



**1st Steering Committee Meeting
12-13 October 2011
Krakow, Poland**

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Summary of Key Discussion Points and Conclusions

The First Session of the Global Methane Initiative (GMI) Steering Committee met in Krakow, Poland on 12-13 October 2011. Eleven GMI Partners were represented at the meeting, including: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Poland, and the United States. Representatives from Norway and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) also participated as observers. A complete list of participants is presented in Appendix A.

During its deliberations, the Steering Committee approved a request from Norway to join the Partnership. The Steering Committee also heard country statements and updates on Subcommittee progress, and discussed:

- [Outreach and Communications](#)
- [Next Partnership Expo](#)
- [Municipal Wastewater](#)
- [GMI Partner Action Plans](#)
- [GMI Futures](#)

The following sections provide more details of the meeting discussions.

WEDNESDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2011

Mr. Jim Jones, Deputy Assistant Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA's) Office of Air and Radiation and acting Steering Committee chair, asked participants to come to order. He welcomed everyone to Krakow, Poland and explained that Ms. Gina McCarthy could not attend given challenging legislative hearings and other domestic issues at home but she sent her regrets and hopes for a successful meeting. He then asked attendees to introduce themselves. A complete list of participants can be found in Appendix A.

With introductions complete, Mr. Jones thanked the Polish Ministry of Economy for its gracious hospitality and acknowledged Krakow as a great city to visit. Mr. Jones reviewed the [Steering Committee goals](#) and explained the meeting would consist of two half-day sessions. He indicated proposed discussion items included reporting and tracking, the next Expo, wastewater options, GMI Action Plans and expectations, and ways to strengthen GMI going forward (e.g., organization).

Mr. Jones reviewed the Steering Committee agenda (see Appendix B) and asked if there were any changes or additions. Hearing none, he invited the Partner Countries to provide brief country statements regarding most notable events and/or activities since the [September 2010 Steering Committee meeting in Mexico City](#).

Argentina

Mr. Alvaro Zopatti with the Secretariat of Environment & Sustainable Development opened his comments by reviewing Argentina's mitigation efforts in all sectors. In Argentina, methane emissions from agriculture are the primary focus, with methane from waste management another important source. Mr. Zopatti indicated there are varying scales of projects in Argentina, from small-scale farms to large-scale biogas operations. He also indicated these projects provided multiple solutions to expanding Argentina's renewable energy supply and generating significant results. He added there were numerous opportunities to replicate and grow projects. Mr. Zopatti acknowledged the wide variety of tools provided by GMI has assisted Argentina in its efforts.

Mr. Zopatti noted the importance to work on better coordination within Argentina's government to help move projects forward as well as adopt beneficial policy approaches. He indicated Argentina would be interested in receiving help for developing its national action plan as well as technical and/or financial assistance with its tracking and reporting, noting the need for results to demonstrate GMI's impact.

Australia

Mr. Wayne Calder with the Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism announced that on 10 July 2011, the Clean Energy Future plan was announced by the Prime Minister. The Clean Energy Future plan has four key elements: 1) the introduction of a carbon price from 1 July 2012; 2) Promoting innovation and investment in renewable energy; 3) Encouraging energy efficiency; and 4) Creating opportunities in the land sector to cut pollution and improve productivity, sustainability, and resilience. The carbon price will commence at \$23 per tonne and rise by 2.5 percent per annum until 1 July 2015, when an emissions trading system will commence with a flexible carbon price. Mr. Calder stated Australia is committed to a 5 percent reduction in emissions by 2020, and an 80 percent reduction from 2000 baselines by 2050. He added that current efforts cover 60 percent of Australia's emissions, particularly from fugitive sources.

The revenue raised through the carbon price will be utilized to provide assistance to households and business. In particular, \$9.2 billion will be directed toward for emissions-intensive, trade-exposed industrial activities including steel, aluminum, and zinc production. An additional \$1.2 billion will be invested for developing clean technologies for the metal forgery industry, and \$1.3 billion will be directed toward coal.

A new climate change authority has been established to determine longer-term activities and is anticipated to make it through Australia's Parliament by year end. Mr. Calder also addressed the range of complementary measures that currently support Australia's sector-specific efforts. For example, Australia's Rural Agriculture Research and Development (R&D) programme currently funds small-scale demonstration projects, with an additional \$1.0 billion earmarked for implementation by July 2012.

Canada

Mr. Franck Portalupi with Environment Canada first expressed his appreciation and gratitude toward the Polish hosts. He continued by indicating Canada has been working with its private sector to advance clean energy deployment. He described ongoing oil and gas projects with the China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) and Mexico's PEMEX that have leveraged more than \$9 million from private industry. Mr. Portalupi also described Canada's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Mexico for a waste management project at the Cancun Landfill. He added that Canada and Mexico are also collaborating on anaerobic digestion (AD) of livestock manure at a swine farm on the Yucatan Peninsula.

Mr. Portalupi also commented on emerging global climate forcers, the role of methane, and benefits to Canada. He likened it to the comparable work under the Arctic Council and wondered how best to address methane.

Mr. Portalupi announced that Canada has offered to host the next GMI Partnership Expo in Vancouver in February 2013. He explained that initially, they had explored date in late 2012 but most venues were already booked. At the conclusion of Canada's country statement, the United States expressed its gratitude to Canada for offering to host the Expo.

Colombia

Ms. Sandra Lopez with the Ministry of Environment thanked EPA and ERG for coordinating the meeting and the Polish Ministry of Economy for hosting GMI. Ms. Lopez explained that Colombia was a charter Methane to Markets member since its launch in 2004, and has continued its support through transition to GMI. She was also delighted to announce that Colombia has become more engaged and now has delegates in all sectors. She explained the previous Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development has been split into a new Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources that houses activities related to most of the GMI sectors, and a new Ministry of Housing, which incorporates other sectors such as landfills. She indicated the existing delegates hail from the Ministry of Environment but she will work with the Housing Ministry to identify additional delegates to cover other sectors.

Ms. Lopez explained the former climate change group is now getting support from Colombia's president. Colombia is also developing its low-carbon development strategy and she anticipates it will mesh well with the country's GMI Partner Action Plan. She will work with in-country colleagues to implement and formulate Colombia's activities under GMI. Lastly, she indicated that Colombia supports the inclusion of municipal wastewater under GMI's purview as well as the emerging short lived climate forcers (SLCFs) initiative, having participated in the Washington, DC and Mexico meetings.

Ecuador

Ms. Lorena Falconi of the Ministry of Environment commented that Ecuador is working to improve its participation in GMI and its approach to project and technology identification. Ecuador is coordinating its GMI efforts under an existing air plan, particularly as it relates to landfill management and other metropolitan plans (e.g., there are presently 38 municipalities with landfills eligible for the projects).

Ms. Falconi described Ecuador's national climate change strategy, which addresses adaptation and mitigation in numerous sectors including energy, landfills, agriculture, and industrial processes and noted its synergy with GMI. She also noted that Ministry of Environment works closely with its sector-related departments to coordinate GMI efforts.

Finland

Mr. Erik Ulfstedt of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs expressed his gratitude toward the Polish Ministry of Economy for hosting the meeting. He also acknowledged the presence of the UNFCCC as an important step for GMI, as well as for national governments to emphasize the linkage and opportunities to work together. He expressed Finland's appreciation for the excellent work done by EPA/ASG for the GMI.

Mr. Ulfstedt indicated Finland is particularly involved in the Landfill and Agriculture sectors. He noted the largest landfill methane recovery in Europe is located in Finland and has been using methane for heating for several years and has recently started electricity production in the form of combined heat and power (CHP). He commented there are currently subsidies for methane recovery and use projects under

Finland's renewable energy legislation. He expressed hope in speaking with Indonesian representatives on potential methane recovery projects in palm oil production. A Finnish company has biodiesel plants in Finland, Netherlands and Singapore that use palm oil as raw material. He added the Energy and Environment Partnerships Finland has established with several developing countries, including Indonesia, which often aim to recover methane gas for energy production.

Lastly, Mr. Ulfstedt indicated Finland is looking to identify a representative for the municipal wastewater sector, as the country has significant knowledge to share within that area.

Germany

Ms. Marlene Sieck with the Federal Environment Agency acknowledged Germany's lack of a more active role in the past. As an expert on waste management she reported that Germany has already been very successful in reducing methane emissions from landfill sites by a landfill ban for untreated waste and that they are happy to contribute their experience in the Landfill Subcommittee. She continued by referencing the role of methane mitigation and Germany's interest in the new discussions on SLCFs. She noted that Germany was present at the Mexico meeting, although she encouraged participants not to lose sight of long-lived forcers. She lastly acknowledged the Expo as important to GMI and its relationship with the private sectors. At the conclusion of Germany's statement, Mr. Jones welcomed their increased engagement.

