosto
Finland

GERMANY

Hubertus von Romer

Embassy of Germany
Mexico City, Mexico

JAPAN

Yuko Nakamura

Embassy of Japan
Mexico City, Mexico

Yasushi Takase

Minister
Embassy of Japan
Mexico City, Mexico

Hiroyasu Takagi

General Manager
Japan Oil, Gas and Metals National Corporation
(JOGMEC) Mexico Office
Goldsmith No. 37, Oficina 401, Col. Chapultepec
Polanco
Mexico City, Mexico
+52-55-5280-1099
Fax: +52-55-5280-0214

MEXICO

Victorano Calderon Medina
Gerente de Proteccion Ambiental
PEMEX
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
Mexico

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
Mexico

Mr. Fernando Tudela
Vice Minister for Planning and Environmental
Policy and Principal Negotiator on Climate Change
Issues in Mexico

POLAND

Katarzyna Kacperczyk
Counsellor
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Al. J. Ch. Szucha 23
Warszawa, 00-580
Poland
+48225238230
Fax: +48226226462

Zbigniew Kamienski
Deputy Director
Ministry of Economy, Economy Development
Department
Plac Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warszawa, 00-507
Poland
+48226934261
Fax: +48226934084

Lukasz Sosnowski
Junior Expert
Ministry of Economy, Economy Development
Department
Plac Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warszawa, 00-507
Poland
+48226935815
Fax: +48226934084

REPUBLIC OF KOREA (SOUTH KOREA)

Gil-Jong Oh
Director General
Instituto Nacional de Investigacion Medioambiental
South Korea

Ho-Seok Song
Director Adjunto
Instituto Nacional de Investigacion Medioambiental
South Korea

Seung-Joon Yoon
Presidente
Instituto Nacional de Investigacion Medioambiental
South Korea

UNITED KINGDOM

Stephen Lysagt
British Embassy
Mexico City, Mexico

UNITED STATES

Angeleen Cooper
Sr. Policy Analyst
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520
USA

Ashley King
Co-Director, Administrative Support Group
Methane to Markets Partnership
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (MC 6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
USA

Barbara De Rosa-Joynt
Multilateral Initiatives Coordinator
U.S. Department of State
OES/EGC, Room 2480
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520
USA

Dina Kruger
Director, Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (MC 6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
USA

Henry Ferland
Co-Director
Methane to Markets Administrative Support Group
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (MC 6207J)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
USA

Regina McCarthy - Chair
Assistant Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
USA

Pamela Franklin
Team Leader
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (MC 6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
USA

Paul Gunning
Chief, Non-CO2 Programs Branch
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW (MC 6207J)
Washington, DC 20460
USA

VIETNAM*

Kim Thi Thuy Ngoc

Ministry of Natural Resource & Environment (MONRE)
83 Nguyen Chi Thanh Street
Ha Noi
Vietnam

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Christopher MacCormac

Resident Director General, ADB
Asian Development Bank
900 17th Street, N.W. Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006
USA

INTERAMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Dolores Barrientos

Interamerican Development Bank
Reforma 222
Mexico City, 06600
Mexico
+91386200-6244

Silvia Rodrigues

Interamerican Development Bank
Reforma 222
Mexico City, 06600
Mexico
+91386200
Fax: +91386200

Inder Rivera

Interamerican Development Bank
Reforma 222
Mexico City, 06600
Mexico
+91386200-6245

**observer (not a current member of the Steering Committee)*