Japan

Mr. Osamu Mizuno of the Ministry of the Environment also thanked the ASG and the Polish hosts for the opportunity to visit Krakow. He welcomed the launch of GMI from its Methane to Markets foundations and indicated that Japan's focus on methane from the targeted sectors fits well within the UNFCCC. Mr. Mizuno continued to outline both Japan's domestic and international efforts, particularly their contributions to projects in developing countries. He commented that Japan welcomes the attention on SLCFs to help tack global warming and also noted that methane as the most important gas within that context. He also recognized the need to address carbon dioxide (CO₂), but felt SLCFs potentially carried more weight because immediate action could be more useful. He stated it was important to note that a new climate framework is anticipated to emerge (i.e., post-Kyoto). He also commented the importance to closely monitor SLCF developments since they will likely complement GMI efforts.

Mr. Mizuno described Japan's domestic efforts and how they mitigate methane emissions. Primary activities include waste incinerations and installing dry seals in oil and gas systems. He noted that Japan has virtually no coal mining Japan's international efforts in developing countries and countries with economies in transition (EITs) involve various levels of implementation and efforts. An important feature of Japan's methane reduction efforts involve the co-benefits received, including reduced air pollution and improved energy access. He noted it would be useful if they could take it one step further by quantifying the associated benefits with their efforts and garnering more attention from stakeholders. Mr. Mizuno commented he was encouraged to see participation of UNFCCC at this meeting.

Mexico

Mr. Cesar Chavez with the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources thanked the Polish hosts and proceeded to share an [update on Mexico's methane reduction efforts](#). He echoed Canada's comments on its work with PEMEX and the United States to reduce fugitive emissions, as well as perform cost analysis in the exploration and production sectors for oil and gas. In the Agriculture sector, he announced Mexico has developed AD standards and when it is inconvenient, the government has also published a series of best management practices (BMPs). Mr. Chavez indicated there are two major landfill gas plants

in Mexico, with other possible locations undergoing feasibility studies. He also indicated the Nuevo Laredo Landfill is currently accepting bids for development. As with AD, he noted Mexico has also developed landfill gas (LFG) guidance. The largest landfill in Mexico City is undergoing feasibility study for biogas collection and management. The Ministry of Environment has discontinued waste disposition so this landfill is now closed, and a new site has yet to be opened. Mr. Chavez also referenced the Cancun bio-digester project underway with involvement from Canada.

In the Coal sector, Mr. Chavez indicated there is one large project in Northern Mexico nearing completion. The site is currently producing 7 megawatts (MW) but continues to experience issues. Mexico will conduct an assessment of its wastewater sector to help determine where to focus its efforts (e.g., area with the highest potential). Mr. Chavez encouraged GMI to take advantage of the attention paid to SLCFs at the Mexico meeting and noted he anticipated further discussion would be held at a 17 October 2011 meeting in Bangladesh, in order to address and/or come up with solutions to combat climate change. He emphasized the important role methane plays and hoped the Partnership would take a readiness position and be willing to take action when necessary. He also views the topic of SLCFs as a clear admission for Partner governments to work with high officials.

Poland

Mr. Zbigniew Kamienski from the Ministry of Economy welcomed the attendees to Poland and also noted its support for the transition from Methane to Markets to GMI. He noted methane recovery and its use is important to Poland's goal for a low emission economy by 2050, and new actions were adopted by the Council of Ministers within recent months (i.e., assumption of the National Program for the Development of Low-Emission Economy). Mr. Kamienski indicated the Ministry has worked cooperatively with other ministries to develop actions within all sectors and provided an [update on Poland activities](#).

In the agriculture sector, Poland has significant potential from waste management as well as energy crops, with the capacity of approximately 2,000 to 3,000 MW. He hoped to cooperate within GMI to better develop this area. Coal currently serves as the primary basis for Poland's energy sector and will continue to play an important role in future production. He noted the exploration of ventilation air methane (VAM) opportunities and provided an overview of the existing projects focused in this area. He also described the present methane capture and usage.

From a landfill perspective, Poland has solved most of the issues associated with methane capture and use at large landfills, but Mr. Kamienski acknowledged that more still needs to be done to address the economic challenges associated with small to medium-sized landfills. In the oil and gas sector, he noted that Polish industry is trying to utilize multiple technologies to reduce emissions, primarily from the transmission sector.

At this juncture, Mr. Ulfstedt asked if Poland and the United States had become involved in shale gas development. Answering this question, Mr. Kamienski highlighted the successful international cooperation Poland has developed so far both with North American and European countries that helps Poland gather state-of-the-art experience in the shale gas production. In his opinion, political discussions that have arisen recently result from the threat that new energy resource might change the worldwide energy geography. He indicated that shale gas production might bring environmental challenges that are met by the current technology advance in a sustainable manner. Mr. Kamienski reassured this is a philosophy Poland—thanks to broadly developed platform of international cooperation—carefully follows. He clearly stated that there were no signals of serious environmental threats related to shale production in Poland. He also added that Poland will continue appropriate research concerning its environmental impact. Apart from that, Mr. Kamienski said that in the Polish point of view, shale gas represents a new opportunity for environmentally friendly energy sources.

Mr. Paul Gunning with the United States added the emissions associated with shale gas are similar to sectors covered by GMI (i.e., oil and gas) and sees how it might be pursued under the Partnership. He echoed the concern that increased fracturing releases more emissions and indicated there will be discussions in the oil and gas technical sessions that begin to address the methane emissions from operations.

United States

Mr. Paul Gunning with U.S. EPA thanked the Polish hosts and noted this was important first official meeting of the GMI. He noted the United States is actively involved in numerous climate change initiatives and recognizes the role methane plays, accounting for approximately one-third of the Earth's warming. Mr. Gunning opened his statement with an [update on U.S. activities](#), emphasizing that U.S. methane emissions account for 8 percent of the U.S. GHGs with the largest percentages coming from oil and gas, enteric fermentation, and the landfills sector.

Mr. Gunning outlined the U.S. EPA domestic programs that served as a springboard for the initial Methane to Markets, noting the individual partnership programs success. In the agriculture sector, he indicated there are 150 projects that represent the most significant potential, while there are an additional 5,000 to 6,000 more sites with possibility. Within the coal sector, U.S. industry has already optimized 90 percent of its methane emissions. For landfills, project development—coupled with regulatory efforts to divert organic materials and employ combustion—have significantly reduced emissions. Despite these efforts, there still exist about 400 opportunities for landfill gas projects. In the oil and gas sector, U.S. EPA's domestic program currently encompasses 60 percent of the industry and has been expanded internationally in recent years. He also referenced the joint project with Canada and Mexico's PEMEX.

Mr. Gunning touched on the political sensitivities associated with the Obama administration and the Supreme Court's decision that EPA could regulate GHG from light-duty vehicles (i.e., mobile sources) and regulations for refining facilities were GHG reporting program, an economy-wide effort that targets 41 sectors with emissions greater than 25,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂E). He noted the first reporting period ended in August 2011 for approximately 6,000 facilities and a second round of reporting will conclude in September 2012, capturing an additional 13,000 facilities and encompassing 85 to 90 percent of emissions.

Mr. Gunning also reviewed the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) co-benefits and its proposed regulation of the oil and gas industry, particularly as it relates to volatile organic compounds (VOCs) impacts on local air quality and hazardous air pollutants. He noted aggressive efforts to address emissions from gas processing up to 26 percent, indicating the significant environmental and economic co-benefits.

Mr. Gunning commented that at the inaugural launch of GMI, the United States made a commitment to the Partnership by pledging \$50 million over 5 years. He emphasized the importance of leveraging funding in developing countries in conjunction with regional and/or multilateral development banks (e.g., Latin and/or South American banks).

Mr. Gunning announced the United States' annual accomplishments report was now available and expressed his hope it would provide the other delegates with an understanding of what the United States is doing to leverage limited funding in all sectors. He indicated the ASG support consists primarily of direct project support as well as technology development and deployment, noting recent oil and gas study tours as one way to share knowledge. Mr. Gunning also added the accomplishments report focuses on the GHG reduction associated with GMI, which—in his opinion—could and should be more significant. Mr. Gunning provided an overview of the U.S. EPA grant solicitation that has been offered since Methane to Markets and noted a new element that requires project identification within the country's GMI Partner

Action Plan and announced the next solicitation is forthcoming (i.e., anticipated by the end of October). Mr. Gunning noted the United States is strongly committed to GMI and supports the exploration of issues related to SLCFs. The United States is also interested in municipal wastewater prospects and further growth of this sector, as well as development of GMI Partner Action Plans as critical instruments to nurture/grow the Partnership.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Ms. Clare Lonergan with UNFCCC acknowledged the GMI-related project development under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and said she looked forward to identify situations through which to make projects more cost-effective. She noted the oil and gas, coal, and waste sectors have been actively contacting UNFCCC to help identify how to improve its methodologies. She noted that recent waste methane workshops have resulted in six new standards and there are forthcoming standards in the coal and oil and gas sectors. She acknowledged the CDM board has identified the agriculture sector as under-represented and noted that it might take a top-down approach to better address opportunities within this sector.

Norway

Mr. Havard Toresen with the Ministry of the Environment thanked the Steering Committee for the opportunity to attend the meeting and also thanked the ASG for circulating Norway's request for membership. He indicated that Norway wanted to ensure strong support for participation and ascertain background for playing an active role, particularly in the oil and gas sector. He noted that in-country private stakeholders were also eager for Norway's participation in GMI. Mr. Toresen also noted that Norwegian representatives would attend the sector-specific sessions as well.

At this point, Mr. Jones asked Mr. Toresen to step out of the room so the delegates could discuss Norway's petition for membership.

Consideration of Norway's Request to Join

Mr. Jones asked if there were any comments or objections to Norway's request to join GMI. The United States expressed strong support for their participation. Hearing no objections, Mr. Jones welcomed Mr. Toresen back into the room and announced Norway would become the 41st GMI Partner.

Outreach and Communication

Mr. Jones reiterated the outreach and communications topics he identified at the beginning of the meeting and invited Ms. Monica Shimamura, Co-Director of the GMI Administrative Support Group (ASG), to provide an overview of the [Status of GMI Outreach & Communications Efforts discussion white paper](#) circulated to the delegates in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Shimamura delivered the [Outreach and Communications presentation](#), which provided background on the ASG's responsibility for outreach and explained how the Partners and Subcommittees were tasked with activities, such as those at the March 2010 New Delhi Steering Committee. She continued by noting a new website had been launched in 2009 with a greater emphasis on tools and resources, and that the website was refreshed following GMI's launch to incorporate the logo and look. Ms. Shimamura noted that from 2009 to 2010, a website analysis revealed a 14 percent increase in page visits and she also reviewed the countries with the greatest number of users. She also encouraged the delegates to think of the Country pages as portals for sharing country-specific information.

Ms. Shimamura explained the *Methane International (MI)* newsletter, previously circulated as a PDF file, was now web-based and delivered electronically to approximately 2,000 recipients—a 30 percent increase since March 2010. She also noted that seven issues had been circulated since March 2010. Readership analysis, however, revealed only 22 percent of the recipients opened the e-mail but of those, nearly 54 percent clicked through the links and/or read the articles. Ms. Shimamura reviewed the priority article topics for several past issues, indicating recent development, project development, and funding mechanisms garner the most attention. She emphasized next steps include getting Partners to utilize the newsletter for country-specific announcements and indicated the ASG was considering reduced frequency with a greater focus on projects.

For tracking and reporting, Ms. Shimamura indicated the ASG had adopted a new database system and had consolidated information from previously stand-alone Agriculture, Coal Mine, and Landfill databases. She explained the ASG hoped Partners would report emission reduction data similar to information submitted in advance for the Partnership-wide Accomplishments Report in 2009, and hoped to use the data to help determine metrics and provide the basis for annual reporting.

Ms. Shimamura announced the ASG has transitioned the previous Methane to Markets Partnership and mitigation opportunities fact sheets into the GMI template and posted electronic versions in five languages—Chinese, English, Korean, Russian, and Spanish—on the GMI website. The ASG is currently developing new sector-specific fact sheets that include project case studies. She encouraged the Partners to translate the fact sheets into native languages and provide to the ASG for posting. She briefly touched on press releases and other news items regarding GMI, and again encouraged Partners to provide items for posting. She also emphasized the importance news releases will serve in advance of the next Expo.

Lastly, she provided an update on the Project Network, indicating the Network comprised nearly 1,100 members as of October 2011 and credited the increase to better engagement efforts (e.g., Expo speaking opportunities, and increased attendance at Partnership events (e.g., subcommittee meetings held in conjunction with other industry venues).

Mr. Jones briefly crystallized the outreach and communication efforts, noting GMI was a voluntary program and the associated difficulties to obtain and articulate results of its efforts to donors, recipients, and the private sector. He commented on the need to effectively tell the GMI story among Partners as well as to advise others (e.g., policy makers). He questioned how better to increase GMI's effectiveness in communicating its results. Mr. Portalupi commended the ASG on the GMI website as a useful tool that—in addition to supporting projects—served as a central location or clearinghouse for grabbing information on methane's presence and mitigation opportunities for presentations by chief climate negotiators as well as briefing ministers. He asked if the ASG had considered charging the subcommittees to conduct more meetings via webinar. Mr. Jones responded that issue would be discussed under the "Futures" topic. Mr. Henry Ferland, ASG Co-Director, thanked the Canadian delegate for his website comments and asked the delegates how better to communicate, using the landfill project as an example that would be ideal for inclusion on the website. Mr. Portalupi indicated there were presentations as well as reports available for posting and he would share them with the ASG. Mr. Jones commented on the importance of raising general awareness of GMI, as well as its specific efforts. Mr. Chavez echoed the commitment to share materials and information for the website, citing Mexico's Agriculture BMP document as a possibility as well as the LFG biogas models.

Ms. Lopez interjected Colombia experienced the same benefits as Canada when it came to relying on the GMI website as a source of information for reporting and communicating outside of the Partnership. However, she indicated that internal communications need to be stronger. She inquired if a monthly reminder could be sent to Partners requesting updates and/or information for the website. She added she would provide an existing Colombian presentation for posting. Mr. Kamienski added Poland's support for

the improved communications and requests, but reminded participants that given the voluntary nature of the Partnership, any direction or language should avoid the perception of “commitment.”

Mr. Calder commented on Australia’s reduced website usage might reflect the policy development cycle relating to climate change strategy, but sees how something like the U.S. annual accomplishments report could help demonstrate effectiveness to stakeholders within industry. He also emphasized the importance of leveraging the UNFCCC linkage.

Mr. Mizuno stated the importance to report GMI’s achievement and outcomes as simple numbers (e.g., GHGs reduced) but encouraged participants to think in terms of co-benefits as well. He said it was imperative to stress the uniqueness of the Partnership as why its achievement(s) is important. He reiterated this might be another way to tell the story, and also suggested developing a list of goals and/or a timeframe for achievement during the “Futures” discussion.

Mr. Jones provided a summary of the outreach and communications discussion and the importance of emphasizing or enhancing co-benefits. He asked the participants if there might be other ideas that were important to pursue in the coming year. Mr. Chavez asked if it might be possible to create a financing portal on the GMI website to help educate stakeholders on the available options and how to obtain more information about the projects and/or mechanisms. Mr. Jones indicated this might become a charge to the Subcommittees to compile information that might be applicable within each sector. To recap, he indicated future direction would involve elevating co-benefits, adding a finance element to the website, and making [more] routine requests for Partner information. Ms. Falconi also encouraged all Partners to create links from their appropriate web pages to the GMI website. Mr. Jones commented it was worth pursuing as a pilot concept with a Partner country and Mr. Ferland confirmed this could be done. Mr. Chavez also asked if the ASG could provide a brief GMI introductory paragraph that could accompany the link on Partner pages.

Mr. Chavez also commented on confusion between GMI and CDM in the climate realm. He added the confusion stemmed from a misunderstanding of the complementary—versus a perceived competitive—relationship. Mr. Jones noted that it might be beneficial to provide clarity on the GMI website to better explain the relationship.

Partnership Expo

Mr. Jones acknowledged the gracious offer from Canada to host the next Partnership Expo in Vancouver, tentatively scheduled for February 2013. Mr. Portalupi indicated Environment Canada has already met with the British Columbia provincial government, the City of Vancouver, and other local agencies in preparation. He also noted they are looking into a main downtown venue and ensured participants the weather would be pleasant at that time of year. Mr. Ferland interjected the ASG considered Vancouver an excellent venue for the next Expo. He continued to provide [presentation on the GMI Partnership Expo](#), noting that his comments would deviate from the [GMI Partnership Expo discussion paper](#) previously circulated now that there was a willing host Partner identified. He provided a brief overview of the two previous Expos, indicating the October 2007 Beijing and March 2010 New Delhi attendance. Mr. Ferland emphasized the Expos provided valuable opportunities for project managers to meet with developers and technologies vendors via the poster sessions. He added the emphasis for the next Expo would be quality opportunities that are ready for implementation and seeking financing. He also added that Partner Countries and technologies vendors were provided booths to distribute information and/or demonstrate tools and services.

Mr. Ferland reviewed lessons learned from the previous Expos, including utilizing an Expo Task Force for planning and outreach, conducting site tours in advance of the technical sessions, and issuing a “call for papers” to identify session topics. He also emphasized the importance of having extensive lead time to ensure adequate media exposure and thereby, attract maximum participation. He noted that Vancouver served as a gateway to the East, while not too far from Europe so he hoped that would make transportation easier for all participants. He reiterated the need for lead time and early planning, noting the task force has been essential for garnering Partner and Project Network involvement and input. He encouraged the Steering Committee delegates to think of the project showcase from a quality versus quantity perspective (e.g., “shovel-ready”). He indicated that as in previous Expos, the subcommittees would also be involved in the project showcase. Lastly, Mr. Ferland reviewed the outreach mechanisms that will be used to promote the Expo, including a dedicated website, marketing, and newsletter articles.

Mr. Jones summarized the issues for the Steering Committee’s consideration, which included support for the proposed location and timing (i.e., Vancouver in February 2013) and whether Partners should be charged with recruiting sponsors, identifying projects, and providing overall support (e.g., attendance). In both instances, delegates agreed. Mr. Jones commented the ASG provided a model for the last two Expos and asked if there were any suggested changes. Mr. Kamienski commented that it was important to lay out the logistics but questioned if the Partnership should discuss an Expo goal (e.g., results to be achieved) and identify one or more themes or key topics. Mr. Portalupi interjected that Canada was intent not just on hosting the meeting to convene stakeholders, but aspired to convey a message of existing and available technologies and projects around the world. He added that intent was strongly supported by Canada’s ministries and other agencies. Ms. Lopez echoed Poland’s comment and encouraged participants to think how issues such as SLCFs and outcomes from COP18 might play into the Expo theme. Mr. Gunning agreed with Colombia and Poland on the potential need for a theme, but—particularly as it relates to future climate regimes—it was too early to input. He indicated better insight might be available following the “Futures” discussion on the next day. He requested the attendees to wait on theme until it might be timelier.

Mr. Jones reiterated Mr. Ferland’s comments regarding the project showcase, that in addition to encouraging the Subcommittees to showcase quality projects to attract service providers, if the Partnership should not also highlight any project development matches that have been made at past Expo.

Mr. Ulfstedt asked whether outreach was exclusive to the Partnership or more global (i.e., how to reach everyone that might be interested). Mr. Chavez asked in regard to Poland’s comment on expectations if the goal might be to sell technologies or market projects. Mr. Mizuno stated he felt Canada had provided a clear vision but inquired if it might be beyond the Partnership to focus on regulatory and legislative environment to accompany the technology component. Mr. Gunning clarified the sector-specific sessions included a policy element. Mr. Mizuno added the importance to showcase projects that could be replicated in other sites and/or countries. He repeated his previous comments about highlighting GMI uniqueness from CDM while taking advantage of its linkage. Mr. Calder indicated he missed the previous Expo but wondered if it might be appropriate [timing] for Partner Countries to reveal their action plans.

Mr. Jones acknowledged the useful dialogue by thanking Poland for raising the need to think about theme in advance of the Expo and complementing Canada for already addressing this issue. Mr. Zopatti inquired about the participation of the local public sector and their involvement in the projects. Mr. Portalupi supported the concept of the Expo Task Force and invited participation from the other countries. Both Poland and Mexico indicated they would participate. Mr. Ferland indicated the ASG will issue a broadcast invitation to all Partners and the Project Network members to participate in the Expo Task Force. Mr. Jones noted the ASG would provide follow-up on all of the suggestions.

Municipal Wastewater

Ms. Shimamura indicated an [update on Municipal Wastewater Sector discussion paper](#) had been circulated prior to the meeting and she provided a supporting [municipal wastewater presentation](#). She provided the sector background, describing how the issues arose and the way the Steering Committee had incorporated it into the Terms of Reference. She reviewed the Wastewater Task Force activities, which included its first meeting in Venice that featured experts from Brazil and the Netherlands. The task force also decided to focus on municipal wastewater and discussed possible technical and financial needs.

Following her overview, Ms. Shimamura outlined the issues for Steering Committee consideration included the sector's structure (e.g., as its own subcommittee, part of the Landfill Subcommittee, continuing as a task force), leadership (i.e., chairs and country participants), and potential charges (e.g., developing a sector-specific action plan). Mr. Jones opened the discussion and encouraged the participants to start at the top and work through the topics.

Mr. Gunning provided the U.S. perspective that the Wastewater Task Force conducted a successful meeting in conjunction with the Agriculture and Landfills Subcommittee, but sees how—in order to be a pillar within the Partnership—it would be best served as a separate subcommittee. He also pointed out despite the similarities, the wastewater sector does have different issues than the other subcommittees and a unique expert community. Therefore, he noted the United States would put forth the suggestion that the municipal wastewater sector be made its own subcommittee. Colombia supported the U.S. suggestion, stating it was the best way to have exclusive activities and target resources. Mexico was also supportive of a Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee regardless of the pros/cons identified by the ASG because it was the best way for the unique issues not to get lost within the Landfill Subcommittee. Japan inquired about methane emissions associated with the wastewater sector. The ASG responded that nine percent of the global methane emissions are attributed to wastewater, and also indicated that emissions from this sector can easily be captured with existing technologies. Poland expressed its support for a Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee and encouraged the delegates to focus more on the methane recovery and use issue in new wastewater treatment plants in developing countries. Canada also supported the concept of a Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee, but pointed out that municipal governments also have significant influence within this sector and perhaps look to the Landfill Subcommittee on how best to apply those incorporation lessons. The United States agreed, and added that strong synergies within the Agriculture Subcommittee exist so it would be beneficial for the new subcommittee to coordinate with the agriculture and landfill sectors.

Mr. Jones asked if there were any other observations. Mr. Toresen indicated he was not aware how high the percent methane emissions from wastewater and asked if there was a minimum number of Partners required to transition to a Subcommittee. Mr. Ferland indicated the task force was established to register initial interest among Partners in the absence of a champion country (i.e., chair). Mr. Jones used this segue to ask if any countries present might be interested in serving a leadership position for the Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee. In the absence of volunteers, he tasked the ASG to reach out to the remaining Partnership for possible chairs. Mr. Gunning interjected that in the interest of keeping the momentum, the United States would serve as an interim chair until another could be identified. Mr. Portalupi said he would inquire back at home if one of his colleagues might be interested in charging the subcommittee but at a minimum, Canada would participate as a member. Mr. Jones asked if the delegates wanted to charge the forthcoming subcommittee with preparing deliverables. The United States indicated it was a logical course forward for the subcommittee to identify its primary methane sources as well as challenges faced (e.g., financing, technologies, policies) in a sector-specific action plan. Mr. Gunning added the plan could also outline the subcommittee's approach for coordinating with the Agriculture and Landfill subcommittees.

Mr. Jones summarized the Steering Committee decisions as creating the Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee, identifying leadership with an interim U.S. chair, and tasking the subcommittee with developing an action plan that incorporates coordination with the Agriculture and Landfill Subcommittees. Mr. Lopez commented she will talk with colleagues at the new Ministry of Housing to learn if they might be interested in participating in the subcommittee. Ms. Falconi inquired how many other countries could participate and Mr. Ferland indicated it was open to all Partners, to which Ms. Falconi said Ecuador would participate.

Mr. Jones thanked the participants on a productive afternoon and said he looked forward to seeing everyone on the salt mine tour.

THURSDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2011

Following the Partnership-wide opening plenary session, Mr. Jones opened the second day of the Steering Committee by again thanking the participants for a productive session the previous afternoon.

Action Plans

Mr. Ferland delivered the [GMI Partner Action Plans presentation](#) and acknowledged Mr. Kamienski's plenary session presentation to help key up the topic. He also noted that a [status of GMI Partner Action Plans discussion paper](#) was circulated prior to the meeting, which included the draft action plan guidance as an attachment.

By way of background, Mr. Ferland indicated the action plans are intended to provide guidance to assist the Project Network and other interested stakeholders in knowing where to get more information on potential Partner Country projects and/or service needs. He explained initial sector-specific were developed by the subcommittees in the early years of Methane to Markets. In 2009, the Steering Committee recognized the need for more country-specific information and charged subcommittees with developing templates for Partner completion. To date, however, many Partners have not provided these country-specific plans. During the Mexico City Steering Committee meeting in conjunction with GMI's launch, the delegates re-emphasized the need for Partner Action Plans and incorporated language in the TOR.

Mr. Ferland stated the GMI Partner Action Plan goals (e.g., articulate overall vision for Partners' participation in GMI, outline key activities and priorities, provide mechanism to advance cooperation between Partners by identifying needs/opportunities) and reiterated the importance of these action plans to convey information to the Project Network. He reviewed the TOR language added in 2010, and commented the Steering Committee paid particular attention to concerns from developing countries that might require assistance compiling their plans. He proceeded to describe the current status, noting the ASG placed emphasis on flexibility in the draft guidance circulated to Partners in mid-2011. The ASG received only positive comments on the guidance and a final guidance is available. He noted there are four simple key elements:

1. Objectives and priorities for participating in the Global Methane Initiative (GMI).
2. Current activities in Partner country or in other countries to advance methane project development and mitigation.
3. Assistance sought from or planned contribution to the GMI.
4. Additional Information and any accomplishments or successes under GMI.

Mr. Ferland reiterated the action plans are intended to be useful—and not onerous—documents. He then introduced the issues for Steering Committee consideration, which include establishing a time frame,

identifying a primary representative (i.e., point-of-contact), creating tools or resources to assist Partners in completing and implementing their action plans, and determining the best way(s) to communicate action plan results (e.g., oral or written updates, online submission). Mr. Jones broke the issue items into their components and invited discussion on each.

On the topic of time frame, Canada inquired if the new TOR language still maintains the voluntary nature of the Partnership, which Mr. Jones confirmed. Mr. Portalupi also expressed concern that the GMI Partner Action Plans might be too similar to the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) that arose from the Cancun climate negotiations and wondered how best to reconcile the documents or bring the respective elements closer together. Mr. Kamienski asked about the difference between the Subcommittee sector-specific plans and these parts of the GMI Partner Action Plans, which are related to particular sectoral issues, and expressed his doubts concerning necessity to develop two separate documents. He also asked about the fundamentals on how to construct the action plans. Mr. Ferland acknowledged Poland's questions and reiterated the four key points that crystallize the overarching need given methane's impact across multiple ministries or agencies. He stated the action plans will help investors better understand which and where developing countries have needs or priorities, and how developed countries can provide assistance. He pointed to the joint projects between Canada and Mexico as examples that might be included in action plans, as well as anticipated projects.

Mr. Calder pointed out not all Partners participate in the Steering Committee and echoed Mr. Ferland's comment that methane is often cross-referenced among numerous agencies. He also wondered if the Action Plan might set the bar too high for a Partner Country engaged in only one sector. In regard to the former comment, Mr. Ferland said most non-Steering Committee Partners are involved in more than one subcommittee so the former scenario is limited. He again emphasized the plans provide an overarching perspective.

Ms. Lopez expressed concern on the lack of resources to develop and/or implement action plans, but now recognized that Colombia's low carbon development strategy fits neatly with the action plans and vice versa. She encouraged the delegates to think about linkages between existing documents and/or policies from which to draw their action plan content. She indicated that Colombia might request subcommittee assistance (particularly with sector-specific issues) and/or other cooperation from GMI to develop its plan.

Mr. Andrew Eil from the U.S. State Department acknowledged Colombia's point on leveraging developing country resources and looking at available materials to do low emission development strategies (LEDS). He indicated that LEDS is a major focus of U.S. government climate change foreign assistance programs and noted the potential of reaching out to Partners lacking the capacity to develop their own national action plans to provide assistance. Mr. Portalupi stated Canada is not opposed to the idea of action plans but indicated they cannot prepare a nation-wide plan given provincial governments' role in methane-related issues. He did state that Canada might have resources available for helping developing countries identify long-term financing using NAMAs as tools, and ultimately scaling up the potential projects by providing funding.

Mexico indicated its national strategy for climate change is more detailed than the proposed action plans, which will likely be a subset of the larger strategy. In this case, too, Mexico anticipates it will simply modify the existing document to extract the action plan elements and did not see the need to start from scratch (i.e., part of a bigger program). Mr. Jones acknowledged Mexico's thinking and again made it clear that the basis for the action plans was to inform stakeholders and not create more work. He did add, however, that Partners might want to complete their action plans in advance of the Expo so they can articulate what might be needed in regards to project development.

Mr. Calder echoed Canada's comments on NAMAs, as well as the regional issues that might make it difficult to assemble a national plan. He, too, indicated that Australia might have technical assistance available and encouraged Partners to think toward the Durban negotiations and how those discussion might impact their GMI Partner Action Plans and emerging national plans. Mr. Jones asked Mr. Kamienski if his initial question had been thoroughly addressed, and he responded affirmatively.

Mr. Jones transitioned the discussion into the second point. The United States expressed strong support for Colombia's position and noted that technical expertise exists to assist developing countries with their action plans. Mr. Gunning added the action plans provided opportunity to further articulate where other needs for assistance exist. He viewed the process as a constructive way to engage Partners and combine efforts (e.g., synthesis). Mr. Jones reiterated previous and ongoing subcommittee support will also continue. Mr. Kamienski requested further clarification on Partner versus sector-specific plans, stating it still was not clear. He suggested deleting the second sentence in the second paragraph of the guidance because some elements of the Partner Action plan will contain sector-specific content. Mr. Ferland explained the need for two document since the Partner Action Plans provide an overarching view in only a few pages, whereas the sector-specific plans are typically more detailed (e.g., lists of potential sites, inventories). Mr. Toresen stated that as an observer and absent from previous discussions, he had no objections to the concept of an overarching document to establish priorities, particularly if development assistance was available. He echoed the U.S. perspective the plans would encourage effective communication and cooperation, and also reiterated Australia's view that there might be additional insight gained following Durban.

Mr. Ulfstedt expressed his hesitancy given the number of players and/or actors including ministries, municipalities, stakeholders, industry, and the various energy and environmental departments. He indicated that Finland would try to assemble the plan accordingly, but was unsure they will be able to deliver the anticipated product. The United States recognized the fortunate situation that U.S. EPA and the State Department are actively and cooperatively involved, but indicated there are other agencies involved. He noted that it might be unrealistic to think or expect that all Partners will be able to achieve cohesive plans given that each country has its own level of cooperation. He encouraged everyone to take the first step as it might be the only way to ultimately be successful (i.e., identify gaps as well as priorities).

Mr. Jones recapped the discussion by stating the action plans are voluntary, but strongly encouraged Partners to attempt compilation. He added the guidance also made it clear that existing plans or documents could suffice. Lastly, he reinforced the Subcommittees' assistance role.

Regarding primary representatives for coordinating and submitting the action plan, the U.S. delegate explained this might be the administrative liaison as defined in the TOR. Mr. Ferland reminded participants that a similar request for a central point-of-contact was made for the *Partnership Accomplishments Report (PAR)* in 2008-2009. Italy supported the U.S. suggestion of a central person and that it did not mean or require a second step; instead, it should be viewed as a way to ensure engagement and responsiveness on a cross-cutting effort. Mr. Jones asked if there were other comments. Hearing none, he recommended using the existing point-of-contact previously identified by Partners. Canada supported the recommendation and also reminded participants these contacts were identified to coordinate comments on the 2010 Ministerial Declaration. Norway agreed with the views expressed by the United States and Canada regarding the need to have a central coordination point, but wanted to ensure the Partner itself distinguished who that person might be. Mr. Mizuno questioned whether "responsible" might be too strong and Mr. Jones concurred it could be dropped. Mr. Eil asked if the guidance's section three could be divided into two parts that create directories that aggregate those seeking assistance and/or can make contributions. Mr. Ferland said the ASG wished to leave the language broad enough that Partners could use it as they see fit, and the final guidance is responsive to Partners concerns raised in Mexico City.

Mr. Jones inquired if late 2012 might be an appropriate timeframe, particularly going into the next Expo and providing clarification to vendors. The United States stated the concept raised by Australia (i.e., have the Expo serve as inspiration to premiere action plans) was a good goal. Mr. Calder added it seemed like a natural aspiration to aim for the 2013 Expo and also in line with the nature of a voluntary program (e.g., more than a year away) and respectful of each country's circumstances (e.g., upcoming elections and/or legislative sessions). Mexico echoed the sentiment, indicating presidential elections in 2012 that might affect their action plan. Mr. Jones stated a similar reality existed in the United States, while Mr. Ulfstedt indicated Finland's 2012 elections would likely not affect its action plan development. Ms. Lopez said that despite voluntary basis and desire to have action plans by the Expo, it might be helpful to have a discussion in Vancouver if/why some Partners have not completed them. Mr. Jones countered that having action plans in advance of the Expo might improve vendor attendance (i.e., provide greater incentive).

Mr. Jones asked participants when and how they envisioned submitting action plans (e.g., within 6 months to a year, as part of country statement). Mr. Ferland explained that establishing a time frame might appear onerous but the ASG was merely trying to get a mechanism in place for creating living documents. He added that in light of previous comments regarding climate talks and national elections, the ASG anticipated action plans might evolve to reflect emerging initiatives (e.g., SLCFs). Mr. Kamienski commented that if the action plans were frequently updated, it might result in providing information on activities achieved only. He suggested updating the plans every two years, but recognized that it might be necessary as change(s) occur; otherwise, it might become too difficult or cumbersome to do it all at once at the end of the period. Japan asked that given the purported flexibility, did the question of timeframe need to be addressed now. Instead, Mr. Mizuno suggested waiting and evaluating a possible time frame scenario based on submittals. Argentina echoed that remark. The United States agreed it had the same mind set as Poland that action plans should be updated as often as necessary, pending changes in government and/or resources. Mr. Gunning also stated that it might be more important for countries to provide comments on what has happened as a result of action plans (rather than country statements) and provide an opportunity to discuss progress or challenges, with more emphasis on how things are going versus when (i.e., specific time frame). Australia agreed there should be less focus on frequency and more emphasis on results, as well as where further assistance might be needed.

Mr. Jones introduced the topic of "how" to update the action plans (e.g., orally at annual meetings, via online submittal). Canada indicated it would make for a long meeting if all Partners provided a verbally update and instead encouraged posting the documents on the website, with only a brief comment as part of the country statement. The United States agreed, adding it would make the process transparent and create opportunities for sharing. Mr. Jones asked if there were objections to having the action plans reside on the GMI website. Hearing none, he added that it might also serve as a self-regulating incentive to keep the documents current. Mr. Jones also summarized his understanding of the other decisions to not specify a time frame for providing updates, but rather see how it goes and encourage Partners to make changes is necessary. Mr. Ferland indicated the ASG viewed the discussion as general acceptance of the guidance with the changes proposed by Partners.

Subcommittee Progress Reports

Coal Mines

Ms. Pamela Franklin, co-chair from the United States, provided the [Coal Subcommittee progress report](#) on behalf of the other acting co-chairs, Mr. Guoquan Zhao of China and Mr. B.N. Basu of India. She indicated the subcommittee met twice since the previous Steering Committee, noting that the June 2010 meeting was held via webinar. She added that while cost-effective to convene this way, the webinar did prove difficult given the breadth of time zones represented in the coal sector. She explained the subcommittee had been instrumental in the development and distribution of the United Nation's Economic Commission in Europe (UNECE) Best Practices Guidance in 2009-2010 and over the past

year, conducted numerous workshops to promote the document and touted practices. She indicated the workshops provided the most effective way to move these practices forward and indicated the UNECE met earlier in the week to discuss further action. Ms. Franklin commented on highlights of country-specific activities within the coal sector and provided an overview of each (see [slides 5-14 of the presentation](#) for details).

Agriculture

Mr. Jorge Hilbert, co-chair from Argentina, provided the [Agriculture Subcommittee progress report](#) on behalf of himself and Mr. Anil Dhussa, co-chair from India. Mr. Hilbert opened by reviewing the subcommittee's meetings since March 2010. He commented that Agriculture's webinar was a useful mechanism to get maximum participation at a low cost. Regarding last year's charge to review subcommittee leadership, he explained that Ethiopia, the United Kingdom, and the United States have expressed interest in becoming co-chairs. He also congratulated the Steering Committee on its decision to elevate the Wastewater Task Force to the status of Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee. Mr. Hilbert indicated that Agriculture is developing an international AD database and that a draft or beta version would be made available that day. He noted that ultimately, it would be posted on the GMI website and include information such as number of AD projects and associated emission reductions. Mr. Hilbert expressed the Agriculture Subcommittee's support for U.S. EPA's new grant criteria requiring letters of support from country delegates and views this as a way to elevate the project's profile. He also requested that projects included in GMI Partner Action Plans have a similar requirement.

Mr. Hilbert explained future activities for the Agriculture Subcommittee might include development of new GHG calculations as well as national AD guidelines to serve as indicators as well as criteria to help governments conduct follow-up. He indicated the subcommittee wished to explore more stringent membership requirements in light of inflated Partner numbers without increased results. He congratulated the ASG on the website redesign and encouraged GMI to explore inclusion of the Google translate function, as well as linking project location to the Partner Country map. Mr. Hilbert directed participants to [slides 7-11 of the presentation](#) to view example activities by country.

Upon conclusion, Mr. Eil asked if the Agriculture sector-specific action plans include project descriptions. Mr. Hilbert clarified his request for letters of support should carry over to Expo projects, indicating that only 30 percent of the members have sector plans. Mr. Ferland commented the Google translate function currently exists on the GMI website, and the ASG is pursuing satellite linkages to projects.

Oil and Gas

Ms. Carey Bylin with U.S. EPA provided the [Oil and Gas Subcommittee progress report](#) on behalf of the co-chairs Michael Layer from Canada, Javier Bocanegra of Mexico, and Kaplan Basniev of Russia. Ms. Bylin reviewed new GMI Partners that will participate in the Oil and Gas sector and also noted that upon review of the subcommittee leadership, no changes were deemed necessary. In an effort to get more involved with other organizations, the Oil and Gas Subcommittee has been working with the World Bank to sponsor workshops and collectively leverage resources. She noted the Oil and Gas sector provided comments on the GMI Partner Action Plan guidance and the subcommittee will work with its members to compile their plans. The Oil and Gas Subcommittee was involved in the review of the new sector-specific GMI fact sheet and will play an integral role in identifying session topics and speakers for the next Expo. Ms. Bylin also provided an overview of country oil and gas-related activities (see [slides 8-17 of the presentation](#) for details).

Following the Oil and Gas presentation, Finland inquired about Russia's flaring activities. Mr. Bylin explained a fellow U.S. EPA colleague tracked activities in Russia so she did not have any concrete details, but it was her understanding that the focus was shifting to vent reduction.

Landfills

Mr. Gabriel Blanco, co-chair from Argentina, provided the [Landfill Subcommittee progress report](#) on behalf of himself and co-chairs Ms. Lopez from Colombia and Ms. Rachel Goldstein from the United States. To start, Mr. Blanco delivered an overview of the landfill sector highlights from the 2010 Expo and its numerous outreach and communication activities (e.g., *MI* newsletter article, more than 25 training/capacity building workshops). He noted the Landfill Subcommittee convened via webinar in June 2010 and met in person in November 2010, the latter of which was held in conjunction with the Agriculture Subcommittee and the Wastewater Task Force. The subcommittee has embarked on other activities associated with LFG models, and will also focus on abatement efforts as part of the expanded GMI. Mr. Blanco was excited to hear the Steering Committee recommended establishing the Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee. He reviewed next steps for the Landfill Subcommittee, which include peer reviewing the LFG best practices handbook, updating the GMI tracking system, and preparing for the 2013 Expo. Lastly, Mr. Blanco announced he would be stepping down as subcommittee co-chair, but Colombia and the United States would remain co-chairs.

Upon conclusion, Mr. Portalupi asked about the proposed subcommittee name change that was discussed in Mexico City. Mr. Blanco indicated the subcommittee elected to wait for a decision regarding wastewater and will now prepare a proposal for the Steering Committee's consideration at the next meeting. Mr. Gunning expressed gratitude to Mr. Blanco for his years of service to both Methane to Markets and now GMI.

GMI Futures

Mr. Ferland introduced the last [GMI Futures discussion paper](#) and [accompanying GMI Futures presentation](#), indicating the ASG was simply testing ideas and providing opportunities for input. He explained the organizational structure of GMI is similar to Methane to Markets (i.e., Steering Committee, ASG, Subcommittees, and a Project Network as defined in the TOR), but emphasized the Partnership's growth over the years from 14 to 41 Partners, three to five sectors, and 110 to 1,100 Project Network members. For the purpose of this discussion, Mr. Ferland stated the ASG was focused on the functions of the Steering Committee chair and hosting the ASG. He provided an overview of both the chair ASG responsibilities and activities, indicating that historically both roles have been filled and/or performed by U.S. EPA. Mr. Ferland stated the ASG was interested in ways that might garner additional involvement, such as having a rotating chair (similar to the UNFCCC and Arctic Council), rotating ASG, or having an independent organization host the ASG. He reviewed the pros and cons associated with the latter two ASG hosting options, citing possible loss of continuity while opening opportunities to provide a possible funding mechanism.

Spring boarding to the topic of funding, Mr. Ferland explained that given GMI's current status and structure, there was no central fund or mechanism for direct project financing. He emphasized GMI's primary influence has been through capacity building and technology transfer. He provided an overview of existing funding (e.g., U.S. EPA grants, leveraging), and pointed out the absence of a funnel through GMI itself. Initial financing options or models identified by the ASG include the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), in which the World Bank acts as a trustee.

Mr. Ferland explained the topic of short lived climate forcers (SLCFs) arose from an August brainstorming session, followed by a September meeting in Mexico. He noted that GMI plays a distinct,

obvious role in the issue but the ASG was interested to learn Partners' readiness and willingness to engage in this emerging initiative (e.g., big opportunities with enhanced attention on methane). He explained methane's contribution to SLCFs (i.e., 30 to 40 percent) and provided an overview and possible action items (e.g., organization, financial support, role of GMI, statement of support).

At the conclusion of Mr. Ferland's overview, Mr. Jones stated the United States is committed to continuing its role as both Steering Committee chair and ASG host, but wanted to solicit input for all Partners and also raise the opportunity for another member. Canada indicated it was pleased the United States would not step away from the roles. Finland supported having the United States continue in both capacities, which has been working well. Poland expressed there are new challenges emerging (e.g., SLCFs) so it is important to maintain continuity, but it was a good idea to raise the issue and discuss. Norway and Australia also extended support for the continued U.S. leadership. Mr. Jones expressed appreciation for Partner support and is happy to continue, but would welcome flexibility going forward.

On the issue of financing, Mr. Jones reiterated that current resources are primarily directed to capacity building. He indicated the ASG had no definitive suggestion(s) but believed it was something to explore. Canada commented on the need for project developers to go where the money is (i.e., no money, no projects). He encouraged participants to look beyond the Copenhagen accord and also consider failed attempts to engage multi-lateral development banks. He noted that an opportunity exists to be the gateway for methane-driven NAMAs, adding that projects might not be GMI specific but the Partnership could serve as a methane umbrella. He also noted the need for ministerial-level support to help showcase projects. Mr. Jones commented on the level of minister awareness and support for GMI displayed in Mexico City.

Mr. Eil agreed with Canada's comments on the need to find and leverage resources as a key success metric. He encouraged attendees to think systematically and strategically moving forward, particularly in light of uncertainty surrounding sources of private financing for methane abatement projects such as the CDM. He noted the Copenhagen Accord sets a target of \$100 billion in annual investment to address climate change by 2020, which necessarily will require significant private investment, and encouraged Partners to consider how to help leverage private sector funding and stimulate new project development. Mr. Presicce stated Italy was thinking along the same lines for raising the platform to leverage private funding. He noted the linkages to existing and potential future funding mechanisms and expressed support for a financing option white paper, although he felt it might be too early to establish a task force to explore the issue. He also encouraged charging the subcommittees to think about possible linkages within each sector. Norway also expressed support for a financing options paper. Mr. Ulfstedt said he was not opposed to the idea of a future task force but that it should be based on the paper's results or recommendations. Mr. Mizuno agreed the proposed paper would help focus discussion on potential options and their various strengths or weaknesses, but he also stressed the need to crystallize why developed countries should help contribute funding. He noted the importance of a convincing story as well as a technical discussion of existing financial mechanism components. He would also like to see GMI distinguish itself and stress its uniqueness coupled with co-benefits of methane reduction. Mr. Eil agreed with Japan's position and stated it was not the ASG's intention to create a new fund, but rather identify ways to funnel funding to GMI projects.

Mr. Jones summarized the discussion as desire to have the ASG develop a financing option paper that is as extensive as possible for future narrowing by the Steering Committee. Mr. Gunning asked that the paper capture the element suggested by Italy that options be explored in consultation with the subcommittees to ensure application or appropriateness for all sectors.

On the topic of SLCFs, Mr. Jones indicated interest stemmed from need to raise methane's profile and harness the increasing global interest. He added the objective to raise awareness and position GMI as a supporter as the initiative emerges. Japan commented that Mr. Gunning's presentation during the plenary

session was very clear and easy to digest, but wondered why the issue needed to be considered as a package. Instead, Mr. Mizuno thought the components should be considered individually (e.g., methane, black carbon). He also inquired if there was no specific action needed, why should GMI pursue the topic at this time. Mr. Eil responded that the purpose for grouping SLCFs was to draw attention to near-term mitigation opportunities that are not currently addressed by the UNFCCC. He added that one of the most compelling points that might have been short-changed in the presentation for brevity was a graphic showing that SLCF mitigation measures in conjunction with CO₂, could keep global warming below 2 degrees Centigrade by 2050 and how this target would not be attainable with CO₂ reduction only. He stated the topic was mostly to raise critical awareness of the short-lived element and how to achieve greater results. He noted there is no current initiative and underlined the question whether it would complement or lend itself to raising awareness of GMI and its coordination efforts. Poland commented that there should be a more global focus, and that might arise as the initiative emerges. Mr. Kamienski encouraged the Partners not to analyze the perspective from Steering Committee delegates but rather a top-down approach.

Mr. Ferland acknowledged the United States and Canada comments and admitted it is still unclear what might emerge, but the ASG was interested in exploring opportunities to expose others to the role of methane and ultimately, GMI. He noted the ASG repeatedly hears from subcommittee delegates that they receive little to no ministerial recognition. He also acknowledged Japan's concerns about why take action now (i.e., before the initiative fully emerges). Norway clarified they support doing something while the initiative is forming but indicated it might be a moving target. The United States encouraged participants not to lose sight of Poland's desire for a global roadmap on the amount of atmospheric methane. He reviewed the methane mitigation opportunities issue that was raised in Rome and wondered if the topic should be revisited. He also commented that U.S. EPA is currently updating its marginal abatement costs (MAC) curves, noting the identification of emissions is concluded and U.S. EPA is now working on compiling cost information across countries and sectors. He saw this preliminary discussion as an opportunity to develop a vision for what (and where) activities can be achieved.

Ecuador viewed this as an opportunity to provide linkages to help make the regional case for emission reductions, but wondered what was the ASG's main objective. Argentina stated there was no country directive presently but wondered if GMI might be over-extending itself in the absence of a solid initiative. Mr. Zopatti encouraged the Partnership to proceed with caution.

Mr. Jones stated he heard Partners were interested in staying on top on the emerging initiative so that once it is fully developed, GMI will be ready to respond. He suggested tasking the ASG to keep Partners informed of future developments. The United States agreed, and emphasized it would support tracking ongoing efforts and recommended all delegates to become more aware of activities to date. He also encouraged participants to take the message back to their national governments, and use the opportunity to illustrate that GMI could be a critical force in this global initiative. Canada indicated a GMI statement of support for the SLCF Initiative is premature and instead, supported the idea of the ASG tracking developments and informing Partners. Argentina echoed this sentiment. Based on these discussions, Mr. Jones stated the ASG would be tasked with staying informed, with the U.S. caveat for Partners to make ministries aware. He also commented that a fair number of Partners are already involved in the preliminary discussions. Canada inquired if the United States was aware of next steps and Mr. Eil responded discussions were ongoing but that the State Department was keen to advance the initiative.

Major Decisions and Outcomes/Charges to the Initiative

Mr. Jones reviewed the [Steering Committee major decisions/outcomes and charges](#) made over the two days to ensure the delegates were onboard prior to sharing it with the remaining Partners. Ms. Shimamura reviewed the major Steering Committee decisions, which included:

- Approval of Norway's request to join.
- Support for Canada's offer to host next Expo in 2013 and utilization of previous Expo model (e.g., Expo Task Force, early determination of Expo themes and objectives, site visits, strategic outreach mechanisms, subcommittee identification of sector-specific session topics/speakers and projects, and promotion beyond GMI members).
- Supported elevating wastewater task force to subcommittee status with the United States serving as interim chair, while ASG queries Partners interested in serving as members or chairs.
- Tasked forthcoming Municipal Wastewater Subcommittee with developing a sector-specific action plan that includes ongoing coordination with Agriculture and Landfill Subcommittees.
- Reached consensus to use new GMI Partner Action Plan guidance. The ASG shall incorporate additional language on leveraging existing tools/resources from other climate initiatives and/or national plans (e.g., NAMAs, LEDS).
- Encouraged completion of GMI Partner Action Plans prior to 2013 Expo.
- Suggested periodic updates should be performed, as necessary.
- Determined GMI Partner Action Plans should be posted on the website.
- Supported continuation of United States' role as Steering Committee chair and ASG host, with flexibility and encouragement for Partners to have opportunity in the future.
- Tasked the ASG with development of white paper to explore financing options for Steering Committee consideration, which will also include Subcommittee consultation.
- Regarding the SLCFs Initiative, the ASG will endeavor to keep Steering Committee and Partners informed and Steering Committee delegates should keep their leadership informed as effort evolves.

Ms. Shimamura also reviewed the various charges to the ASG, Partners, and Subcommittees as they relate to outreach and communication, the next Expo, municipal wastewater, action plans, and GMI futures (see [slides 9-20 of the presentation](#) for details).

Other Business

Following the recap, Mr. Jones asked if there was any other business. Canada asked if the subcommittees could be charged with holding webinars in lieu of in-person meetings. Mr. Gunning explained that historically, the subcommittees have endeavored to meet twice a year and that it is difficult to replace or replicate the value of face-to-face meetings. He suggested that webinars should not supplant but rather supplement in-person meetings. Mr. Ferland recommended holding at least one in-person subcommittee meeting prior to the Expo, to be supplemented with webinars as necessary. Australia commented if these discussions were based on focused agendas, much could be accomplished via webinar.

Mr. Jones asked if fourteen months might be too long to wait before the next Steering Committee, assuming it would be held in conjunction with the Expo. The United States recommending utilizing the webinar option if any issues arise that require urgent or immediate discussion; otherwise, he felt the time frame was adequate. Canada indicated they anticipated the Steering committee meeting would be an Expo component so echoed the U.S. position. Mr. Jones asked if there was precedence for handling Steering Committee business via webinar and Mr. Ferland responded affirmatively that both TOR and Ministerial Declaration review had been conducted in this manner. Mr. Jones noted webinars might also serve as a good option if the SLCF initiative emerges within the coming year.

Hearing no further new business, Mr. Jones thanked the participants for their time and energy over the last two days as well as the preparation in advance of the meeting. He expressed hope for continued engagement in advance of the Expo and looked forward to seeing everyone in Vancouver.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.



1st Steering Committee Meeting
12-13 October 2011
Krakow, Poland



Steering Committee Participants

Argentina

Alvaro Zopatti

Climate Change Advisor
Office with the Secretariat of Environment & Sustainable Development
Argentina
azopatti@ambiente.gob.ar; alvarozopatti@gmail.com

Australia

Wayne Calder

Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism
GPO Box 1564
Canberra, ACT 2601
Australia
+61 2 6243 7718
wayne.calder@ret.gov.au

Canada

Franck Portalupi

Manager, Technology Partnerships
Environment Canada
200 Sacre Coeur
Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0H3
Canada
+1-819-997-2375
franck.portalupi@ec.gc.ca

Colombia

Sandra Lopez

Climate Change Advisor
Ministry of Environment of Colombia
Calle 37 No. 8 - 40
Bogota 100101
Colombia
+57-1 3323400, Ext. 1179
slopez@minambiente.gov.co, sandra.lopez.t@gmail.com

Ecuador

Lorena Falconi

Asesora
Ministerio del Ambiente
Subsecretaría de Cambio Climático
Quito, Ecuador
lfalconi@ambiente.gob.ec

Finland

Erik Ulfstedt

Ambassador
Ministry for Foreign Affairs/KPO-10
P.O. Box 428
Government, 00023
Finland
+358-9-160 55791
erik.ulfstedt@formin.fi

Germany

Marlene Sieck

Scientific Employee
Federal Environment Agency
Wörlitzer Platz 1
Dessau, 06844
Germany
+49 340 2103 2464
marlene.sieck@uba.de

Italy

Francesco Presicce

Italian Ministry for the Environment , Land and Sea
via C.Bavastro 174
Roma 00147
Italy
+390657228162
presicce.francesco@minambiente.it

Japan

Osamu Mizuno

Director
The Ministry of the Environment
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8975
Japan
+03-3581-3351, Ext. 6532
osamu_mizuno@env.go.jp

Mexico

Cesar Rafael Chavez Ortiz

General Director of Urban and Tourism Environmental Promotion
Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources
Blvd. Adolfo Ruiz Cortines 4209
Jardines en la Montaña
Mexico City, 14210
Mexico
+52 55 54 90 09 29
cesar.chavez@semarnat.gob.mx

Poland

Katarzyna Kacperczyk
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Al. Szucha 23
Warsaw, 00-580
Poland
+48 22)523 82 30
katarzyna.kacperczyk@msz.gov.pl

Zbigniew Kamienski
Deputy Director - Economy Development Department
Ministry of Economy, Poland
Plac Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warsaw, 00-507
Poland
+48226935919
zbigniew.kamienski@mg.gov.pl

Honorata Nyga-Łukaszewska
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Al. Szucha 23
Warsaw, 00-580
Poland
+48 22 523 97 77
honorata.nyga-lukaszewska@msz.gov.pl

Lukasz Sosnowski
Expert
Ministry of Economy, Poland
Plac Trzech Krzyzy 3/5
Warsaw, 00-507
Poland
+48226935815
lukasz.sosnowski@mg.gov.pl

United States

Andrew Eil
Coordinator for Climate Change Assistance Programs
U.S. Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Suite 2480
Washington, DC 20053
United States
+1-202-647-6738
eilag@state.gov

Henry Ferland
Co-Director
Global Methane Initiative, ASG
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Mailcode: 6207J
Washington, DC 20460
United States
+1-202-343-9330
ferland.henry@epa.gov

Paul Gunning
Acting Director
Climate Change Division
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
United States
+1-202-343-9736
gunning.paul@epa.gov

Jim Jones
Deputy Assistant Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room 5426
Washington, DC 20460
United States
+1-202 564-0342
jones.jim@epa.gov

Monica Shimamura
Co-Director
Global Methane Initiative, ASG
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW 6207J
Washington, DC 20460
United States
+1-202-343-9337
shimamura.monica@epa.gov

Observers

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Clare Lonergan

UNFCCC

Martin-Luther-King-Strasse 8

Bonn, 53175

Germany

+49 157 0336 9835

clonergan@unfccc.int

Norway

Havard Toresen

Deputy Director General

Ministry of the Environment, Norway

Norway

Appendix B

GLOBAL METHANE INITIATIVE 1ST STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

First Session
Park Inn
Krakow, Poland
12-13 October 2011

GMI1/Doc.1

Final Agenda

Item

Document

Day One – Wednesday, 12 October at 2:00 PM

Agenda 1	Welcome and Opening of the Meeting	
Agenda 2	Introductions	
Agenda 3	Statement of Meeting Goals	
Agenda 4	Adoption of the Agenda	GMI1/Doc.1
Agenda 5	Brief Country Statements and Updates* (Remarks to be 5-7 minutes per country)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Argentina• Australia• Brazil• Canada• China• Colombia• Ecuador• European Commission• Finland• Germany• Ghana• India• Italy• Japan• Mexico• Nigeria• Poland• Republic of Korea• Russia• Ukraine• United Kingdom• United States	
	Observers: UNFCCC, NORWAY <i>*Partners in bold have indicated they will participate, additional confirmations are expected.</i>	
Agenda 6	Consideration of Norway's Request to Join GMI	
Agenda 7	Status of GMI Outreach & Communications Efforts	GMI1/Doc.2
Agenda 8	GMI Partnership Expo	GMI1/Doc.3
Agenda 9	Update on Municipal Wastewater Sector	GMI1/Doc.4
Adjourn at 6:00 p.m.	End of Day One	

Day Two – Thursday, 13 October at 11:30 AM

Agenda 10	Welcome/Re-Opening	
Agenda 11	Status of GMI Partner Action Plans	GMI1/Doc.5
Agenda 12	GMI Futures	GMI1/Doc.6
Lunch	Working Lunch, during which Subcommittees will provide progress reports (see below)	
Agenda 13	Progress Reports from Subcommittees <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Agriculture Co-Chairs• Coal Co-Chairs and Vice Chair• Landfill Co-Chairs• Oil & Gas Co-Chairs and Vice Chair	
Agenda 12 (con't)	GMI Futures (con't)	GMI1/Doc.6
Agenda 14	Next Steps and Charge to Subcommittees for Year 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of Decisions Made and Next Steps• Develop Charge to Subcommittees presentation	
Agenda 15	Other Business	
Adjourn at 6:00 p.m.	End of Day Two	

*Background or concept papers on the key topics will be provided.